

DLP Policy	Rep ID	DLP Rep ID	DLP Summary of Rep	DLP Officer Reponse	DLP Section	objection or support
CS10	1	000001DLP	<p>Object to the allocation of site H40 for housing adverse effect on the residential amenity of the neighbours (noise, disturbance, overlooking and loss of privacy). Unacceptably high density Loss of open aspect of the neighbourhood Visual impact on the neighbourhood and also an effect on its character. Loss of existing views onto open countryside Compromising Highway safety due to the narrowing of the road on Lodge Close, extra traffic on Westwood Lane and Brooke Drive, and exits onto Manor road Manor road is very busy and would be worse if there was an increase in traffic from any development. Loss of wildlife and habitats Impact on public footpath The Trans pennine trail will be affected visually due to any cutting back of the mature hedges that dates back over 300 years There are enough vacant Brown Field sites in are area with out the need to spoil open countryside</p>	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS1	2	000001DLP	<p>Object to allocation for housing at Land east of Lodge Close Alternative brownfield sites are available 1. increase in vehicular traffic in the immediate vicinity. Westwood Lane is not suitable for heavy vehicular usage. Any increase in traffic raises an issue with regard to children's safety 2. Sewage and foul water drainage. There have been problems with the ability of the local pumping station and water courses to effectively deal with the excess capacity of sewage and foul water at times of adverse weather conditions. 3. Planning permission has recently been refused for residential development on this site for a multitude of reasons.</p> <p>Would strongly argue that this location is a green wedge area as set out in the consultation document 2017. The Local Plan should absorb area 57 on the map into SG2.</p>	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS4	3	000001DLP	Build the homes but do not forget the schools. All are full in this area [Hasland]	The availability of education facilities will be taken into account through the detailed process of assessing sites. Where there is potential to provide additional capacity to support new development, policy CS4	Infrastructure Delivery	Comment
CS10	4	000001DLP	<p>Object to the the inclusion of the site as a possible area for housing development Although there is a need for new housing development brownfield sites attract grants and do not involve the use of green agricultural land This field is not on the Local Development Plan (2015) as a designated area for residential development There are other locations along Manor Road marked for residential development closer to the amenities of the Brimington Local Service Centre This proposal is 'breaking out' into open countryside Westwood Lane does not provide a safe or appropriate access The current traffic levels are already unsafe The junction at the top of Westwood Lane hazardous as it is a sharp right angle junction with very poor sight lines Horses and their riders from 3 local riding centres, cyclists,(both club and private), walkers and walking clubs travel up and down Westwood Lane every day in order to access the bridle By being allowed to 'return to nature' for the last forty years or so, this field has become a haven for wildlife. This field was planned to be designated as Public Open Space on the previous Local Plan. This is now designated as a 'developing woodland' (SBwood38) on the new Local Plan. Construction works and residential use would drive out animal life The bridleway immediately to the north of this field is very well used and has been upgraded by the council It is also part of the Trans Pennine Trail route and National Cycle Network. Development would detract from the public amenity value of this path The amenity and view for would be adversely affected by development.</p>	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection

CS10	5	000001DLP	Object to residential sites H34 DLP, H15DLP, H69DLP and possible total of 313 homes School is already above capacity and people moving into the area are unable to get their children in our school. They often appeal unsuccessfully Other schools in our area are also full There would also be impact on local doctors, dentists etc	These sites will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	6	000001DLP	Object to inclusion of H15 as a potential housing site The proposed site is greenfield and forms an attractive feature when exiting Hasland The site is a flood plain for Calow Brook Calow Lane is difficult to navigate smoothly. More traffic generated by additional housing would be disastrous	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
	7	000001DLP	Pg 9: it is of great concern that the situation regarding health continues to deteriorate. The cause is needed before appropriate action can be undertaken.	Noted. CBC continues to work with Derbyshire County Council, The NHS and CCG's on this issue.	Strategic Objectives	Comment
	7	000002DLP	Progress on the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor is contingent upon the prior delivery of the CST plans for Mastin Moor. It is therefore important that CBC works as expeditiously as possible once Outline Planning is applied for by CST. I would also hope that CBC seek to ensure that SRVC becomes a Government sponsored Garden Village in the event that this programme is extended or that current successful areas drop out.	Progress on the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor is not contingent upon delivery of development at Mastin Moor. Work is progressing with CST towards a planning application for development around the Works Road Area. The corridor was unsuccessful in gaining designation as	Strategic Objectives	Comment
	7	000003DLP	I welcome the last sentence in this paragraph regarding voluntary organisations.	Noted	Strategic	Support
	7	000004DLP	I feel that it is important to mention the areas to the East of the Borough- not just Bolsover Castle and Hardwick Hall but The Dukeries area in general. The Peak District is at capacity and there is a great opportunity in terms of the visitor economy to the east. This would benefit from being mentioned and prioritised. This applies to CS14.	1.6 add reference to Sherwood Forest. Reference to north Nottinghamshire added to 7.12.	Strategic Objectives	Objection
	7	000005DLP	Reference is made to "improving safety features": can an explanation be provided as to what these are? Would welcome improvements to the A619 potentially by the SRVC Spine Road.	Includes lighting, CCTV, removing blind corners and	Strategic	Objection
	7	000006DLP	Would welcome improvements in access to the Chesterfield Railway Station. St Mary's Gate should be pedestrianised to improve the setting of the Church Plan should refer to the possibility/desirability of extending the Sheffield Supertram system to the Borough instead of using the railway infrastructure at Barrow Hill and Markham Vale or an extension of the Robin Hood Line. (Strategic Objective 9).	There are no plans to extend the Sheffield Supertram to the borough.	Strategic Objectives	Objection
	7	000007DLP	The statistics regarding unemployment are not reliable indicators of the issue. The number of people in the Borough who are economically inactive is higher than the unemployment statistics used in this Plan.	Local Plans must be based on 'based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects	Spatial Strategy	Objection
	7	000015DLP	A new Local Centre should be developed at an early stage of development at Mastin Moor. This will help establish the new community and immediately benefit the existing community of Mastin Moor.	Noted. The requirement is reflected in policy LP1 iii (Mastin Moor). The timing of a new Local Centre will need to be negotiated as part of any planning	Vitality and Viability	Objection
	7	000020DLP	Congestion is a problem on the A619 and in Mastin Moor and Woodthorpe at school dropping off and pick up times, together with the numerous times that the M1 is closed. Bus transportation is not as frequent as stated; on Sunday afternoons between 4 and six for example. Given the current situation with the removal of subsidies it is likely that bus services will get worse. The majority of the buses in the Borough are old, unattractive and highly polluting. Real Time Information boards should be provided at bus stops- initially on the major routes.	Noted. The council will continue to work with Derbyshire County Council and public transport providers to identify improvements to services and access to information.	Travel and Transport	Objection
	7	000021DLP	OBJECT The proposal by HS2 to locate an IMD on part of the former Staveley Works site is highly inappropriate and detrimental to the area. It is unlikely to bring as many jobs as alternative uses and highly unlikely that many of any of the new jobs will go to local people. The track from HS2 to Staveley will blight many houses in a way that a normal railway service would not. The depot will operate 24/7. It will pollute the immediate neighbourhood with noise, light pollution and fumes. This will have an adverse effect on health. There will be increased HGV traffic during the day and maintenance trains operating all night. The Local Plan should urge the planners of HS2 to follow the example of HS1 in siting the IMD.	The location of an HS2 Infrastructure Maintenance Depot and the access route to it from the main HS2 line has been confirmed by the safeguarding declaration issues by the government in July 2017. The Local Plan reflects this position and seeks to plan positively for it. The council is working with HS2 Ltd, Derbyshire County Council, landowners and other partners to maximise the benefits and mitigate the impact of the proposal on the borough.	Travel and Transport	Objection
	7	000022DLP	SUPPORT	Noted	Regeneration	Support
	7	000023DLP	I am not aware of a Methodist Chapel in Mastin Moor since the Jubilee /Ebenezer Chapel was closed in 2000 and then demolished.	Noted, paragraph 10.17 has been amended accordingly	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
	7	000024DLP	I have previously commented on the bus service	Noted	Regeneration	Objection

	7	000025DLP	I question that there is "low potential of hitherto unknown archaeology anywhere in the non-opencast areas": the opposite is likely to be true.	This statement is based on advice from the County Archaeologist and the Historic Environment Record. A heritage assessment is expected to be a requirement of	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
	7	000026DLP	The Norbriggs Flash LNR is a floodplain area and so naturally will flood when there are high levels of rainfall. So it is not "at risk of flooding" as understood by the public. The second area is one that is of greater concern to the public and one that the CST proposals will address with balancing/attenuation ponds.	The level of flood risk is based on Environment Agency flood risk maps	Regeneration Priority Areas	Comment
	7	000027DLP	Land to the west is Norbriggs Flash LNR not Netherthorpe Flash which is to the south.	Paragraph 10.21 has been amended for clarity	Regeneration	Objection
CS1	7	000008DLP	Agree with the RPA of the Eastern Villages. Middlecroft identified as in the top 10% of deprivation there is no strategy proposed. How is Middlecroft to be improved?	Addressing deprivation requires a multi-agency and multi-disciplinary approach. The allocation of the RPAs is one response where the availability of development opportunities that can address specific aspects (for example the range of types and tenures of properties, supporting key infrastructure or provision of new infrastructure through development). There are a	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS10	7	000010DLP	I support Point 4: Reserved Sites Options in the Mastin Moor RPA.	Noted	Homes and	Support
CS10	7	000011DLP	I would support an expansion of the site to accommodate 650 houses using land to the north of Bolsover Road.	Noted. The site is subject to a current application for 650 houses using the land east of Bolsover Road.	Homes and Housing	Support
CS11	7	000012DLP	OBJECT to the provision of Affordable Housing in the Mastin Moor area. The CST development is needed to bring into balance the existing Mastin Moor community, which consists almost wholly of Affordable Housing	Policy CS11 applies across the borough. The policy allows flexibility for a revised provision in areas where viability would be affected, and for provision to be in the form of special needs housing to meet a specific, Local Need (for example, in providing adapted properties or adaptations to existing properties	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS11	7	000013DLP	SUPPORT Adaptable and Accessible Housing.	Noted	Homes and	Support
CS11	7	000014DLP	The statistics provided in Para 50 may well be subject to question following the Referendum and the decision to exit the EU. Probable that there will be a drastic fall in the level of immigration to the UK. We will have an even more aging population and more demand for Retirement Village style communities.	Scenarios related to levels of immigration and the impact of brexit have been considered in the updated SHMAA which will inform the next stage of the Local	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS15	7	000016DLP	The current and proposed policies have resulted in residents being denied a full range of supermarkets and large retail shops. Chesterfield Town Centre is suited to tourism and leisure use There is a place for niche and specialist shopping. The current retail parks and out of town food stores are clearly what the public want They do not want to shop at Chesterfield Market (and even less so at Staveley Market) The Chesterfield Market place is clearly suited to the continental model as a tourist attraction with a café culture. CBC should be encouraging supermarkets like Morrison's in Staveley to plan now for the future. ASDA and	Such an approach would not be consistent with the sequential approach set out in the NPPF. The plan will allocate suitable location within and on the edge of Chesterfield Town Centre, Staveley Town Centre and District Centres to meet the retail needs of the borough as identified in the retail capacity assessment currently under preparation.	Vitality and Viability	Objection
CS16	7	000017DLP	OBJECT. The current and proposed policies have resulted in residents being denied a full range of supermarkets and large retail shops. Chesterfield Town Centre is suited to tourism and leisure use There is a place for niche and specialist shopping. The current retail parks and out of town food stores are clearly what the public want They do not want to shop at Chesterfield Market (and even less so at Staveley Market) The Chesterfield Market place is clearly suited to the continental model as a tourist attraction with a café culture. CBC should be encouraging supermarkets like Morrison's in Staveley to plan now for the future. ASDA and	Such an approach would not be consistent with the sequential approach set out in the NPPF. The plan will allocate suitable location within and on the edge of Chesterfield Town Centre, Staveley Town Centre and District Centres to meet the retail needs of the borough as identified in the retail capacity assessment currently under preparation.	Vitality and Viability	Objection
CS17	7	000018DLP	SUPPORT	Noted	Social	Support
CS18	7	000019DLP	SUPPORT Percent for Art should be used to support a Green Bridge to cross the A619 at Mastin Moor, rather than a light controlled crossing.	Noted. A bridge across the A619 is not likely to be viable to deliver as a public art project.	Design and the Built Environment	Support
CS9(b)	7	000009DLP	I support this and in particular as it impacts on the CST proposals for Mastin Moor.	Noted	Open Spaces	Support
RPAs	7	000028DLP	SUPPORT the LP1 RPA with the Mastin Moor RPA being expanded to include the area to the north of Bolsover Road, as detailed earlier. I would support public transport being provided to Markham Vale in addition to walking and cycling. Precent for Art should pay for a green bridge over the A619	Noted. A bridge across the A619 is not likely to be viable to deliver as a public art project.	Regeneration Priority Areas	Support
	9	000001DLP		Noted	Vision	Support

	9	000002DLP		Noted	Strategic	Support
Canal Corridors	9	000009DLP		Noted	River and Canal	Support
CS1	9	000003DLP	Support option 2 - inclusion of Midlecroft and retaining rother ward as Regeneration Priority Areas	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	9	000004DLP	Support Housing Target Option 3 and Employment Land Option 2 as most realistic and deliverable	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS1	9	000005DLP	Support no changes to Green Belt	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS10	9	000013DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000014DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000015DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000016DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000017DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000018DLP	This is greenfield land outside existing built up areas	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	9	000019DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000020DLP	land is greenfield but not high quality and adjoins built up area	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000021DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000022DLP	land outside built up area and has impact on listed Ringwood Hall	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	9	000023DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000024DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000025DLP	Need to maintain setting of Listed Building	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000026DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000027DLP	Greenfield land outside existing built up area	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	9	000028DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000029DLP	land is greenfield but not high quality and adjoins built up area	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS10	9	000030DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000031DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000032DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000033DLP	greenfield land outside built up area and impact on listed Dunston Grange	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	9	000034DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000035DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000036DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000037DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support

CS10	9	000065DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000066DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000067DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000068DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000069DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000070DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000071DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000072DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000073DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000074DLP	Greenfield land outside the existing built up area	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	9	000075DLP		This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	9	000076DLP	Impact on listed building at Bank Close House	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	9	000077DLP	Object to inclusion of reserved sites around Dunston Hall due to impact on surrounding Countryside and over development of large greenfield site outside existing built up area	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS18	9	000006DLP		Noted	Design and the	Support
CS19	9	000007DLP		Noted	Historic	Support
CS21	9	000012DLP	Support Brimington Staveley Bypass and Hollis Lane Link Road	Noted	Major Transport	Support
PS1	9	000011DLP	Support the retention of Chesterfield Town Centre as the main primary shopping area Chesterfield could do with a bus station, although a suitable site may be difficult to find	Noted	Making Great Places	Support
River Corridors	9	000010DLP		Noted	River and Canal	Support
RPAs	9	000008DLP		Noted	Regeneration	Support
CS10	10	000001DLP	Objects to the inclusion of a possible area for 26 dwellings on land off Lodge Close when an application for 38 dwellings (REF.CHE/16/00683/FUL) has been refused already. Believes this area should not be included at all in the new Local Plan for the many reasons included in letter (ref.PS/2/1075) and the Delegated Report Sheet. Representee believes these reasons still hold and is at a loss as to why it has been included in the LP.	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	12	000001DLP	Strongly object to the land east of Lodge Close being on the new Consultation Plan for housing development as consider any housing development here to be unsuitable (confirmed by 90 objections from residents living in the area). Issues include over sewerage, traffic, safety and amenities. Westwood Lane and Lodge Close is a quiet residential area mostly occupied by retired people. It is also a greenfield site and loss of habitat and wildlife corridor is totally unnecessary where brown field sites are available. Would like to see site removed from Local Plan.	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS15	13	000001DLP	We recommend the following additional clause to this policy to promote and support cultural activity in town centres (alternatively in policy PS1 for Chesterfield Town Centre): The temporary and meanwhile use of vacant buildings and sites by creative, cultural and community organisations will also be supported, particularly where they help activate and revitalise town centre locations and the public realm.	Creative, cultural and community uses broadly fall within main town centre uses and as such the policy criteria allows for such uses within centres, either permanently or on a temporary basis. Suggested change to provide a more positive emphasis to CS15: 'The Council will support the temporary occupation of	Vitality and Viability	Comment

CS17	13	<p>The Council does not propose to change this policy, however, we do recommend considering changing references to economic viability in the final paragraph of the policy.</p> <p>Many community and cultural facilities are run by charities, volunteers or other community organisations and are not considered 'viable' in a developer sense, which leads to pressure being put on these facilities, which are otherwise highly valued by the local community.</p> <p>We would therefore encourage you to refer to community need, rather than viability.</p> <p>For your information, to meet the requirements of Para 70 and 156 of the NPPF, the Trust normally recommends a policy along the following lines:</p> <p>Cultural and Community Facilities Development of new cultural and community facilities will be supported and should enhance the well-being of the local community, and the vitality and viability of centres.</p> <p>Major developments are required to incorporate, where practicable, opportunities for cultural activities, including providing public realm capable of hosting events and performances to widen public access to art and culture, including through the interpretation of the heritage of the site and area.</p> <p>The loss or change of use of existing cultural and community facilities will be resisted unless</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meet the need of the local population, or necessary services can be delivered from other facilities without leading to, or increasing, any shortfall in provision; or • it has been demonstrated that there is no longer a community need for the facility or demand for another community use on site. <p>The temporary and meanwhile use of vacant buildings and sites by creative, cultural and community organisations will also be supported, particularly where they help activate and revitalise town centre locations and the public realm.</p> <p>Council will apply the 'agent of change' principle, whereby if a development would potentially result in conflict Chesterfield is in the advantageous position of having two theatres compared to other towns of a similar size. The Trust would therefore suggest that an additional clause be included in this policy that recognises this and suggest wording such as:</p>	<p>Criteria 'a' covers the need element. The policy would be strengthened by replacing 'or' with 'and' so both criteria must apply. This ensures that community need is considered in cases where the current use is not economically viable.</p>	Social Infrastructure	Comment
PS1	13	<p>Protect and enhance the centre's existing cultural venues</p> <p>We also recommend the following additional clause to this policy to further promote and support cultural activity in town centres (alternatively in Policy CS15):</p> <p>The temporary and meanwhile use of vacant buildings and sites by creative, cultural and community organisations will also be supported, particularly where they help activate and revitalise town centre locations and the public realm.</p>	<p>Recommend change to PS1 criteria a: Protecting and enhancing the centre's sub-regional and local role in providing employment, services, leisure, CULTURAL VENUES and retail</p>	Making Great Places	Comment

CS10	14	000001DLP	<p>Strongly objects to the Land to the east of Lodge close, Brimington Common, being on the New Consultation Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Concerns re. impact on the residents of Lodge Close, Westwood Lane, and brooke drive, from a large increase in traffic using these roads. Highway safety would also be affected due to the narrow entrance road from Lodge close, and with Westwood lane not having any constructed pavements pedestrians will be at risk.</p> <p>There is also the increased traffic congestion onto Manor road, which is present is gridlocked most of the day due to the cars parking on the road for access to the school and peoples homes.</p> <p>There are three other brownfield sites in the area already been planned for residential developments with over 470 homes, so why build on open countryside and green fields that benefits a large amount of different wildlife and habitats.</p> <p>There would be an increased level of noise and pollution and any development would have a negative visual impact on the neighbourhood and its character and loss of existing views and its open aspect.</p> <p>This site has recently been refused planning permission for a housing development ref- CHE/16/00683/FUL and had 100 objections from local people and parish councillors, and was contrary to policies CS1, CS2, CS3, CS9, CS10, CS18 and CS20 of the core strategy policy EVR2 of the 2006 Local Plan, successful places. With this amount of planning issues this goes to show that this land is not appropriate piece of land for the revised Local Plan and should not be approved.</p>	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS13	15	000001DLP	The proposal to include this land (which is in our ownership) located between the M1 Commerce Park Duckmanton, S44 5HS and the M1 Motorway (as shown on attached plan) as Employment Land is acceptable to us. As previously noted there is considerable demand in this location.	Noted	Jobs Centres Facilities	Support
CS10	16	000001DLP	<p>Objects to the East of Lodge Close Brimington being included within the draft version of the next Local Plan as a possible area for housing development.</p> <p>Objected previously (Oct, 2016) to the proposal for 38 houses which was refused. Objects for same reasons stated within previous letter as it is totally unsuitable with poor access along Westwood Lane (only a virtual footpath), traffic levels, pollution, sewerage problems on Manor Road and no local amenities.</p>	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	17	000001DLP	Access to the proposed site would be via Westwood Lane. There are no existing pavements on Westwood Lane, only a 'virtual footway'. There would also be an increase in the volume of traffic that would use Westwood Lane.	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS15	18	000001DLP	The retail park should be identified as being part of the Chatsworth Road District Centre	The Local Plan defines District Centres as serving 'a primary local, convenience function for the surrounding residential areas, as well as providing significant specialist comparison retail'. The scale and nature of the occupants of the retail park do not fit this definition. The park is subject to range of goods restriction appropriate for and edge/out of centre retail park and parking restrictions that limit the scope	Vitality and Viability	Objection
CS10	20	000002DLP	<p>OBJECT to inclusion as housing site</p> <p>Access is inadequate</p> <p>Junction of Westwood Lane and Manor Road is inadequate</p> <p>Too far from Brimington Local Service Centre</p> <p>Doubt about ability to deal with waste water from the site</p> <p>Loss of wildlife and biodiversity</p> <p>Boundary hedge is historic and should be preserved</p> <p>Would fragment the green network in the area</p>	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection

CS9	20	000001DLP	<p>Agree with the methodology for assessment</p> <p>Southern boundary of the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap should be revised</p> <p>The current boundary is 'soft' (a footpath/bridleway)</p> <p>The revise dboundary should incorporate:</p> <p>The field marked as H40(57), which would provide a transition from the urban environment to open countryside</p> <p>The 'developing woodland' to the east above the field, which has resorted to natural woodland</p> <p>The field to the west of the above field</p> <p>This would also protect the ancient and historic southern boundary of field H40</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity</p>	<p>Support</p>
CS10	21	000001DLP	<p>land should be kept as is for wildlife, trees and recreation</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology</p>	<p>Homes and Housing</p>	<p>Objection</p>
CS10	22	000001DLP	<p>decision to refuse planning permisison was the right one</p> <p>Should be left as open space for the good of wildlife and people in general</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology</p>	<p>Homes and Housing</p>	<p>Objection</p>
CS11	23	000001DLP	<p>Greater need for two bedroom housing built to modern standards of heating and insulation due to UK's aging population. Few bungalows have been built in the past 20 years and many require updating. New bungalows could be available to purchase or rent.</p> <p>Specialist developers usually build in Southern England and there is a need for them to build in this area.</p> <p>With increasing demands on social care this would be cheaper for LA's in a small modern property as opposed to a 4 bedroom house.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges a need to plan to meet the needs of an increasing older population and the draft new Local Plan reflects this to a degree in policy CS11, which will allow the Council to negotiate affordable older persons accommodation within new developments where evidence is available to support such an approach. Paragraph 6.11 of the draft new Local Plan identifies the change of population age over</p>	<p>Homes and Housing</p>	<p>Comment</p>
	24	000001DLP	<p>Overall tenor is good however, insufficient evidence is given to the needs of faith communities.</p> <p>Suggest an additional point numbered 1.26 with the following wording:</p> <p>Everyone has access to appropriate Faith or Community facilities, located where possible in relation to the housing areas and with safe access facilitated.</p>	<p>An additional point has been added as follows:</p> <p>"Everyone has access to social infrastructure, including community, leisure, religious, education and health facilities including local shops, public houses and places of worship." This reflects the full range of social</p>	<p>Vision</p>	<p>Comment</p>
CS17	24	000002DLP	<p>Insert the words "where culturally appropriate" at the end of the first sentence after the word encouraged.</p> <p>Improvement of of existing facilities</p> <p>Add a sentence on the end of the paragraph saying "Major developments such as those covered under Making Great Places PS1-5 will be required to show provisions for providing and or improving social infrastructure and will be required to allot some opportunities suitably priced for the 3rd sector to develop".</p>	<p>The term 'culturally appropriate' cannot be adequately defined in planning terms. The policy seeks to 'encourage' multi-use but could not be used to force this where it is not acceptable to an applicant, occupier or landowner (hence the use of 'encourage' in preference to terms such as 'require'). It is considered that the policy already provides sufficient protection.</p>	<p>Social Infrastructure</p>	<p>Comment</p>
CS10	25	000001DLP	<p>If this application is passed, please ensure that the road congestion and pollution is improved before building starts.</p>	<p>This will be addressed through the Planning Application process (Note: Planning Permission was</p>	<p>Homes and Housing</p>	<p>Comment</p>
CS17	26	000002DLP	<p>OBJECT to use of the term 'cycling and walking'. This should be 'walking and cycling'.</p> <p>Construction of highly dangerous shared paths in town should cease.</p>	<p>'Walking and cycling' is used throughout the plan.</p> <p>'Cycling and walking' has been used in three sentences in the plan. The order in these sentences does not</p>	<p>Social Infrastructure</p>	<p>Objection</p>

CS5	26	000001DLP	<p>Industrialisation of Green Belt should not take place OBJECT to BWIND01, SBWIND07, SBWIND10: Harm to landscape There are no pylons or other vertical elements, the area is unspoilt Danger from construction on unstable land The high rotating structures would catch the eye and be detrimental to the rural scene; This is a particularly sensitive area for development of this kind, because of the panoramic views and it would take the focus away from the unspoilt rural scene and be a detriment; In some instances the proposed sites are too close to people's homes (e.g. SBWIND10) and turbines would severely impact on the residential amenity of the nearest properties; This is a particularly tranquil area. The turbine noise would be audible and be conspicuous, spoiling the birdsong etc.;</p> <p>Grasscroft Woods (SBWIND10) has a special status and the council recently worked with other agencies to manage the logging and regeneration of this ancient woodland. An environmental survey showed many species of wildlife that would be at risk from a major development; The areas are criss-crossed by public footpaths and public should be encouraged to enjoy the rural areas – recent studies show the benefit of rural surroundings to stress levels; These high green belt areas are visible from a great distance, and great impact would be caused by introducing a significant vertical element into the landscape. This would adversely impact on long views across the landscape and beyond, harming the peace and tranquillity of the rural area; The imposition of industrial machines would harm the rural setting and would stop the areas being 'get away from it all', unspoilt areas, peaceful and quiet with rural scenery. The development and success of 'Peak Resorts' would be seriously compromised by the erection of turbines around it.</p>	<p>Concerns noted, but no change required. Policy CS5 is sufficiently robust to ensure that any impacts are acceptable. Policy is consistent with the NPPF paragraphs 87, 88 and 91 which states that: When located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.</p>	A Changing Climate	Objection
CS1	28	000001DLP	<p>Support the inclusion of Barrow Hill in the RPAs Support the provision of 83ha of new employment land over the plan period</p>	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS13	28	000002DLP	<p>Support CS13 in principle and with specific reference to the former Wagon Works and Butlers Foundry, Chesterfield; and Storforth Lane Trading Estate.</p> <p>The Wagon Works/Butlers Foundry site will be progressing through the planning system within the next 12 months. We are currently undertaking infrastructure reviews and flood risk alleviation work.</p> <p>Seek clarification as to what is meant by the phrase 'Proposals that facilitate a mix of uses will be encouraged'. The wording seems at odds with the emphasis of paragraph 7.8, which does not 'encourage' mixed use developments, but which 'does not preclude' them. There is a lack of clarity within the policy.</p>	Noted	Jobs Centres Facilities	Support
RPAs	28	000003DLP	<p>Supports the allocation of Regeneration Priority Areas, particularly the area proposed at Barrow Hill. Support the approach that sites within the RPA are not specifically allocated for particular uses, to allow for flexibility in response to local social and economic needs.</p>	The support for RPA's as proposed is noted.	Regeneration Priority Areas	Support
RPAs	28	000004DLP	<p>Policy LP1, in relation to Barrow Hill, is overly prescriptive in that it does not specifically allow for enhanced employment opportunities outside of Barrow Hill Roundhouse. To enable the RPA to operate successfully, more flexibility in relation to potential employment sites should be introduced. This may, in due course, necessitate a review of the green belt boundary in proximity to Barrow Hill Round House and Whittington Road.</p>	Currently no very special circumstances warranting a review of green belt boundaries (and release of land within the green belt for employment development) have been identified by the Council. The RPA boundary at Barrow Hill is specifically drawn to avoid the release of green belt land and the associated policy intended to encourage large scale residential development and ensure that any such development provides results in regeneration benefits. Whilst the policy as worded	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
CS1	29	000002DLP	<p>SUPPORT Option 3 (SHMA OAN 244 plus Reserve Sites) with the caveat that these Reserved Sites should not be allowed to come forward at the expense of Strategic Sites and Housing Allocations. This should be made explicitly clear within the Local Plan. Suggest that Reserved Sites be held back until towards the end of the Development Plan period.</p> <p>Support policy CS1. Given the policy references the Regeneration Priority Areas, our clients would like to suggest that it also references all Strategic Sites.</p>	<p>Noted. The OAN will be revised based on the updated SHMA.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that further work is required on how to phase any reserve sites and what triggers would be, and any monitoring required.</p> <p>"including the 'place shaping' areas set out in policies PS1 to PS6 and Regeneration Priority Areas" added to</p>	Spatial Strategy	Support

CS10	29	000001DLP	<p>The site is listed under Regeneration Priority Areas and Strategic Sites in the Potential Housing Allocations & Reserved Sites table on pages 44 to 47 of the Draft Local Plan as 'PS5 - Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor'. It isn't clear why Regeneration Priority Areas and Strategic Sites have been grouped together in this table or, indeed, which is which. This should be made clear and a distinction between the two should be provided.</p> <p>It isn't clear why Barrow Hill and Holme Hall are identified as Regeneration Priority Areas in CS1, LP1 and in Part 10 but are not included in the Potential Housing Allocations & Reserved Sites table.</p>	This will be clarified for the pre-submission version of the plan.	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS10	29	000003DLP	<p>if the Council are minded to include Reserved Sites in their Housing Growth Target (ie. Option 3), these should not be allowed to come forward before / at the expense of Strategic Site and Housing Allocations.</p> <p>If it becomes apparent that more development can come forward at Mastin Moor or Duckmanton, above the 400 dwellings identified for each, this should not come forward before the Housing Allocations and should be held back until towards the end of the Development Plan period.</p> <p>Reserved Sites have been reserved because, although they are deemed to be suitable, they are not considered to be the best sites for housing, otherwise they would be included as allocations. Holding back Reserved Sites will ensure that Strategic Sites and Housing Allocations, in what the Council deem are the most suitable locations, will come forward first.</p>	It is acknowledged that further work is required on how to phase any reserve sites and what triggers would be, and any monitoring required. The Draft Local Plan indicates an amount of development for the RPAs that based on existing evidence is considered to be appropriate, and this is what the final allocations will be based on. Any planning applications for a level of growth that exceeds this would need to be considered on its merits.	Homes and Housing	Support
CS11	29	000004DLP	<p>A more flexible approach is therefore recommended, whereby the amount of affordable housing is negotiable. We acknowledge the Council's use of the word 'up to' within the policy.</p> <p>Suggest the following wording be added, 'The Council recognise that in some cases viability of housing sites can be marginal and therefore a flexible approach is required. Where the viability of schemes fall short of the policy requirements, the onus will be on the developer / landowner to clearly demonstrate the circumstances justifying a lower affordable housing contribution or a different tenure mix.'</p> <p>Accessible and Adaptable housing -recommend that the Council pursue Option 1. This is clearly the more flexible of the options. 25% of all new housing being adaptable seems unreasonably high. Recommend that, as with affordable housing, wording be applied whereby more flexibility is added. If Option 2 is pursued, there should be the opportunity for developers to negotiate the proportion of adaptable housing, provided it is fully justified.</p>	CS11 as drafted does allow for negotiation of affordable housing up to 30%. This policy will be revised in light of the new SHMA. The policy as drafted refers to requirements being 'subject to viability'. Suggested wording is therefore not considered necessary. The position on adaptable and accessible housing will be revised based on new viability evidence.	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS13	29	000005DLP	Draft Local Plan Policy CS13 (Economic Growth) identifies that only B1 (b & c), B2 Industrial uses and B8 uses will be appropriate in the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor. We would question why B1(a) Office development has been discounted and would seek for such uses to be allowed here. Development should be market driven. B1(a) Offices should not be discounted at this stage.	B1(a) offices are defined as 'Main town centre uses' in the NPPF (annex 2) and are subject to the sequential approach set out in the NPPF. Policy PS5 does allow for Main Town Centre uses as part of the centre proposed for Works Road with the Staveley and Rother Valley	Jobs Centres Facilities	Objection
CS18	29	000006DLP	Page 71 identifies two options for art: to link the percent for art to the development value or to link the percent for art to the development costs. We do not support either approach. The inclusion of art should be subject to viability. Whilst art may be appropriate on some proposals, it isn't on others. The inclusion of art shouldn't be about value or cost, it should be about its actual purpose and what it adds to the area / development.	Noted. Suggest amendment to policy wording as follows: '...and maintenance of public artwork, subject to viability, secured by a legal...'. This aspect of CS18 may need to be revised based on new viability	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
CS18	29	000007DLP	<p>Whilst the criteria set out in Policy CS18 is fairly generic, the wording of the policy is very lengthy. It is quite easy to envisage negotiations between applicants and officers being delayed during the application process by the detail of the wording of this policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 154 of the NPPF advises that Local Plans should be 'aspirational but realistic' and that they should set out clear policies on what will or will not be permitted. Policy CS18 is so long and generic that there is a risk the essential requirements, and the Council's overriding aspirations, will be lost.</p> <p>SUPPORT inclusion of the site as a part of the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor Strategic Site.</p>	In the council's experience the wording of policy CS18 has not delayed negotiations on planning applications. CS18 is considered to be a clear statement of the council's expectation on design and in accordance with the NPPF (the proposed policy criteria a) to n) were tested and considered sound through the examination of the Local Plan Core Strategy in 2013, post	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
PS5	29	000010DLP	It should be made clear within the wording of Policy PS5 that development of the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor is a priority for the Council. The policy must be flexible enough to ensure that development will come forward.	Noted. The development of the Staveley Corridor is one of the priorities of the council's current Corporate Plan.	Making Great Places	Support

PS5	29	000011DLP	Reference is made within the policy to a 'comprehensive redevelopment' and a 'comprehensive masterplan'. Paragraph 154 of the NPPF advises that Local Plans should be 'aspirational but realistic'. Whilst we acknowledge that a 'comprehensive redevelopment' and a 'comprehensive masterplan' would be the aspirational approach, the Local Plan needs to be realistic. Whilst a high level Masterplan, similar to the one contained on page 113 of the Draft Local Plan, is reasonable, it is unreasonable and inflexible for the policy to prevent single land parcels from coming forward.	Due to the complex nature, scale and infrastructure requirements of the site as a whole, the policy requirement for a comprehensive masterplan is considered to be appropriate and justified. No change.	Making Great Places	Objection
PS5	29	000012DLP	The policy provides specific criteria for our clients' site (identified as the Lagoon Character Area) and the Works Road Character Area, in the sixth paragraph, where it advises that, 'Planning applications specifically for the Works Road and Lagoon Character Areas will be expected to include information demonstrating: i. A joint masterplan as part of a Design and Access Statement and evidence of how the application addresses this masterplan and the delivery of critical infrastructure.' It is unreasonable and inflexible to insist that a joint Masterplan and Design and Access Statement, covering parcels of land in multiple ownerships, is the only acceptable way forward. A high level Masterplan is reasonable, anything more than this is unreasonable. We would reiterate that Policy PS5 should not prevent individual parcels of land from coming forward. If it does, it is unlikely that development on this Strategic Site will happen for a long time, which undermines the strategic	Due to the complex nature, scale and infrastructure requirements of the site as a whole, the policy requirement for a joint masterplan is considered to be appropriate and justified. No change.	Making Great Places	Objection
PS5	29	000015DLP	The sixth paragraph also has aspirations for a transport assessment, assessing the overall impact of the development and how this will be managed and a phasing plan setting out the approach to the delivery of infrastructure. We would suggest that the Council are seeking to pull these separate, individual sites too tightly together. They are owned by separate land owners, who have their own aspirations and targets. Our clients would like to suggest that the wording be amended to state that this is the preferred approach, which would enable the flexibility to allow alternative approaches. Separate applications will not prevent future phases of development from coming forward in terms of infrastructure.	Due to the complex nature, scale and infrastructure requirements of the site as a whole, the policy requirement for a transport assessment is considered to be appropriate and justified. No change.	Making Great Places	Objection
PS5	29	000016DLP	Object to the Council's suggestion that an upper limit be placed on the amount of A1 retail to 280sq.m Within the Lagoon Character area. Officers are fully aware of the pre-application discussions to date and will note that our clients are proposing a 300sq.m convenience retail use on their site. We would question why the policy includes such a restriction. Surely this should be market led. Paragraph 157 of the NPPF advises that sites should be allocated to promote development and the flexible use of land. This restriction on an A1 use does not provide this flexible use.	new retail uses outside of existing or proposed centres should normally be subject to a sequential assessment under the NPPF. The threshold reflects the proposed exemption to this requirement set out in policy CS16 and is set to match the limits for Sunday Trading in the Sunday Trading Act 2014 and relates to what would be commonly understood as the Net Sale Area. This is	Making Great Places	Objection
PS5	29	000017DLP	The criteria of the 'The Lagoon Character Area', advises that the Council will seek to extend the 'Bluebank Pools Local Nature Reserve.' The Bluebank Pools Local Nature Reserve (LNR) falls to the west of our clients' site. It isn't clear where the Council envisage this extension will take place and we'd seek further clarity on this. It is our intention to reserve a part of our clients' site, to the west, for ecological habitat. If the Council had this area in mind, we'd be open to the LNR's extension into this area. We wish to reserve judgement on this aspiration, until it becomes clear exactly what the Council are proposing, but would suggest that this is perhaps something which could be supported, provided it wouldn't impact on the developable areas of the site.	This is intended to be limited to the land immediately west of Bilby Lane and within the limits of the PS5 policy allocation, as previously discussed with your client. Wording has been added for clarification "... (to the west of Bilby Lane within the land allocated on the Policies Map)"	Making Great Places	Objection
River Corridors	29	000009DLP	A River Corridor runs through the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor and along our clients' site's northern boundary. Policy LP3 advises that development which prejudices the existing character of and/or the future potential for the improvement and enhancement of the environment of rivers will not be permitted. Whilst it is not envisaged that any future development on our clients' site will impact on this area, were it determined that the development may prejudice the River Corridor, the Council would need to apply some flexibility in applying Policy LP3, or be at risk of preventing development from coming forward.	There is no reason to assume any incompatibility between policies LP3 and PS5. However policy CS2 does allow for exceptions where the proposed use: "is required to regenerate sites and locations that could not otherwise be addressed".	River and Canal Corridors	Comment
RPAs	29	000008DLP	seek the Council's confirmation as to whether these sites will be afforded greater, equal or lesser priority than Strategic Sites	The RPAs form part of the council's overall Spatial Strategy as set out in CS1 and there is no implied	Regeneration Priority Areas	Comment
CS18	30	000005DLP	Natural England welcomes this policy particularly point (j) which aims to preserve or enhance the landscape character and biodiversity assets of the borough. We also pleased to note the provision in this policy that new developments should consider the long term impacts of climate change.	Noted	Design and the Built Environment	Support
CS5	30	000001DLP	We are pleased to note that this policy will ensure full consideration of renewable energy developments on natural landscapes and nature conservation. We also welcome the provision that renewable energy proposals will be expected to include measures to enhance biodiversity.	Noted	A Changing Climate	Support

CS8	30	000002DLP	welcomes this policy as it will provide protection for air and water quality and contaminated land however we suggest that the protection of soils should also be included. The plan should recognise that development (soil sealing) has a major and usually irreversible adverse impact on soils. Mitigation should aim to minimise soil disturbance and to retain as many ecosystem services as possible through careful soil management during the construction process. Soils of high environmental value (e.g. wetland and carbon stores such as peatland) should also be considered as part of ecological connectivity. We advise that policy refers to the Defra Code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites	The policy can be amended to include a section under Soil and Agricultural Land Quality which reflects the NPPF (Paragraph 112) and incorporates an element on soil conservation. A reference to best practice can be made in the policy but a detailed reference to the DEFRA code of practice would potentially become out of date within the period of the plan and so is not to be	Environmental Quality	Support
CS9	30	000003DLP	welcomes the overall aim of this policy it could be strengthened and clarified in a number of aspects: 1. The policy wording should set out the intention to achieve a net gain for nature to reflect paragraphs 9 and 109 of the NPPF. 2. The hierarchy of designated nature conservation and landscape sites should be explained within the policy distinguishing between international, national and local sites to reflect the guidance set out in paragraph 113 of the NPPF. 3. Whilst we welcome the provision to link habitats set out in point (f) we consider that the policy should set out a strategic, landscape scale approach, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity which would follow the guidance set out in paragraphs 114 and 117 of the NPPF. 4. We acknowledge that the Council is intending to update the "Greenprint for Chesterfield" using the latest information from the Local Biodiversity Action Plan which is welcome. However we suggest that the policy wording should reflect this by including an additional point to promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets. This would also reflect the guidance set out in paragraph 117 of the NPPF. 5. We suggest that the policy should include the avoidance-mitigation-compensation hierarchy with clarification that compensation should only be considered as a last resort. This would follow the guidance set out in paragraph 118 of the NPPF. We also suggest that it may be clearer if the topics of Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity & Geodiversity, and Landscape Character were considered under separate sections or headings.	DISCUSS AT MEETING _ would mean a re-writing of the policy into a Green infrastructure section, a landscape character section, a bio/geo diversity section and an accessible open space and sports section	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Support
CS9(b)	30	000004DLP	We are pleased to note that this is now a separate policy.	Noted	Green	Support
Canal Corridors	31	000021DLP	SUPPORT	Noted	River and Canal	Support
CS1	31	000001DLP	Policy and proposals map unjustified, ineffective and inconsistent with national policy	The proposals map reflects the policies and proposals set out in the proposed Local Plan, it is considered that	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	31	000029DLP	Object to Strategic Gaps SG1 & SG2 Excessive size of gaps promotes unsustainable development Not consistent with NPPF and not justified Places undue pressure on the green belt	The broad locations of the gaps and wedges and the justification for them was explored in the examination of the 2013 Core Strategy and considered consistent with the NPPF. The boundaries of the proposed Strategic Gaps and Green Wedges were independently assessed by ARUP. The borough's growth can be met	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	31	000030DLP	Object to absence of a Green Belt Review, should have been undertaken in parallel with North East Derbyshire District Council and Sheffield City Council	The NPPF states that "Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" (para 83). It is not a requirement to review the green belt as part of the preparation of a Local plan. The borough's growth can be met without	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS10	31	000010DLP	List of potential reserved sites too restrictive and not justified Not effective, inconsistent with national policy and insufficiently positive	It is acknowledged that further work is required on the mix of reserve sites, how to phase and what triggers	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS11	31	000011DLP	Insufficiently positive, justified and effective Local Plan should promote bungalows and mobile park homes and choices to meet demographics and community aspiration	It is acknowledged that further work is required on different housing types to reflect the evidence in the updated SHMA.	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS13	31	000012DLP	Reference to "Local Plan Sites and Boundaries" should be removed	Noted, this will be replaced with reference to the	Jobs Centres	Comment
CS14	31	000013DLP	Insufficiently positive Opportunities to deliver enhancements to the green belt in accordance with CS1 should be supported	This policy is substantially unchanged since being examined in 2013. However an additional bullet point has been added as follows: "viii.enhancing and	Tourism and Visitor Economy	Objection
CS15	31	000014DLP	SUPPORT	Noted	Vitality and	Support

CS17	31	000015DLP	Not justified, is inconsistent with national policy, insufficiently positive and ineffective First sentence should be re-worded to avoid excluding development targeting local need No centre should be designated that does not support multi-modal transport accessibility Policy should not ban development that is sustainable and meets a designated boundary (of CS12b) Suggest first sentence should read "Social Infrastructure facilities will be permitted within town, district and local service centre boundaries and on land adjoining those boundaries. Social Infrastructure facilities will be permitted elsewhere provided it can be shown that they are reasonably accessible by public transport and by pedal cycle and by pedestrians and provided they do not significantly contradict any other policy intention of the	This policy is unchanged from the Core Strategy where it was found to be justified and consistent with national policy. It supports the overall spatial strategy of concentrating development around centres. That said, it is acknowledged that there may be occasions when development of social infrastructure outside of centres would be appropriate, however Policy CS2 already allows for exceptions to be made to These parts of the policy are unchanged from the Core Strategy where it was found to be justified and consistent with national policy	Social Infrastructure	Objection
CS18	31	000016DLP	Not justified, is inconsistent with national policy, insufficiently positive and is ineffective (b) "innovative" should be defined (j) too restrictive (l) "acceptable" should be defined	(b) By definition, "innovative" implies original ideas and new methods, that may not have previously been used. The NPPF (para 63) refers to the weight to be given to "outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design". The remaining wording of criteria (b) is considered to provide sufficient clarification and is in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF para quoted above. (j) it is not considered restrictive that development	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
CS19	31	000017DLP	Inconsistent with national policy Setting of heritage assets is a material consideration, Not all landscape context is significant	The policy does not refer to landscape	Historic Environment	Objection
CS2	31	000002DLP	Inconsistent with National Policy	Aside from minor amendments, this policy remains largely as approved as part of the 2013 Core Strategy which was prepared and examined post publication of	Location of Development	Objection
CS20	31	000018DLP	RPA at Duckmanton and Mastin Moor are inconsistent with policy and unjustified If council is promoting growth outside convenient walking distance and exception statement needs to be added	The principle of growth at the RPAs was established in the Core Strategy. Policy LP1 requires a new Local Centre to be provided as part of development at Mastin Moor. Duckmanton has a good range of	Travel and Transport	Objection
CS21	31	000019DLP	The proposals map safeguards land for the preferred route of HS2 which is inconsistent with National Policy	Policy CS21 does not safeguard land for the route of HS2, this is done through a separate Safeguarding Direction outside the Local Plan process. However the advice of HS2 is that the route should be shown in Local plans. The safeguarded route will be removed	Travel and Transport	Objection
CS3	31	000003DLP	Recommend adding "applications for housing development in unsustainable locations will not be considered justified on the isolated grounds that the council lacks a five year supply of deliverable housing sites"	The wording of this policy is as recommended by the DCLG as a 'model policy' and reiterates the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF dictates the approach to 'Relevant policies for the supply of housing' when determining planning applications in the absence of a deliverable supply of housing sites sufficient for five years and is now the subject of extensive case law. The 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' then applies so by definition 'unsustainable locations should not be considered	Location of Development	Comment
CS4	31	000004DLP	Inconsistent with national policy. Recommend addition of "so far as is reasonable" after "...will be required to contribute via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)".	The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (as amended) do not allow LPAs to exert discretion on whether payments should be made except under specific circumstances. The council has adopted	Infrastructure Delivery	Objection
CS5	31	000005DLP	Proposals map is inconsistent with national policy due to detrimental impact upon setting of heritage assets	CS5(a) ensures that impacts on heritage assets and their settings will be addressed if proposals come forward. The current and draft NPPF continues to require LPAs to consider identifying suitable areas for	A Changing Climate	Objection
CS7	31	000006DLP	Presume policies will be renumbered	Yes, policies will be renumbered for the submission version of the plan	Sustainable Management of	Support

CS8	31	000007DLP	Inconsistent with national policy since tranquility is not recognised	Reference to tranquillity has been added to the policy	Environmental	Objection
CS9	31	000008DLP	Proposals map is inconsistent with national policy and unjustified In places strategic gap boundaries promote unsustainable development, boundaries at Woodthorpe and Brimington are of particular concern unjustified boundaries deny communities fair share of economic growth	The broad locations of the gaps and wedges and the justification for them was explored in the examination of the 2013 Core Strategy and considered consistent with the NPPF. The boundaries of the proposed	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Objection
CS9(b)	31	000009DLP	Policy insufficiently positive Horizontal travel distance insufficient measure of accessibility Policy should empower councils to resist proposals that are insufficiently accessible due to barriers of gradient and road crossing	Noted. Revised standards are to be addressed in an update of the council's Open Space Assessment and the policy will be reviewed in the light of this.	Open Spaces	Objection
PS1	31	000023DLP	SUPPORT	Noted	Making Great	Support
PS2	31	000024DLP	SUPPORT	Noted	Making Great	Support
PS3	31	000025DLP	SUPPORT	Noted	Making Great	Support
PS4	31	000026DLP	SUPPORT	Noted	Making Great	Support
PS5	31	000027DLP	Inconsistent as with national policy as it prejudices the announcement of HS2 phase 2	The use of the former Staveley Works as a site for the HS2 phase 2 northern Infrastructure Maintenance Depot has now been confirmed by Ministerial	Making Great Places	Objection
PS6	31	000028DLP	Reference to LDF should be removed	Noted, the reference will be updated	Making Great	Objection
River Corridors	31	000022DLP	Insufficiently positive Policy should be re-worded to avoid "will not be permitted"	Noted, policy will be re-worded "Only development which can demonstrate it does not prejudice the existing character of and/or the future potential for the	River and Canal Corridors	Objection
RPA's	31	000020DLP	Inconsistent with National Policy No community consensus exists for the expansion of Mastin Moor and Woodthorpe RPA at Mastin Moor is not justified by deprivation statistics	The principle of growth at the RPAs was established in the Core Strategy. No change.	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
	32	000001DLP	Should acknowledge that heritage assets are wider than buildings and should include below ground archaeology	The word 'built' has been removed so the word 'heritage' remains, to cover the diversity of types of heritage assets in the Borough without listign in detail	Vision	Objection
	32	000002DLP	More detail on town centre historic core would be useful eg: "This is an area which encompasses the areas of medieval and Roman activity within the historic core of Chesterfield, and where development proposals will need careful consideration of archaeological impacts."	Explanatory text can be supplemented to incorporate the suggestion.	Historic Environment	Objection
	32	000003DLP	It should be made clear that the proposed Local List relates to Built Heritage only (not to undesignated archaeological sites). E.g. "The Borough Council will identify non-designated built heritage assets"; 'The council is currently preparing a Local List of built heritage assets'.	Explanatory text can be amended to incorporate suggestion.	Historic Environment	Objection
	32	000004DLP	'English Heritage' should read 'Historic England'	Noted, this will be amended accordingly	Historic	Comment
CS19	32	000005DLP	a policy strand in relation to the Chesterfield Town Centre Historic Core would be useful, e.g. 'requiring development proposals within the Town Centre Historic Core to be accompanied by appropriate levels of archaeological assessment'	An additional bullet point has been added to policy CS19 using the suggested wording.	Historic Environment	Objection
CS19	32	000006DLP	Policies Map should show the Historic Core	The Historic Core will be shown on the constraints map which will be a live document. This will allow it to be	Policies Map	Objection
CS10	33	000001DLP	This land is designated as open countryside and should remain that way. There are many brown field sites which could be better used for development. The impact on wildlife would be devastating. Safety is a concern with higher risk of criminal activity and nuisance behaviour . The residents do not need the stress and worry building would bring. Parking will be a major problem Westwood Lane is not wide enough for provision for pavements Drainage and sewage is a problem in this area	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	34	000001DLP	OBJECT to site on Calow Lane opposite Heathcote Drive in Hasland as suitable for Housing development. Calow Lane is an extremely narrow road and access is often difficult due to cars being parked on it. Development would make traffic and idling cars and air quality worse. Access onto Calow Lane would potentially be hazardous due to the weight of traffic in this area. There is pressure locally on primary and secondary school places in this area.	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection

CS10	35	000001DLP	<p>OBJECT to site H15</p> <p>Traffic problems on Calow Lane are already terrible</p> <p>The width is so narrow that cars park on one side and then there is only room for one way traffic on the other for quite a considerable length</p> <p>There is regular damage done to parked cars due to the road width problems.</p> <p>The pavement is too narrow and used by families with young children trying to get to the 3 schools in Hasland. It is at busy times and difficult for cars to get out of the side streets to rush</p> <p>Any further development would make the situation worse.</p> <p>There is not enough car parking in Hasland Local Centre, Extra capacity just makes that worse.</p> <p>All 3 schools are successful with no available land to build more places is left (this is particularly crucial at the secondary and infant school).</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making</p>	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	36	000001DLP	<p>OBJECT to allocation of site for housing.</p> <p>Adverse impact on surrounding area</p> <p>Highway safety</p> <p>Crime</p> <p>Archaeology</p> <p>Hedgerows</p> <p>Trees</p> <p>Wildlife</p> <p>Drainage/sewage</p> <p>Envrionmental Health</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making</p>	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	37	000001DLP	<p>Congestion - Calow Lane is an extremely busy road. It is supposed to be weight restricted but there is an industrial estate which attracts quite a lot of heavy traffic and additional housing and residential traffic would cause quite serious problems further along Calow Lane as you approach Hasland.</p> <p>Outside the development area, there is a natural boundary there and the natural boundary near the by-pass which adjoins the development in the Gorse Valley area.</p> <p>Flooding- Part of this area and the fields just below Heathcote Drive is subject to floodi.</p> <p>Impact on schools - Hasland Junior and Infant schools are extremely busy and full and would require additional building, although the amount of land available is very limited.</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making</p>	Homes and Housing	Objection
	38	000003DLP	<p>Re. policies map: areas in grey confusing when trying to understand allocations.</p>	<p>Noted. Different graphics will be investigated for future</p>	Policies Map	Comment
CS10	38	000001DLP	<p>Support as a housing allocation. PP granted and it is anticipated that a reserved matters application will be submitted in 2017. It will deliver housing in 2018 and is a robust and deliverable allocation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	Homes and Housing	Support
RPAs	38	000002DLP	<p>No objection to designation of RPA.</p> <p>Unclear how draft policy LP1 relates to the granting of 15/00085/OUT. The site should be shown as a housing allocation within the RPA. It is anticipated that the site will deliver housing in 2018 - is robust & deliverable.</p> <p>Condsideration should be given to extending the RPA or housing allocation to include land east of Poplar Farm and South of Middle Farm.</p>	<p>The site (15/00085/OUT) should be shown if it has passed the necessary LAA stages. The site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of</p>	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection

CS10	39	00001DLP	<p>Highway/Access/Trans Pennine Trail/Public Footpaths Westwood Lane and Lodge Close provides a gateway to Westwood and is a thoroughfare for residents and users of the Trans Pennine Trail. Traffic concerns re. unsuitability of roads - Manor Road is constantly congested which will only be exacerbated by the addition of further traffic. Safety concerns, especially re. pedestrian access.</p> <p>Wildlife The proposed build site was determined to be a Public Open Space on the previous Local Plan. As a consequence wildlife has flourished and it is now a haven for a variety of animals/insects such as butterflies, moths, nesting birds, rabbits, foxes, snakes, shrews, mice along with birds of prey/bats feeding from the area. Flora and fauna has similarly thrived naturally encouraging the wildlife. Impact on business- would impinge on attractive environment and eradicate this.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Watch Scheme On Westwood Lane /Lodge close the residential community is of a certain demographic (elderly, retired, mature professional home owners). The addition of housing introduces an entirely new and contrasting dynamic and diversity of resident which will adversely create an imbalance to the current harmony.</p> <p>Visual Impact The neighbourhood and proposed access is of a certain style which is not replicated in the new build proposals. This is entirely out of character and keeping and creates a contrasting and negative outlook, not least since the proposed green field development site would be a new usage of the land prominently situated adjacent to Doomsday referenced Westwood, footpaths, bridleways and cycle routes therein.</p> <p>There is no necessity or requirement at all to build in the location with many other larger brown field sites available in Chesterfield more suited.</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making</p>	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	40	000011DLP	<p>We note that the proposed site allocations have not yet gone through a rigorous sequential test process, and so there are currently sites proposed in flood risk areas. In the absence of evidence to demonstrate that the sequential test process has been carried out, and subsequently passed, the following sites are currently a cause for concern: - H15 (DLP); - H37 (DLP); - H08 (DLP); - H48 (DLP); - H69 (DLP).</p> <p>We would like to highlight that the sequential test process needs to be carried out as soon as possible to justify those sites in flood risk areas. Ultimately, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identified that it is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not there are other sites available at lower flood risk as required by the Sequential Test.</p>	<p>These sites will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making. This process will include application of the flood risk sequential test as required by the NPPF. The sites highlighted as a concern have been included as key areas in the Chesterfield Integrated Flood Risk Study.</p>	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	40	000012DLP	<p>We note that the proposed site allocations have not yet gone through a rigorous sequential test process, and so there are currently sites proposed in flood risk areas. In the absence of evidence to demonstrate that the sequential test process has been carried out, and subsequently passed, the following sites are currently a cause for concern: - H15 (DLP); - H37 (DLP); - H08 (DLP); - H48 (DLP); - H69 (DLP).</p> <p>we would like to highlight that the sequential test process needs to be carried out as soon as possible to justify those sites in flood risk areas. Ultimately, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identified that it is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not there are other sites available at lower flood risk as required by the Sequential Test.</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making. This process will include application of the flood risk sequential test as required by the NPPF. The sites highlighted as a concern have been included as key areas in the Chesterfield Integrated Flood Risk Study.</p>	Homes and Housing	Comment

CS10	40	000013DLP	<p>We note that the proposed site allocations have not yet gone through a rigorous sequential test process, and so there are currently sites proposed in flood risk areas. In the absence of evidence to demonstrate that the sequential test process has been carried out, and subsequently passed, the following sites are currently a cause for concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - H15 (DLP); - H37 (DLP); - H08 (DLP); - H48 (DLP); - H69 (DLP). <p>we would like to highlight that the sequential test process needs to be carried out as soon as possible to justify those sites in flood risk areas. Ultimately, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identified that it is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not there are other sites available at lower flood risk as required by the Sequential Test.</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making. This process will include application of the flood risk sequential test as required by the NPPF. The sites highlighted as a concern have been included as key areas in the Chesterfield Integrated Flood Risk Study.</p>	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	40	000014DLP	<p>We note that the proposed site allocations have not yet gone through a rigorous sequential test process, and so there are currently sites proposed in flood risk areas. In the absence of evidence to demonstrate that the sequential test process has been carried out, and subsequently passed, the following sites are currently a cause for concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - H15 (DLP); - H37 (DLP); - H08 (DLP); - H48 (DLP); - H69 (DLP). <p>we would like to highlight that the sequential test process needs to be carried out as soon as possible to justify those sites in flood risk areas. Ultimately, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identified that it is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not there are other sites available at lower flood risk as required by the Sequential Test.</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making. This process will include application of the flood risk sequential test as required by the NPPF. The sites highlighted as a concern have been included as key areas in the Chesterfield Integrated Flood Risk Study.</p>	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS10	40	000015DLP	<p>We note that the proposed site allocations have not yet gone through a rigorous sequential test process, and so there are currently sites proposed in flood risk areas. In the absence of evidence to demonstrate that the sequential test process has been carried out, and subsequently passed, the following sites are currently a cause for concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - H15 (DLP); - H37 (DLP); - H08 (DLP); - H48 (DLP); - H69 (DLP). <p>we would like to highlight that the sequential test process needs to be carried out as soon as possible to justify those sites in flood risk areas. Ultimately, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identified that it is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not there are other sites available at lower flood risk as required by the Sequential Test.</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making. This process will include application of the flood risk sequential test as required by the NPPF. The sites highlighted as a concern have been included as key areas in the Chesterfield Integrated Flood Risk Study.</p>	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS2	40	000001DLP	<p>We support the aims of this policy, and in particular bullet point 'g', which reiterates that future unallocated development will need to meet the requirements of the flood risk sequential test.</p>	Noted	Location of Development	Support
CS5	40	000002DLP	<p>Hydro power - it is recommended that developers should contact the EA as early as possible to begin pre-application and determine whether they would be likely to obtain a licence, what associated infrastructure would be required (e.g. fish passage) and therefore whether the scheme is potentially viable.</p>	<p>Agreed. Suggest addition to policy wording: Pre-application advice from the Environment Agency is advised.</p>	A Changing Climate	Comment

CS7	40	000003DLP	<p>As the SFRA is now 7 years old we request that the policy should be rewritten as follows, to ensure that all planning decisions are made against the best available flood risk information at any time:</p> <p>- 'Consequently, every effort should be made to ensure development only takes place in areas with the lowest probability of flooding, or constructed safely where it has been demonstrated that this is not possible. Development should not increase the risk of flooding to either the proposed site itself, or to third parties. The Borough Council has in place a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2009) and will also have the Chesterfield Integrated Model to allow it to make more informed judgements about potential development sites in the Local Plan. Strategic decisions can therefore be made on where development is most appropriate in relation to flood risk. However, as the SFRA represents only a snapshot in time, development proposals should always be considered against the best available flood risk information, such as the EA's Flood Map for Planning and flood risk modelling.'</p>	Agree proposed changes to paragraph 4.8	A Changing Climate	Comment
CS7	40	000004DLP	<p>A 'Flood Risk Investigation' is currently being commissioned for Chesterfield, to support the LP process (to be completed approx. Sep 2017). We recommend that wording should be added to supporting paragraph 4.10, requiring proposals to consider the findings of the forthcoming Chesterfield Flood Risk Investigation, as this document will form the starting point for flood risk considerations across the area.</p>	Agree proposed changes to paragraph 4.10	A Changing Climate	Comment
CS7	40	000005DLP	<p>'Flood risk' specific comments:</p> <p>The opening line of the policy states that 'the council will require flood risk to be considered for all development...'. We recommend that the word 'considered' should be replaced by the word 'mitigated' or 'managed', to ensure that the policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and associated practice guidance.</p> <p>We note that bullet point 'a' states development proposals will 'be directed to locations with the least impact on flooding or water resources'. We recommend that the words 'with the least impact on flooding' should be replaced by the words 'with the lowest probability of flooding', to ensure compliance. We would also recommend that additional wording should be added to the end of the sentence, along the lines of 'as required by the flood risk sequential test'. This would add further clarity on what is expected of new development in flood risk areas.</p> <p>Finally, the final sentence of policy states that 'the Council will require minor developments that require new surface water drainage to give priority to sustainable drainage systems'. It is our opinion that 'minor developments' might cause confusion to developers, who might interpret that as the planning definition for minor development; a change of wording would help avoid such confusion.</p> <p>Protecting the Water Environment</p> <p>We recommend that the following wording should be added to the policy, under a new sub heading of 'protecting the water environment':</p> <p>- Protecting the Water Environment</p> <p>Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that water is available to support the development proposed, and that they meet the Building Regulation water efficiency standard of 110 litres per occupier per day.</p>	Agree proposed changes to Policy CS7 except that the council cannot require the higher standard of water efficiency as there is no local evidence on need or impact on viability to support such a policy requirement. The wording has been included to encourage this standard where possible.	Sustainable Management of the Water Cycle	Comment
CS8	40	000006DLP	<p>Support the principles of this policy, but recommend that the following text should be added to the 'water contamination' section of this Policy:</p> <p>- 'Development proposals will be expected to contribute positively to the water environment and its ecology, and should not adversely affect surface or ground water quality, in line with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive'.</p> <p>This change would give developers greater clarity on what is expected of them in these situations, whilst also adding weight to the policy.</p>	Agree proposed addition to Policy CS8	Environmental Quality	Comment
CS8	40	000007DLP	<p>There may be opportunities to achieve remediation of contamination through the Local Plan by reducing/removing the requirement to contribute affordable housing on affected sites, or reducing/removing the requirement to contribute financially to other infrastructure, for example.</p>	Noted. Abnormal costs are considered when assessing the viability of proposals and any other policy requirements such as affordable housing. No change	Environmental Quality	Comment

PS5	40	000010DLP	Whilst we support the principles behind point 'k' of this policy, we would like to highlight that remediation may be required prior to any development commencing on parcels of affected land. It is likely that any subsequent planning applications/development proposals will need to be supported by further studies and/or	Noted. Reference to policy CS8, which deals with development of contaminated land in more detail, will be added to point (k) as follows:	Making Great Places	Comment
River Corridors	40	000009DLP	Re-wording of the policy to increase the likelihood of the plan delivering Strategic Objective S7. We recommend that the following wording should be added: 'New development proposals on or adjacent to a river corridor should investigate the creation, and management, of ecological buffer strips and corridors to preserve and enhance the biodiversity of the area'. This would help contribute to the government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity.	Noted, wording will be added following: "New development proposals on or adjacent to a river corridor should investigate the creation, and management, of ecological buffer strips and corridors to preserve and enhance the biodiversity of the area	River and Canal Corridors	Comment
CS10	41	000001DLP	Feels that green space should be preserved to give residents the necessary level of breathing space and privacy. The area has become much more developed over time, with St Mary's School and the park contributing to this. However, there is still a level of tranquillity on the north side and were this to be lost it would be hugely detrimental to the area. Feels as though the use of green field sites is not justified based on estimates of housing demand. Until such a time that demand is proven then sites should not be brought forward in green spaces as this will only encourage developers to go for them rather than the more difficult brown field areas. Brown field sites should be pushed so that places of natural beauty and relaxation can be preserved.	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	43	000001DLP	H35 (DLP), Inkersall Road (Land West of), Staveley is supported. The site is deliverable, a suitable and sustainable location for development; achievable with residential development being able to be delivered on site within five years; and is viable. The landowner is currently working with an agent to sign up a suitable party to take forward a planning application for the site. The Trans Pennine Trail bounds the site to the west; the development of the site provides an opportunity to provide formal open space to link the Trail with Poolsbrook Country Park to the east of the site.	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	43	000002DLP	Support reserve site at Dunston which could deliver up to 952 dwellings, however concerns are raised that only a single location is identified should delivery fail. Suggest that smaller sites, immediately adjacent to the proposed allocations will ensure that the necessary infrastructure is provided and a comprehensive approach is taken to the masterplanning of the sites. Such a site could include the land to the south of of proposed allocation H35 (DLP). It is suggested that H35 (DLP) could be delivered in tandem with land immediately to the south of the site (see attached layout), extending up to Inkersall Green Road.	Sites will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making. The approach to delivery of housing will be set out in a Housing Topic Paper.	Homes and Housing	Objection

CS1	44	000001DLP	<p>the draft Local Plan is not sound as it is not positively prepared</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan does not aim to meet the objectively assessed need identified in the Chesterfield SHMA (2014). - There is a shortfall in the quantum of land identified to meet the housing target of additional dwellings - The range and distribution of sites and proposed phasing for the release of land fails to meet qualitative requirements to meet both housing needs and the economic aspirations of the plan. - The over reliance on “reserved sites and regeneration” sites is also likely to adversely impact on the ability of the Council to maintain a deliverable 5 year housing land supply. - the housing requirement is based on a SHMA which is three years out of date, and does not use the latest population figures. <p>The Local Plan is not 'Justified'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The phasing of release of housing sites is not the most appropriate strategy for meeting housing needs. It relies too heavily on a large number of small housing sites and large scale regeneration areas to be delivered during the plan period. <p>The Local Plan is not 'Effective'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The phasing of sites will not be effective in meeting either the quantitative or qualitative requirement for housing to meet either the economic growth aspirations of the plan or the housing needs and demands of the Borough's population. <p>The Local Plan Housing target does not appear to include the 20% buffer that is required.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.5 of the new Local Plan advises that this under delivery should be spread throughout the plan period. Given the persistent under delivery and to ensure an adequate supply of sites, it is considered that the shortfall should be delivered early in the plan period, rather than spread through the plan period.</p> <p>The Local Plan (table on pages 44-46) identifies “Potential Housing Allocations” to deliver 3,980 units over the plan period. This provision is not sufficient to meet the housing need identified in Policy CS1 of 4,630 units, supports the proposed allocation of sites H06 and H67 for housing development, and considers that the wider area to the south should also be allocated for residential development.</p>	<p>The SHMA has been updated and the revised OAN will be set out in the next stage of the Local Plan. The approach to housing delivery will be set out in a Housing Topic paper.</p>	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS10	44	000003DLP	<p>A wider allocation would allow for the comprehensive development of the site as a whole or on a phased basis. It would deliver wider regeneration and sustainability benefits, including the provision of social infrastructure i.e. local centre, whilst maximising opportunities for walking and cycling.</p> <p>The wider site at Land south of Bamford Road should be allocated for residential development within the Chesterfield Local Plan.</p>	<p>Support noted. Any new sites proposed will be subject to assessment through the LAA.</p>	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS2	44	000002DLP	<p>For larger developments, which propose to include a new centre to meet the accessibility requirements of draft Policy CS2, some guidance should be provided on the nature of the uses to be provided within the new centre.</p> <p>This policy should be amended to include criteria, which supports development on greenfield sites which are located in sustainable locations.</p>	<p>There is a definition provided in the plan for a local centre and this is adequate to provide an appropriate balance between guiding development and ensuring flexibility in relation to new local centres. CS10 provides the policy for proposals for greenfield housing</p>	Location of Development	Comment
PS5	44	000005DLP	<p>The objectives include the delivery of a range of housing opportunities. However, it is not specific in defining the quantum of housing.</p> <p>The Proposed Housing Allocations list (Page 47) indicates that the site has an estimated housing capacity of 1,500. However, this has not been detailed within the Land Availability Assessment (LAA) with a site assessment, which should be made available for comment.</p> <p>This quantum of housing is not likely to deliver in its entirety within the plan period.</p> <p>These concerns should be addressed for consistency of the plan, and reviewed to ensure the proposed housing requirement can be delivered.</p>	<p>The capacity of the site to accommodate 1500 homes has been determined through detailed masterplanning work carried out with the landowners and will be made available to support the plan. The LAA is being updated to reflect this work. The policy will be updated to give an overall housing target and an indicative split by character area.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that not all of this will be delivered within the plan period and an updated housing trajectory will be prepared to reflect this.</p>	Making Great Places	Comment

RPAs	44	000004DLP	It is not currently clear where the estimated housing numbers in the allocations table will be accommodated and it is therefore not clear whether the stated number is deliverable. Policy LP1 should be revised so it is clear that it seeks housing-focused regeneration, and includes specific sites that are expected to deliver the housing requirement. The proposed housing allocations table should be updated accordingly.	Agree that further clarity is required to justify that the proposed housing can be accommodated within the RPA areas. This information is available on the LAA and could be included within the Local Plan supporting evidence or Housing Topic Paper. Consider the approach set out provides enough flexibility to secure	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
CS9	45	000002DLP	The Trust welcomes the Council's commitment to the BAP process and is working with the Council to update the Greenprint for Chesterfield We note the reference to stepping stones and corridors both of which taken together with core sites form the ecological network referred to in the NPPF. It is vital that this ecological network is identified and protected wherever possible within the Borough. The presence of open mosaic habitats on previously developed land will in some areas result in conflicts between proposed development and nature conservation. It is vital that sufficient habitat is retained within re-development here could impact on protected species (water vole) and this will need to be addressed as part of the planning process.	Noted	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Support
PS3	45	000005DLP		Noted. Provision is made on conditions on the outline planning permission for monitoring and provision of a	Making Great Places	Support
PS5	45	000006DLP	object to the policy, but would re-consider if the biodiversity interest of this area is better reflected in the description and policy or if the Council demonstrated that these concerns could be addressed through the general application of the Biodiversity policy CS9. The proposed development of land within this corridor has the potential to impact upon a variety of habitats and species of nature conservation value especially the UK BAP priority habitat type 'Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land' We would like to see the description of the area specifically mention biodiversity as a key issue that will need to be considered as part of the ongoing development. the policy should include wording to support the establishment of a sustainable network of grassland habitat within and around the site. At present the emphasis is on the river and canal and retaining/creating associated wetland habitat. We would suggest adding the following wording:- "Establish a network of open grassland habitats through the site to maintain and enhance brownfield	Noted, an additional objective 'n': will be added, worded as suggested	Making Great Places	Objection
River Corridors	45	000004DLP	supports the new policy on River Corridors	Noted	River and Canal	Support
RPAs	45	000003DLP	object in part to this policy as we believe that it could strengthened with respect to biodiversity. consideration should be given to amending the wording of the first part of the policy as follows:- b) Deliver environmental and biodiversity benefits	Policy amended as suggested	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
CS1	46	000001DLP	Support the approach taken to dealing with the under-delivery of homes since 2011 over the plan period in calculating the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (as set out in paragraph 2.5), which will assist in ensuring that the Local Plan is aspirational, realistic and deliverable. Support the preferred option of meeting the objectively assessed housing need but with some flexibility to meet growth aspirations and contribute to the wider Sheffield City Region aspirations through reserve sites.	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS10	46	000002DLP	The Borough Council is a member of the Chesterfield Canal Partnership. Support policy LP2 Chesterfield Canal, as it provides measures for the ongoing restoration of the Chesterfield Canal.	Noted	River and Canal Corridors	Support
CS10	47	000001DLP	Addition of 284 homes off Calow lane would increase traffic and create significant disruption	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
	48	000001DLP	The majority of houses on Calow Lane do not have access to off street parking creating a bottle neck at Peak Would welcome more positive interaction with Borough Council Officers and Members	Noted, this will be addressed outside the Local Plan	Vision	Comment
	48	000002DLP	Walking and Cycling can benefit the visitor economy. Chesterfield is well placed to benefit from increased leisure cycling	Noted	Vision	Comment

	48	000003DLP	Promoting walking and cycling for short journeys will assist the Borough's contribution to climate change	Support noted	Vision	Support
	48	000004DLP	Promoting walking and cycling mean more people on the streets with social interaction. Encouraging car use reduces social interaction. More people on the streets makes people feel safer.	Support noted	Vision	Support
	48	000005DLP	The Borough Council has failed to connect the new Queen's Park Sports Centre to the cycle network. Despite planning and input the infrastructure provided so far remains dangerous and unconnected a year after the centre opened.	This issue relates to a specific development and planning permission and is outside the scope of the Local Plan to address. Measures to improve access are	Vision	Objection
	48	000006DLP	All new housing sites should have walking and cycling infrastructure planned to make high quality connections with the existing and planned strategic cycle network. Housing developments should prioritise walking and cycling infrastructure within the sites.	Policy CS20 seeks to prioritise 'safe and convenient' pedestrian and cycle access to and within sites.	Vision	Comment
	48	000007DLP	SUPPORT	Support noted	Vision	Support
	48	000008DLP	note there is no reference to the cycle route connecting Chesterfield to the Avenue site (and further south to Clay Cross and the 5 Pits Trail). This route will become National Cycle Network route 67.	Reference will be added after paragraph 1.24 "This will include making links to wider local and national walking and cycling networks including the Trans Pennine Trail, Cuckoo Way and, via a new link to the	Vision	Comment
	48	000010DLP	Long term monitoring of air quality should be carried out on Derby Road and Chatsworth Road. These areas regularly used to fail air quality when measuring stations were sited there.	The Local Plan does not determine where air quality monitoring will be carried out, but this issue will be	Travel and Transport	Comment
	48	000011DLP	Whilst we agree with all the points made there is no commitment written in these paragraphs by the Borough Council to actively add to the networks through planning gain or where the borough council has responsibility for the route. We note that CS20 does make a commitment and urge the borough councils planning dept to consult with our Campaign to agree new or enhanced infrastructure.	New paragraph added after 9.6 "9.6.9.7.The borough council will work with partners including Derbyshire County Council and Chesterfield Cycle Campaign to improve and expand the network of cycle routes in and beyond the borough and will seek developer contributions through planning obligations and/or CIL towards this where appropriate"	Travel and Transport	Comment
CS2	48	000016DLP	Any new development must include good quality connections to the strategic cycle network with a condition it is built before the development is opened.	Noted. Policy CS20 requires "prioritisation of safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle access to and within the site". Policy CS4 requires that "necessary	Location of Development	Comment
CS21	48	000012DLP	Chesterfield-Staveley Regeneration Route and the Staveley Northern Loop Road Phase 2 will almost certainly have an adverse effect on the environment of the Trans Pennine Trail (canal path) Noise and air quality will suffer along the route.	Policy CS8 already requires that "all developments will be required to have an acceptable impact...taking into account noise, dust, air quality..." An additional requirement will be added to policy CS21 stating that : "Proposals for the CSRR and Staveley Northern Loop Road will be required to conserve and	Major Transport Infrastructure	Objection
CS21	48	000013DLP	We support the Hollis Lane Link Road and a redesign of the railway station forecourt to remove confliction between pedestrians, cyclists and motorised traffic. (also 10.27)	Support noted	Travel and Transport	Support
CS4	48	000009DLP	We urge the Borough Council to use the CIL to provide high quality walking and cycling routes to connect new developments to existing infrastructure.	The council's CIL Regulation 123 list currently includes "Implementation of Chesterfield Strategic Cycling Network" and "Measures to improve walking, cycling and public transport provision within [list of specified	Infrastructure Delivery	Comment
CS8	48	000017DLP	It appears that development is permitted even if it makes an AQMA worse. Policies need to be in place to always improve air quality and not allow unsustainable car based development. Support enhanced walking and cycling routes between the town centre, Waterside and the railway station.	The sentence "unless there are significant material considerations that would outweigh the harm" to be	Environmental Quality	Objection
PS1	48	000014DLP	Noise pollution is a major problem from the A61. Support the building of a 'green bridge' (lightweight deck) over the cutting next to the Chesterfield Hotel as proposed in the URBED town centre master plan.	Support noted	Making Great Places	Support
PS4	48	000015DLP	No reference is made to cycling access at Markham Vale. A major employment site should be well connected by sustainable transport.	Further bullet point to be added: "make appropriate provision for walking and cycling access to	Making Great Places	Objection
RPA's	49	000001DLP	OBJECT to the Mastin Moor RPA Community were not properly consulted when the idea was proposed objections include traffic problems (A619), and increased demand for access to schools and GP surgeries.	Noted. The RPA's were established in the Core Strategy which was considered sound by an Inspector and had public consultation that went beyond what is required in the regulations. The relevant agencies (DCC and	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
	51	000001DLP	Strongly Agree	Noted	Vision	Support
CS1	51	000002DLP	Reserved sites should only be used as a last resort when all available previously developed land has been used and there is a clear further requirement	It is acknowledged that further work is required on the mix of reserve sites, how to phase and what triggers	Spatial Strategy	Comment

CS1	51	000003DLP	Green wedges and strategic gaps should be resolutely protected from development Agree with option for a single designated reserve site but should only be used as a last resort	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS10	51	000005DLP	Agree with chosen option of Dunston Other optional sites are not suitable. Brimington south option is a designated strategic gap	Noted	Homes and Housing	Support
CS15	51	000006DLP	Land should be prioritised for housing needs. Do not need more out of town shopping centres, retail parks or car supermarkets. Retail should be pushed back into town centres	Noted. Policy CS16 sets out the approach to new retail which ensures that town centre locations are prioritised.	Jobs Centres Facilities	Comment
CS9	51	000004DLP	Strongly agree	Noted	Green	Support
CS10	52	000001DLP	Calow Lane already has parked cars and could not sustain additional traffic No footpah for pedestrians 7.5t road limit Land prone to flooding Loss of rural feel to village Parking at local shops is already a problem Would result in dangerous entrance Risks to children walking to and from school Disruption to residents during construction School run will be worsened Already a lot a developments in the area adding to traffic Alternative brownfield sites are available No need for housing Impact upon hospital	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS1	53	000001DLP	No comments in response to consultation. Reminder to consult on any plans and strategies that affect assets.	Noted	Strategic Objectives	Comment
	54	000003DLP	The smart motorway network will support growth in the area and help safeguard the operation of the SRN.	Noted	Travel and	Comment
CS20	54	000002DLP	Support Policy CS20 and the stated desire to work with HE to ensure any adverse impacts of additional traffic are minimised (including Transport Assessments undertaken as part of the development management process). Welcome objective 9 tackling congestion, securing strategic improvements to the transport system and encouraging sustainable transport. Welcome objective 10 which states that all development should be supported by inclusive infrastructure.	Noted	Travel and Transport	Support
CS20	54	000004DLP	Highways England is refered to as the "Highways Agency" These references should be updated throughout the Local Plan.	Noted, references have been amended.	Travel and Transport	Objection
PS4	54	000001DLP	Principle interest is in safeguarding the operation of the M1, particularly J29A. Aware that much of the proposed development is in the vacinity of the Markham Vale Enterprise Zone. Risk of adverse impacts from further development in this area (beyond existing planning applications). Supports the PS4 Policy for Markham Vale which indicates that any works not covered by existing permission must demonstrate that they can mitigate any adverse impacts on the highways network.	Noted	Making Great Places	Support
PS1	55	000001DLP	Royal Mail object to the inclusion of the Future Walk facility within the Place Shaping boundary for Chesterfield Town Centre. The designation purpose is not consistent with Royal Mail's operations, and could potentially hinder Royal Mail's ability to adjust their operations in future in order to meet demand for postal services.	The Chesterfield Town Centre masterplan is a non-statutory masterplan. The Local Plan does not specify a use for this site and a wide range of options are	Making Great Places	Objection
PS1	55	000002DLP	Royal Mail object to the draft development allocation of former multi-storey car park site as a 'Potential Refurbishment/Development Project' site on the Chesterfield Town Centre Illustrative Masterplan 2015. This area of land is under Royal Mail's ownership, and is of importance to Royal Mail in providing flexibility to adjust and/or expand their operations.	Noted. The Chesterfield Town Centre masterplan is a non-statutory masterplan. The Local Plan does not specify a use for this site and a wide range of options are possible, including the potential to exand existing	Making Great Places	Objection
PS1	55	000003DLP	Regarding the expansion of the pedestrianised inChesterfield Town Centre as per the Masterplan, Royal Mail request that expansion be cognisant of the need for Royal Mail to access residential properties within the town centre. Royal Mail would object to any restriction of their ability to use routes along West Bars and New Beetwell Street, which would cause significant delays in delivery times.	Noted. The Chesterfield Town Centre masterplan is a non-statutory masterplan and the Local Plan does not propose any specific expansion of pedestrianisation. Any further expansion would be the subject of legal processes through Traffic Regulation and Stopping up	Making Great Places	Comment

CS10	56	000004DLP	<p>Apart from 'Land at Whitebank Close', none of the potential housing sites appear to affect sports facilities.</p> <p>The requirements of NPPF paragraph 74 would need to be met. This requirement links back to evidence base comments previously raised.</p>	Noted.	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS9	56	000001DLP	<p>The Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy (PPOSS) is now over 3 years old and given changes in circumstances such as those relating to specific sites, requires an update.</p> <p>The POSS does not appear to have been backed up by robust and comprehensive evidence for all open space typologies.</p> <p>Whilst the last sentence within paragraph 5.12 is supported (other than inclusion of the word Borough's), at present there does not appear to be sufficient evidence to inform future decisions other than a presumption in favour of retention.</p>	Noted. The Council is aware of the need to update the PPOSS and the LPA intends to ensure that this is done. The Council intends to carry out an up to date assessment of open space to cover all relevant open space typologies. The text can be amended to reflect.	Open Spaces	Objection
CS9	56	000002DLP	<p>Object to application of a 'standards approach' for sports provision based on a quantitative area - not supported and does not draw upon locally specific evidence of need for facility requirements to meet identified requirements.</p> <p>Principle of protecting, enhancing and providing for sports facilities is strongly supported but must be done in Principle of requiring development to contribute towards sports provision where a need is identified is supported, but the proposed standards based approach for doing so is not supported.</p>	Noted. The use of a standards approach to sports provision is acknowledged to be inappropriate given current guidance by Sports England and will be deleted in respect to outdoor sports facilities. A standards approach is however still appropriate for other types of	Open Spaces	Objection
CS9(b)	56	000003DLP	<p>The application of a 'standard' to determine whether a sports facility is surplus to requirements is similarly not supported. Decisions need to be made with reference to up to date and locally derived evidence, and include site specific considerations.</p> <p>The wording of the last paragraph needs to be reconsidered as there would seem to be a need for a link between i. and iii. rather than ii. and iii.</p>	The standards will be reviewed based on the updated Parks and Open Spaces Assessment and Strategy.	Open Spaces	Objection
RPAs	56	000005DLP	<p>A number of the RPAs appear to be of scale and nature that could potentially accommodate new sports facilities on site.</p> <p>These opportunities need to be further explored in conjunction with an update of the sports evidence base to ensure that any relevant site specific opportunities, needs and recommendations for sport are addressed in subsequent stages of the Local Plan preparation.</p>	Noted.	Regeneration Priority Areas	Comment
CS9	58	000001DLP	<p>Welcome the protection given to ancient and non-ancient woodland in this policy.</p> <p>The WT welcome the commitment to increase tree cover, and the recognition that tree and woodland planting will help the Borough in responding to climate change.</p> <p>Support that this policy will help the Council to achieve the targets set out in the Greenprint for Chesterfield biodiversity action plan.</p>	Noted	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Support

CS9(b)	58	000002DLP	<p>Recommend that proximity and access to woodland is recognised as a health and wellbeing provision through the Woodland Access Standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size; and • That there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round trip) of people's homes 	<p>Chesterfield Borough Council recognises the health and wellbeing and economic benefits that access to greenspace brings. Use of the Woodland Access standard (WAST), which complements Natural England's ANGST, would further strengthen the LAA from an open space accessibility perspective and assist in meeting the Local Plan's aims around health and wellbeing. As such the council will work towards the provision of accessible woodland.</p> <p>The WAST aspires to an accessible woodland of at least 2 hectares within 500 metres of every home, and a woodland of at least 20 hectares within 4km. The figures for Derbyshire are 18.5% and 62.6% respectively (as of July 2016). Woodland accessibility has been calculated using the Forestry Commission dataset and Ordnance Survey's Address Layer. All of Chesterfield's residents live within 4km of a 20ha. Area of woodland and 59.02% are within 500m of a 2ha. Site. Given Chesterfield is predominately an urban area it would be impractical to meet the standard for 2ha areas of woodland.</p> <p>As such, the provision of new woodland will not be a requirement of new residential development. The Council will work with partners and developers to improve the provision that currently exists in</p>	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Comment
RPAs	58	000003DLP	We welcome the policy's support for developments in Regeneration Priority Areas which "increase trees and tree groups to enhance landscape character."	Noted.	Regeneration Priority Areas	Support
RPAs	58	000004DLP	It should also be recognised that there is evidence that urban trees remove large amounts of air pollution and improve urban air quality. This evidence is brought together in the Woodland Trust discussion paper Urban Air Quality (https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/mediafile/100083924/Urban-air-quality-report-v4-single-pages.pdf). WT happy to discuss.	<p>The importance of trees in improving air quality is recognised by the authority and Section 5.7 of the plan has been amended to make this link explicit. The existing draft plan details the requirement for a net gain in biodiversity (Policy CS9) and it would be appropriate to add that maintaining and increasing urban tree cover should be a priority where possible in respect of improving air quality within the Borough.</p> <p>CS9 will therefore be amended to state:</p>	Regeneration Priority Areas	Comment

CS10	59	000001DLP	<p>Support allocation of land West of Hady Lane (H31)</p> <p>Extant outline planning permission (OPP) for residential development granted 8 December 2015 (for 10 low density plots). Development is in line with core local plan policies requiring a minor alteration to greenfield boundary.</p> <p>Access to the town centre, proximity to public transport and schools are highlighted alongside the unobtrusive design of the development. A local centre (Hasland) is within 0.8 miles.</p> <p>Desktop Flood Risk Assessment showed the site was not at direct risk of flooding by rivers or streams and a SuDS is being considered.</p> <p>The sites does not intrude on the Green Belt, Green Wedges and Strategic Gaps. It represents a small loss of a privately-owned green open space. An Ecological Impact Assessment indicates a scheme could viably offer a net positive gain to biodiversity at the site level.</p> <p>The site is technically viable, with no insurmountable technical issues envisaged based on previous development & ground investigations.</p> <p>Minimal highways impact - a DCC consultation supports development with a number of viable access solutions available to connect Hady Lane to the dwellings via the eastern site boundary.</p> <p>The land owner has requested that the land at this location is considered for inclusion as an allocated site for residential development in the updated Draft Local Plan, providing longer term support for the outline planning</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making (this process having no impact on the validity of any current planning permission in place).</p>	Homes and Housing	Support
CS2	60	000001DLP	<p>The commitment to promoting healthy lifestyles and opportunities for physical activity aligns with CCG priorities. Distribution of GPs and health centres within the borough is reasonable.</p>	Noted	Location of Development	Support
CS2	60	000002DLP	<p>Some of the proposed housing developments are likely to have an impact on existing facilities as some GP surgeries are currently at capacity and are already looking to expand to meet the existing population needs.</p> <p>For 25 dwellings or more all Derbyshire CCGs use the same methodology to estimate the impact of new residential development. Expansion of existing premises and to encourage collaborations of smaller practices is preferred and in line with NHS England policy 'General Practice Forward View'.</p> <p>North Derbyshire CCG and Hardwick CCG intends to make formal requests for developer contributions where it is felt that the development was making demands on local health services.</p> <p>The CCGs will work with the local council to identify which surgeries would be most impacted as a result of the potential additional patients caused by the new residential development.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy CS4 makes provision for contributions to health facilities through planning obligations. The potential for healthcare facilities to be funded via CIL can be investigate in a future review of the council's CIL Regulation 123 list.</p>	Location of Development	Comment
PS2	61	000001DLP	<p>Object to the Chatsworth Road District Centre Boundary as currently proposed. Request that the boundary be extended to include the whole of the Perry's Ford Garage Site where Lidl are currently planning to build a new store (successful pre application talks have taken place).</p> <p>The replacement store will add to the vitality of the town centre and provide short stay car parking for both Lidl users and those visiting other shops, encouraging linked visits.</p>	<p>At present the Chatsworth Road District Centre boundary only covers the Northern section of the Perry's Ford Garage site (as this is the customer facing part of the site). As the store would enhance the retail and short stay parking provision within the Chatsworth Road District Centre and complement those already existing within it, it would be appropriate to extend the boundary to include the whole site should the application be permissioned. The red line boundary (see https://publicaccess.chesterfield.gov.uk/online-</p>	Policies Map	Objection

	62	000004DLP	<p>P 9.14 states that land for HS2 is not safeguarded but the map indicates that it is.</p> <p>P 10.27 implies that the Canal between Mill Green and Staveley is disused and derelict whereas the length as far as Staveley basin has been restored and is in use.</p> <p>There appears to be missing notation on the map for the cross hatched green north of Staveley.</p>	<p>The statutory guidance from HS2 for Local Planning Authorities states that "Where a Safeguarded Direction is taken into account in a Local Plan; it should be represented on the policies map". CBC has taken the view that displaying the route is helpful for perspective developers. P 9.14 was accurate at the time of writing. In line with guidance, the Local Plan P9.14 will be updated to state that "Safeguarding Directions have been made by the Secretary of State for Transport. They are not proposals of the LPA and the routes in question will not be determined through the development plan process. They will be considered in Parliament under hybrid Bill procedures, which will provide appropriate opportunities for petitions to be made to Parliament by those directly affected by the scheme."</p> <p>P.10.27 will be updated to detail that the canal has been restored and is in use as far as the Staveley basin</p>	Policies Map	Objection
CS10	62	000001DLP	The table includes site H43 as an allocation but it is shown as a reserve site on the consultation policies map.	<p>Noted. This will be clarified in the next version of the Local Plan. Sites will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment</p>	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS10	62	000002DLP	Welcome the inclusion of Brampton Manor as a housing site, the precise number of dwellings will need to be considered at application stage.	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to	Homes and Housing	Support
CS18	62	000003DLP	Would welcome a more direct reference to viability in the policy.	<p>The Core Planning principles set out in the NPPF require that LPAs 'always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings' (para17) and is clear that 'Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and</p>	Design and the Built Environment	Comment
PS3	63	000001DLP	Waterside is covered by an allocation for mixed use in the Adopted Core Strategy (July 2013). It is noted that the PS3 policy in the Draft Local Plan does not include "Financial / professional services (A2)". It is requested that this is added to the policy.	AM	Making Great Places	Comment
PS3	63	000002DLP	19 dwellings are referenced as complete. Waterside would like to see the wording amended given that development is still on going. It is suggested that specific reference to the number of dwellings be deleted.	AM	Making Great Places	Comment
PS3	63	000003DLP	The paragraph will also need to be updated to reflect the recent planning permissions awarded by the council. CWS strongly support the allocation of the site in the new Local Plan under Policy PS3 and note that the wording is similar to that in the Core Strategy.	Noted.	Making Great Places	Support
CS1	64	000001DLP	An attached masterplan (approved as part of OUT permission) is designed to capitalise on and restore the site's most valuable assets - River Rother and Chesterfield Canal. The draft policy is in line with the outline planning permission.	The approach to addressing shortfall will be set out in a Housing Topic Paper.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	64	000002DLP	Object to use of Liverpool method for addressing historic shortfall of housing delivery. Would support use of the 'Sedgefield method' whereby the shortfall is addressed within the first 5 years of the plan given it complies with government policies to significantly boost housing supply. Believe method to be contrary to NPPF.	Assumptions on the delivery of sites and trajectory will be set out in a Housing Topic Paper.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	64	000002DLP	Object on the basis that the council has not produced any 'duty to cooperate' evidence that would equate to having considered reasonable alternatives for addressing the shortfall. Woodall Homes question the 5 year housing supply which is heavily reliant on the delivery of 610 dwellings at Chesterfield Waterside and the delivery of 44% of the total number of houses identified in the RPAs within the first 5 years of the plan. Believe strategy to be unjustified.			

CS11	64	000003DLP	<p>WH object to the wording of CS11:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policies on housing mix can impact housing delivery. The lack of qualification in the SHMA signifies a risk of lengthy housing mix negotiations given the relatively low 4 plus bed market home target set out in the SHMA. - Policy wording is vague - how will the council assess the range of dwellings required on individual sites? If intending to use SHMA tables, WH encourage the consideration of how useful they are in guiding housing mix. -Policy does not take into consideration the likelihood that some families may wish to have a spare room for guests / as an office. - There has been no opportunity for the housebuilding industry's knowledge or experience of the local housing market to be taken into account re. housing mix. Little market perspective is provided in the SHMA. -Given SHMA para 10.30 discourages the use of prescriptive figures and states that the market can sometimes be a more appropriate judge of housing mix, WH recommend that the council removes the first paragraph of CS11. The mix of house types will flow from the allocations identified by the council as part of the plan making 	<p>Policy CS11 is consistent with national guidance (NPPF paragraph 50) and is sufficiently flexible. The SHMA has been updated and the Local Plan will be amended to reflect any changes in evidence.</p>	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS1	65	000001DLP	<p>Object to Strategic Gaps as leave very little development opportunities left to create attractive and sustainable future housing sites to meet the current and arising needs for the population of the Borough.</p> <p>Believe development can take place south of the A619 east of Brimington without prejudice to the entire SG2 Gap. There is no real perception of a gap along the A619 and therefore development here makes no significant difference to the existing situation.</p>	<p>The Ringwood & Hollingwood gap (B) utilises Chesterfield Road as a strong Northern boundary point and supports the preservation of the separate identities of the settlements of Brimington, Inkersall, Middlecroft and Brimington Common. The boundary of the gap consulted on in the Sites and Boundaries Issues and Options Consultation in 2012/13 included the site, and although an exact boundary has not been set in an adopted plan, strong weight should be given to the recently published review of the Strategic Gaps and green Wedges which is published on the councils' website in which the Ringwood & Hollingwood Strategic Gap has been assessed as meeting three purposes which are congruent with the NPPF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Maintaining open land between neighbouring settlements to prevent merging and protect the setting 	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	65	000002DLP	<p>Given failure to meet the previously set housing targets, a wider range of housing sites should be used to stimulate market interest and meet housing growth. Limiting sites via SGs fails to boost the supply of housing in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>Option (3) will suffer from a lack of flexibility in terms of the finding of potential reserve sites given the overly restrictive green gap designations. Housing targets should be viewed as minimum figures.</p> <p>Would like to see further cooperation with SCR by proposing housing sites aimed at meeting that areas needs in full if adjoining authorities cannot meet their own requirements.</p> <p>Do not consider protecting sustainable housing locations outside the green belt to be sustainable.</p>	<p>The local plan offers a number of housing sites that would encourage development in sustainable locations. Sufficient land is available outside the Green Wedges and Strategic Gaps to deliver the borough's OAN and allow for flexibility. CBC is working with other adjoining authorities throughout the local plan preparation process as part of the Duty to Cooperate. A Land Availability Assessment is currently underway which will aid the determination of which sites are to be taken to the next stage of the planning process. It is acknowledged that further work is required on the mix</p>	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS10	65	000003DLP	<p>Object to the policy CS10</p> <p>The 952 units on reserve sites are not considered to offer a wide enough potential pool of sites in terms of size and location which may be attractive to the market. Recommend adding the site at Ringwood Road to assist in achieving the housing target as either an allocation or a reserve site.</p> <p>Do not consider protecting sustainable housing locations outside the green belt to be sustainable.</p>	<p>The land South of Ringwood Road was submitted through the Call for Sites and as such has undergone analysis through the Land Availability Assessment. The site did not appear on the draft Local Plan owing to the significant adverse impact the site would have on the strategic gap. The boundary of the strategic gaps were consulted on in the Sites and Boundaries Issues and Options Consultation in 2012/13 and although an exact</p>	Homes and Housing	

CS9	66	000001DLP	<p>Often less obvious sites can be of particular importance to key butterfly species that are more sedentary. These sites that may be under threat of development or lack essential habitat management.</p> <p>The Staveley and Rother Valley complex is of particular importance owing to the 'Open Mosaic Habitat' which as per the BAP should be maintained in situ wherever possible. Four 'BAP butterfly' or 'NERC species' are represented in the Chesterfield Borough.</p> <p>The Staveley and Rother Valley complex holds key butterfly species. The loss of prime habitat for the BAP species dingy skipper and small heath, together with other rough grassland uncommon species such as common blue and brown argus, requires the retention of remaining areas that sustain these key species and compensation areas established. There must be no net loss of the butterfly populations and diversity.</p> <p>On-going, specialised management is recommended in order to sustain the correct habitat and avoid vegetation succession leading to the demise of the site in terms of its suitability for the key butterfly species. Recommend to secure via condition.</p> <p>The areas in red are to be developed and EMBC suggest that modest areas of suitable habitat are retained and managed within these areas.</p> <p>The area in green is perhaps not to be developed and EMBC recommend it be retained and managed for butterflies.</p>	<p>Noted, a further objective 'n' relating to the creation of open mosaic grassland has been added to the policy in response to concerns raised by Derbyshire Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>The detailed information provided will be noted and can be taken into account as part of any planning application process.</p>	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Comment
CS9	66	000003DLP	<p>Hartington Pit has been or is the subject of reclamation and the provision of compensation land for biodiversity. We recommend strongly that the areas within the Hartington site intended for conservation and the aforementioned compensation sites are fully assessed against the original intention of providing habitat for the key butterfly species lost to the open mosaic at the Hartington site. It is important that action is taken to ensure the biodiversity and associated butterfly objectives are being met and that management plans are in place and resourced to sustain all such sites indefinitely.</p>	<p>Planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment of the Hartington Tip site subject to a series of planning conditions and obligations relating to the conservation and enhancement of habitats.</p>	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Comment
CS10	67	000001DLP	<p>Objects to excluding land off Loundsley Green Road, Chesterfield as a housing allocation.</p> <p>Outline planning consent for 14 dwellings has recently been granted on this site and client is already in advanced discussions regarding its sale to local developers.</p> <p>Recommend the council regard the site as being suitable and immediately available for housing and deliverable early within the plan. Recommend designation within the Local Plan.</p>	<p>The site should be shown if it has passed the necessary LAA stages and will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making.</p>	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	67	000002DLP	<p>No objection to the proposed housing allocation at Linacre Road, Chesterfield (or to the inclusion of Ashgate Plantation within the Holme Hall RPA designation), but remains keen to ensure that the implications of any future development on land directly adjoining client's site are considered at an early stage.</p> <p>Recommend criterion v of the policy section relating to Holme Hall RPA to include the requirement for any development to provide an appropriate (and secure) fence along those boundaries of the proposed housing site bordering Ashgate Plantation in addition to any buffer.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy LP1 ensures that development respects the constraints of the area, is sensitive to the adjoining open countryside and existing residential communities.</p>	Homes and Housing	Comment
RPAs	67	000003DLP	<p>Alternatively the relationship between the development and Ashgate Plantation could be more positively managed by integrating the woodland within the wider Masterplan for the site, providing Green infrastructure, improved pedestrian links/connectivity through and around the development site and wider RPA designation.</p> <p>Opportunity to use the integration of Ashgate Plantation to offset some (on site) open space requirements, to maximize the number of dwellings that could be accommodated within the housing allocation. Efficiencies could also usefully provide the means for the long-term protection/woodland management (enhancement) of this site which could involve local schools through S106 agreement.</p>	<p>Ashgate plantation is a local wildlife site and is protected as such. Agree to suggested change to criteria v of LP1 Holme Hall to reference boundary treatment.</p>	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
RPAs	67	000003DLP	<p>Support the requirement in draft Policy LP12 to "provide for an appropriate buffer to minimise and mitigate any adverse impacts upon Ashgate Plantation Local Wildlife Site".</p> <p>Client continues to experience persistent problems of local trespass, tipping and vandalism and would not wish these to be exacerbated by future development (via increased resident footfall in close proximity to the woodland) on the directly adjoining land.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	Regeneration Priority Areas	Support

	68	000010DLP	Recognition within Policy CS13 of the important role that the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor will play in the provision of employment land development is welcome.	Noted	Jobs Centres Facilities	Support
Canal Corridors	68	000020DLP	Support within Policy CS13 for farm and rural diversification developments is welcome. Across CST's farmed estate, there is an ongoing need to modernise and take advantage of scale economies and action to diversify and convert to alternative uses, including both employment and residential uses. Support Policy LP2 Chesterfield Canal. Recognition within paragraph 10.30 that the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor offers 'an opportunity...north of the canal adjacent to Works Road for canal related commercial activity as part of the wider regeneration of this corridor' are in line with CST proposals.	Noted	River and Canal Corridors	Support
CS10	68	000005DLP	CST supports the proposed allocation of site H62. Believe that the boundary of the proposed allocation should however be amended to incorporate additional land as presently it excludes immediately adjacent existing developed land that could also be redeveloped for residential use, along with other land that also offers significant development potential. The exact boundaries of the proposed H62 allocation, as show on the proposed Policies Map, are unclear in-so far as they are partly obscured by the site reference number. The boundary of the proposed allocation should be extended to include all of the existing buildings and associated yard areas. The proposed allocation boundary should also be extended (in accordance with the attached plan) to include the paddock area located to the immediate south of the farm buildings. That area has been included within the proposed Strategic Gap SG2 designation.	The Pondhouse Farm site is subject to further assessment as part of the LAA process and a decision will be taken on this following the conclusion of this process.	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS11	68	000008DLP	The reduction of the threshold for affordable housing is questioned given the expression of a preference without viability testing given this change may impact upon the delivery of residential development sites placing additional burdens on developers.	The proposed threshold follows recent government guidance and is being tested through a whole plan viability appraisal and the results will inform the next	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS11	68	000009DLP	The principle of improved accessibility and adaptability within housing stock is supported but this can only be achieved if development remains viable. Without evidence as to the viability of this policy choice it is not possible to express an informed view as to whether it is an appropriate choice or not. CST therefore reserves its view on this policy matter.	The proposed policy is being tested through a whole plan viability appraisal and the results will inform the next stage of the Plan. CS11 also allows for flexibility with any requirements being subject to viability which	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS14	68	000011DLP	CST welcomes recognition within Policy CS14 of the role that tourism development can play in supporting rural diversification. Redundant or otherwise underutilised farm buildings can be suitable for conversion and re-use for tourism-related uses.	Noted	Tourism and Visitor Economy	Support
CS15	68	000012DLP	CST supports the inclusion of new Local Centres at Mastin Moor and the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor within the Hierarchy of Centres.	Noted	Jobs Centres Facilities	Support
CS18	68	000013DLP	The preferred option of linking percent for art to 'development value' rather than to 'development costs' as in the Core Strategy is questioned. If the same percentage target is used, for any one scheme this would lead to an increased level of contribution being sought. This is because 'value' will always be higher than 'cost' (unless a scheme has been developed at a loss). The Council may therefore need to seek a lower percentage contribution target, but this could still yield as high a monetary contribution as under the previous approach. Recognition that regard must be given to overall viability is welcome.	Noted. Suggest amendment to policy wording as follows: '...and maintenance of public artwork, subject to viability, secured by a legal...'. This aspect of CS18 may need to be revised based on new viability evidence.	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
CS18	68	000014DLP	Paragraph 8.7 refers to 'the council...preparing a Residential Design SPD jointly with North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Bassetlaw District Councils'. Unless a new SPD is being developed, this would seem to be an error, as the Residential Design SPD was adopted on 24th July 2013, when the Core Strategy came into effect.	Noted. Revision to paragraph 8.7 required.	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
CS18	68	000015DLP	Formatting error in Policy CS18: 'Development will be expected to:' should not be bullet point '(a)' but rather form the start of the second paragraph, introducing the list of requirements. Despite the consultation document expressing the Council's preference to change the 'percent for art' requirement to link to development 'value' rather than 'cost', Policy CS18 under 'Percent for Art' still refers to '...the council will seek to negotiate up to 1% of the total development cost of the scheme for the design, installation and maintenance of public artwork....'. This is confusing and should be clarified.	Noted. Revisions to policy CS18 required.	Design and the Built Environment	Objection

CS19	68	000016DLP	<p>Objects to described timeframe for a Local List of Heritage assets with both the LP. It is also noted that the Council's website is also substantially out of date on this matter.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.18 refers to 'English Heritage'. Its role in the context described has been superseded by Historic England.</p> <p>The lack of any published criteria as to how the assets are to be identified and assessed, the role that landowners will have in the process of inclusion (or not) on the list and the overall decision making process is of concern.</p> <p>Policy CS19 would affords a significant level of protection to 'non-designated heritage assets of local significance, set out in and referred to as The Local List' which will significantly impact on opportunities for their CST objects to the detailed boundaries of the proposed Strategic Gap between Ringwood and Hollingwood (SG2), specifically its inclusion of land to the immediate east of Troughbrook Road, Hollingwood.</p>	An updated timetable will be provided. References to 'English Heritage' will be updated.	Historic Environment	Objection
CS2	68	000002DLP	<p>Believe that the western boundary of the SG has not been defined along the most appropriate or suitable boundary, having regard to the purposes for which land is to be included within the Strategic Gap. Extension of the Strategic Gap designation up to eastern edge of Troughbrook Road is at odds with the Council's acceptance of development at Pondhouse Farm and generally along the eastern side of Troughbrook Road.</p> <p>Believed that the designation should be amended so as to exclude the former farmstead (buildings and yard areas) known as Pondhouse Farm in its entirety along with a modest area of paddock that is located to the immediate south of the farmstead and east of Troughbrook Road (see attached plan) as the paddock itself is not definitive in providing an appreciation of the wider countryside.</p>	The Pondhouse Farm site is subject to further assessment as part of the LAA process and a decision will be taken on this following the conclusion of this process.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS21	68	000017DLP	The continued safeguarding of land for the Chesterfield-Steveley Regeneration Route (CSRR) between Rother Way on the A619 and Bilby Lane is welcome. Safeguarding of land for the Steveley Northern Loop Road Phase 2 is also welcome. Funds that may be used for the latter may however be more beneficially invested in delivering other sections of the CSRR through the SRVC. CST would urge the Council to keep that matter under review.	Noted	Travel and Transport	Support
CS5	68	000003DLP	CST supports the identification of 'Area[s] Identified as Suitable for Wind Energy Development' on the Policies Map and Policy CS5's general updating so as to be consistent with revised national guidance.	Noted	A Changing Climate	Support
CS9	68	000004DLP	As set out above in relation to Policy CS1, CST objects to the detailed boundaries of the proposed Strategic Gap between Ringwood and Hollingwood (SG2).	The Pondhouse Farm site is subject to further assessment as part of the LAA process and a decision	Green Infrastructure and	Objection
PS5	68	000006DLP	CST supports the continued identification of the Steveley and Rother Valley Corridor as a Strategic Site within a housing allocation of 1,500 dwellings.	Noted	Making Great Places	Support
PS5	68	000021DLP	<p>Amendments to 'p provide more detailed guidance for the determination of planning applications following on from the decision not to pursue a separate Area Action Plan' is welcome, along with updates to reflect proposals by HS2 to locate an Infrastructure Maintenance Depot on the site.</p> <p>Development proposals being prepared by CST for land within the SRVC, working with other landowners, are consistent with the policy.</p>	Noted	Making Great Places	Support

PS5	68	000022DLP	<p>Object to reference of a reinstatement of the Works Road Canal Wharf. No reinstated canal link is proposed within that part of the site. The proposed marina would however reinstate a section of the historic alignment of the canal. The policy should be amended to provide general support to canal-related development including a new marina.</p> <p>On the second bullet point of the 'Hall Lane Character Area – Key Objectives' the words 'eastern end' should be deleted – housing development would be located at the western end of that Character Area, close to Barrow Hill and / or Works Road.</p> <p>On the proposed Policies Map, land to the east of Works Road and north of the Chesterfield Canal is included within the Chesterfield Canal designation. It is unclear if designation of that approximately triangular shaped piece of land is intended to reflect the '[r]einstatement of the former Works Road canal wharf' referenced within Policy PS5 or indicate support for canal-related development within that land parcel. It is not however the</p>	<p>Wording for the Works Road Character Area amended to "Canal-related commercial activity including food and drink uses (A3 and A4) and employment (B1), including provision for moorings, in the location of the former canal wharf to the east of Hollingwood Lock" to allow for more flexibility.</p> <p>Noted, reference to the "eastern end" of the Hall Lane Character Area has been deleted.</p>	Making Great Places	Objection
RPAs	68	000001DLP	CST supports the continued inclusion of Mastin Moor and Barrow Hill as Regeneration Priority Areas (RPAs).	Noted	Regeneration	Support
RPAs	68	000007DLP	<p>CST supports the continued identification of Mastin Moor as a Regeneration Priority Area (RPA), however the housing potential (400) underestimates the development potential of land at Mastin Moor that is within the control of CST.</p> <p>Masterplan-led proposals (subject to community consultation in 2016) clearly identify that at least 600 dwellings could be delivered within the designated area, improving regeneration benefits, as sought by the Local Plan.</p> <p>OUT application soon to be submitted which is in line with the LP.</p>	Support noted. Policy LP1 allows for the proposed amount of housing (the amount that was tested through the Core Strategy evidence) and allows for this to be exceeded if the landscape and infrastructure impacts are acceptable and if the additional growth is needed to secure regeneration benefits as demonstrated through a viability appraisal.	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
RPAs	68	000018DLP	<p>CST supports LP1 as it supports the principle of and provides guidance on what form of development will be acceptable within RPAs.</p> <p>Development proposals being prepared by CST on land within the Mastin Moor Regeneration Priority Area would comply with the criteria set out in Policy LP1.</p>	Noted	Regeneration Priority Areas	Support
RPAs	68	000019DLP	<p>The intent of criterion (v) in respect of the Mastin Moor RPA could be made clearer. The criterion makes reference to 'the pumping engine', which no longer exists. The criterion suggest that building design should reflect the 'tramway'. The location of buildings could perhaps have regard to the historic location of the tramway, but not the design of the building itself.</p> <p>Criterion (v) could be amended to read as follows: 'Promote design that positively contributes to the surrounding area, responding to and reflecting local heritage features in the design and location of new buildings where relevant, including the historic pumping engine and tramway.'</p>	Agree to suggest wording with the exception of 'assets' rather than 'features'.	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
CS10	69	000001DLP	Vital protected green area with protected species. Site has mains sewer drain, single track access and no safe pedestrian area. Services cannot accommodate further building.	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	70	000001DLP	Support reserve sites at Dunston.	Support Noted.	Homes and	Support
CS10	70	000002DLP	Support reserve sites at Dunston.	Support Noted.	Homes and	Support
CS10	70	000003DLP	Support reserve sites at Dunston.	Support Noted.	Homes and	Support
CS10	70	000004DLP	Support reserve sites at Dunston.	Support Noted.	Homes and	Support
CS10	70	000005DLP	Request land at Fields Farm Newbold to be included as part of reserve site designation.	<p>Need to contact Agent to confirm whether the parcel of land in question is in the same ownership as the neighbouring site(s).</p> <p>Sites (including Reserve Sites and RPAs) in the Draft Local Plan are potential sites and will be subject to</p>	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS5	71	000001DLP	Object to proposed windfarms due to visual impact, impact on wildlife and noise.	Concerns noted, but no change required. Policy CS5 is sufficiently robust to ensure that any impacts are	A Changing Climate	Objection
CS5	71	000002DLP	Object to site due to proximity to Glasshouse woods and impact on wildlife.	Concerns noted, but no change required. Policy CS5 is sufficiently robust to ensure that any impacts are	A Changing Climate	Objection
	72	000001DLP	Great deal has changed since publication of Core Strategy (e.g. Brexit, HS2). Object to lack of public consultation on strategic vision and strategic issues and options.	The vision and strategic options and issues were fully consulted on as part of the Core Strategy, which was adopted in 2013. It is accepted that there have been changes since then, and those changes that are	Vision	Objection

CS1	72	000003DLP	There is a need for a strategic gap to the east of Woodthorpe. The A619 and stream create strong boundaries for a strategic gap.	The evidence (ARUP Review of Green Wedges and Strategic Gaps 2016) does not support a Strategic Gap	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	72	000004DLP	The strategic gap boundary should be the western boundary of Woodthorpe in the same way boundaries have been sited to prevent expansion of Brimington and Tapton. The gap (north of Bridle Road area) should not be reduced. This area contains old quarry and woodland that support local biodiversity.	The boundary is proposed as recommended by the ARUP report (paragraph 8.3.5) which advises that in order to strengthen this Strategic Gap, the land to the south of the consented residential built form and west of Spencer Avenue should be excluded to reduce the	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	72	000005DLP	Object to omission of Green Belt review given need to cooperate with neighbouring Sheffield, Bolsover and North East Derbyshire councils.	The NPPF states that "Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" (para 83). It is not a requirement to review the green belt as part of the preparation of a Local plan. The borough's growth can be met without	Spatial Strategy	Objection
RPA5	72	000002DLP	LP1 does not adequately safeguard the separate identity of Woodthorpe. The proposed houses will be closer to Woodthorpe than Mastin Moor and mainly within the Woodthorpe LSOA.	Criteria x of Policy LP1 Mastin Moor (Maintaining the distinct identities and settings of Mastin Moor and Woodthorpe through the use of landscaping and open	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
	73	000001DLP	Endorse general policy objectives.	Noted	Vision	Support
	73	000002DLP	Endorse general policy objectives.	Noted	Strategic	Support
	73	000003DLP	Endorse general policy objectives.	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
	73	000004DLP	Endorse general policy objectives.	Noted	Infrastructure	Support
	73	000005DLP	Endorse general policy objectives.	Noted	A Changing Climate	Support
Canal Corridors	73	000016DLP	Support restoration of canal.	Support noted.	River and Canal	Support
CS10	73	000001DLP	<p>Objects to the site being used for residential development given the serious impact on the environment, infrastructure and recreation.</p> <p>Environmental Site is a greenfield area used by many villagers and tourists for recreational purposes alongside cyclists, horse riders and dog walkers. Building would jeopardise this and diminish views into EH protected Westwood. Concerns re. protection of biodiversity and green infrastructure as indigenous natural species are apparent in this untouched natural habitat. Bats, foxes, badgers, rabbits, voles, field mice etc as well as variety of specific British natural woodland birds and insect life, butterflies have been seen.</p> <p>Site was designated as Public Open Space on the previous Local Plan. Now a stronger case to protect as adjacent land to the east (former allotment gardens – field no. 2386) has been planted with a variety native broadleaf trees about 20 years ago to form new woodland to increase biodiversity - now designated as a 'developing woodland' (SBwood38) on the new Local Plan. Construction works and subsequent residential use of this field could drive out animal life. Biodiversity assessment is required.</p> <p>Traffic generation / Public Highways It would generate traffic to unreasonable & untenable levels on the surrounding residential streets. A site of 38 dwellings could potentially double vehicles using the Public Highways. Concern re. impact on Brooke Drive, Westwood Lane and Lodge Close. Environmental aspect of air pollution and noise levels must be considered alongside maintenance (concerns re. potholes). Already issues surrounding access and blockages if delivery vehicles of a certain size or tonnage have to deliver in these areas.</p> <p>Concerns re. Manor Road Brimington Common & traffic accommodation and gridlocking. Brooke Drive & Westwood Lane already suffer traffic aiming to avoid certain stretches of Manor Road. Highway safety would need an assessment and report from a Derbyshire County Council Highways Department Engineer.</p>	<p>This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making</p>	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	73	000007DLP	Brooke Drive, Westwood Lane and Lodge Close are used frequently by cyclists, horse riders, ramblers and Hope that the reserved sites are only used in the last resort. If possible land at Dunston should not be developed. Other sites should be used before rural land.	It is acknowledged that further work is required on the mix of reserve sites, how to phase and what triggers	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS15	73	000008DLP	Support policy objectives. Important to get more visitors to spend time in town. Empty market stall areas could be used for live entertainment to increase footfall and spending.	Policy objectives support noted.	Jobs Centres Facilities	Comment

CS18	73	00009DLP	Need to conserve historic buildings including the black and white buildings of the 1920s/30s. The remaining gardens around the Town Hall should be retained and enhanced. New Buildings should complement existing stock and avoid transient fashion e.g. flat roof design of medical centre on Ashgate Road. Suggest information board in the town centre showing the Roman Fort location.	There is no policy that is specific to the black and white buildings.	Design and the Built Environment	Comment
CS19	73	000010DLP	Should designate a Conservation Area to protect the Victorian residential area of Lower Newbold. Should consider future treatment of whole area between West Bars and Sheffield Road.	The Local Plan does not designate Conservation Areas, which are dealt with through a separate process. However this comment will be passed to the Council's	Historic Environment	Comment
CS20	73	000013DLP	Bus services to station should be improved, including a direct link between Chesterfield and Chatsworth.	Bus services are outside the control of Local Plan	Travel and	Comment
CS21	73	000011DLP	Support link between Hollis Lane and station.	Support Noted	Travel and	Support
CS21	73	000014DLP	Support Chesterfield-Staveley regeneration route, but it should not prejudice full restoration of the canal.	Comments noted.	Major Transport	Support
CS8	73	000006DLP	Query whether Chatsworth Road and Derby Road (between Lordsmill Street roundabout and Langer Lane) should be considered as Air Quality Management Areas.	Noted. Policy CS8 has been updated to take account of existing and future Air Quality Management Area	Environmental Quality	Comment
PS1	73	000012DLP	Hope that Corporation Street can become main approach to station from town. Widening bridge over A61 would improve its appearance. Need to solve problem of derelict hotels (Clifton Hotel and Chesterfield Hotel) in this area. Need to solve problem of commuter parking in residential areas around the station. The station surface car-park should be converted into a two-storey car-park.	Noted. Policy PS1 will be revised to reflect the HS2 growth Strategy.	Making Great Places	Comment
PS1	73	000017DLP	Suggest release of some land in Northern gateway for housing, by extending site currently Allen & Orrs timber yard. Suggest new circular multi-storey car park within Donut roundabout area, and demolish old multi-storey car park and use the land for housing. Support former NEDDC offices as potential housing site for a landmark scheme based on The Terrace on Saltergate.	The Allen & Orr Timber Yard will be the subject of further investigation as part of the LAA process. The council is currently in the process of procuring the replacement of the Saltergate MSCPI.	Making Great Places	Comment
PS1	73	000018DLP	Suggest comprehensive redevelopment scheme improving access to station, increasing car parking, enhancing Corporation Street and restoring or replacing the Chesterfield Hotel. Markham House should be redeveloped.	Policy PS1 and the Chesterfield Town Centre Masterplan aims to facilitate the suggestions mentioned. It should be noted that the Chesterfield Hotel and Markham House are within private	Making Great Places	Comment
RPA5	73	000015DLP	Support RPAs. Important that DCC improves the schools serving these communities.	Support noted.	Regeneration	Support
CS10	74	000001DLP	OBJECT to allocation of land at Lodge Close for Housing Objections from highways authority	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS9	74	000002DLP	Site should be included in the Strategic Gap between Brimington/Brimington Common and Inkersall	The site (H40) is on the south west edge of the proposed Ringwood and Hollingwood strategic gap (Brimington Common). Strong weight should be afforded to the recently published review of the Strategic Gaps and green Wedges which is published on the council's website. The site was subject of a recent planning application (CHE/16/00683/FUL) and it was considered that the proposed development was unlikely to have a negative impact on the function of the Strategic Gap despite its role in creating a strong durable boundary around the development site (particularly to the western side). The site (H40) will continue to be assessed for suitability through the Land Availability Assessment.	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Objection
	75	000001DLP	supports the identification in paragraph 1.13 that mineral resources should be protected from unnecessary sterilisation Surface coal resources are prevalent across the entire borough the relationship between the Local Plan and wider policy frameworks, including the Derby and Derbyshire Mineral Local Plan should be clearly identified	Support noted. Agree paragraph to be added to clarify wider policy framework in relation to mineral resources.	Vision	Comment
	75	000002DLP	supports the identification that Chesterfield borough may have areas of unstable land as a consequence of past coal mining activity	Noted.	Environmental Quality	Support

CS8	75	000003DLP	supports requirement for desk top survey and where appropriate phase II study for development on land which is suspected of being unstable Support requirement a programme of remediation to be agreed prior to implementation of any planning permission on unstable sites. The policy is in accordance with the NPPF	Support noted.	Environmental Quality	Support
CS1	76	000001DLP	Opposed to use of greenfield sites for building (wishes them to be preserved for wildlife). RPAs will suffer further deprivation from building if development dwarfs the original village and changes its identity.	Some greenfield development is necessary to meet housing needs over the plan period. Policy LP1 will ensure that development respects the constraints of	Vision	Objection
CS10	76	000002DLP	Opposed to use of greenfield sites Wishes to clarify whether RPAs are to be used irrespective of the reserve sites.	Some greenfield development is necessary to meet housing needs over the plan period. RPAs are a focus for regeneration and growth (as established in the Core	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS20	76	000004DLP	Increase in housing in RPAs will create traffic issues. Residential areas along Rectory Rd and Duckmanton Rd will be affected adversely. Already congested at busy times, as is the Bolsobor - Chesterfield Rd itself.	The Local Plan will ensure that traffic impacts are acceptable (CS20). Policy LP1 (v) Duckmanton requires that development proposals deliver highway and	Travel and Transport	Objection
RPAs	76	000003DLP	Objects to development of a greenfield site as: - too large - risk of reducing existing village into a ghetto area - destruction of habitats - change from rural - suburban (identity change) - increase in traffic - problems in village need tackling in other ways.	Concerns noted. Development in the RPAs must be of a scale that is appropriate for the area whilst ensuring a sufficient regeneration benefits. The Local Plan will protect biodiversity (CS9) and ensure that traffic impacts are acceptable (CS20).	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
CS10	77	000001DLP	Questions the requirement for 4629 homes when the number of people is estimated to rise by 6600 (6%). The demographic split shows the 85+ age group increasing by 3700 (56%) - most of these are likely to be in homes so there will be a lower housing requirement.	The updated SHMA uses most recent population projections and a methodology that follows national guidance to derive a dwelling figure. The updated SHMA also takes account of the need for specialist housing for older people. The next version of the Plan	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS8	77	000002DLP	RPA areas and Reserve sites are not required in light of this. Traffic pollution is already unacceptable (note Brimington AQMA) Other areas need consideration and action - e.g. Chatsworth Road, Derby Road, Markham Road, etc.	Noted. Policy CS8 has been updated to take account of existing and future Air Quality Management Area designations. The Brimington AQMA has been declared, and the action plan is currently being	Environmental Quality	Objection
CS10	78	000001DLP	Where is the action plan for Brimington, Church Street? Object to use of Westwood Lane and Brooke Drive for access - too narrow and lack of pavements (pedestrian safety concerns). Schools & Doctor's surgeries are full - development would mean additional strain on services. The sewerage system requires improvement. Habitats would be destroyed if the land was developed, would like to see these protected.	This site will be subject to further assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making	Homes and Housing	Objection
	79	000004DLP	Object as incorrect. All activities on the former chemical site have now gone. All hazardous substances have been removed. There is no requirement for a Hazard Referral Zone. Appropriate steps should be taken to	Noted, this has been passed on to the consultants undertaking the SA to be updated. The process of	Strategic Objectives	Objection
PS5	79	000001DLP	A significant factor in bringing forward the land to the east of Works Road (the former chemical works - "the site") is delivering the ground remediation for the protection of human health and controlled waters. Confident that the vast majority "the site" can be suitably remediated, it's just a question of time and cost.	Noted	Making Great Places	Comment
PS5	79	000002DLP	The nature of the former activities (iron, coke, chemicals) and the proposed use of a significant proportion of the land for the HS2 IMD lends "the site" towards future employment use. Remediation to a residential standard is not impossible, but given the need for employment land we would agree "the site" would be well suited. Early masterplanning is recommended in order to advise current and near future remediation projects and also to offer the opportunity to optimise the layout and remediation requirements. This has the potential to reduce overall costs and speed up delivery.	Noted	Making Great Places	Comment

P55	79	00003DLP	The proposed IMD now appears to be a reasonable fit for the site. The very important spine road needed to support the SRVC plan can and must still be accommodated.	Noted, further commentary is to be added to this section following confirmation of the safeguarded land required for HS2.	Making Great Places	Objection
	80	000001DLP	Given talk of using the IMD as a construction site for the east leg of HS2, early masterplanning is required. The 60 acres proposed for the HS2 depot would require several years to deliver the stages of remediation. Strategic Objective S11 is supported which seeks to ensure that the Green Belt of the Borough will be maintained and enhanced.	Noted	Strategic Objectives	Support
	80	000002DLP	Support the addition of a specific Strategic Objective 13 to enhance health and wellbeing, which is translated into the Vision	Noted	Strategic Objectives	Support
	80	000024DLP	Habitats Regulations Assessment: It is noted that in Table 3.1, which summarises the threats to and sensitivities of European sites, the last column identifies Potential Local Plan Impact Pathways. For the 2 closest designations, the Peak District Moors SPA and SAC which lie around 4km to the west of Chesterfield Borough, this column text states that with regard to recreational pressure: ‘The effect of recreational pressure originating in the Chesterfield area is uncertain: although unlikely to be significant, the unique attraction of the Peak District is likely to result in a greater visitor catchment than typical for many European sites.’ This appears to have discounted any recreational increase through ‘in combination’ effects with other local plans and projects without any evidence or empirical data to determine whether there is indeed a zone of influence. ‘In combination’ needs to recognise the ‘in combination’ effects with other Local Plans, but also ‘in combination’ effects with other policies. CBC’s proposed 4,629 housing target is considered to be a minimum throughout the LPCD as a preferred reserve site has also been identified should the additional housing growth be required. The proposed housing levels considered in the Habitats Regulations Assessment are believed to have a minimal impact. However, it is not clear whether the ‘in combination’ effect with CBC’s Tourism Policy, which recognises Chesterfield as a hub for visitors to the Peak District and identifies capacity for increasing visitor accommodation, has been considered with the proposed housing numbers as this could potentially have a likely significant effect through recreational pressure on the SAC/SPAs. As such it appears that a likely significant effect cannot be screened out.	Noted. Comment passed to the consultants doing the SA work and will be responded to as part of the SA process.	Homes and Housing	Comment
	80	000025DLP	The overall potential housing land supply that has been identified on pages 44 to 47 is 8,863 houses, with 3,980 houses identified on proposed housing allocation sites, 952 on the Dunston Grange Reserve Site and 3,931 identified within the RPAs and Strategic Sites. This overall total of 8,863 causes concern because it is considerably above the OAHN requirement of 4,629 houses for the Borough over the Plan period. Whilst the NPPF requires local planning authorities to provide some flexibility in its housing land supply to meet its OAHN and five year housing land supply requirements, the land supply which has been identified at over 8,800 dwellings appears to be excessive. There is no explanation in the LPCD why this excessive level of land supply has been identified, which well exceeds the Borough’s future housing requirements; whether it is proposed that all of the housing allocations, including Reserve Site and RPA sites, will be carried forward into the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan; and how much of the land supply is expected to be delivered in the Plan period. This is likely to cause uncertainty and confusion to residents, developers and infrastructure and service providers in the Borough. This issue needs to be explained further in the next stage of the Plan’s preparation	Noted. The sites (including Reserve Sites and RPAs) in the Draft Local Plan are the potential sites and will be subject to further assessment before being taken through to the next stage of the plan where sites sufficient to meet the OAN will be proposed. This will be clarified in any supporting text.	Homes and Housing	Comment
	80	000034DLP	The LPCD’s overall approach to town centres and retailing is fully supported. The definition of the Borough’s revised hierarchy of centres (from that set out in the LPCS) is welcomed and considered to be robust and well justified based on extensive survey evidence. The definition of a hierarchy should ensure that the scale and nature of new retail and leisure development is located in and adjoining the most appropriate centre in the hierarchy to accommodate the development without having disproportionate and harmful trading impacts on centres in the hierarchy.	Noted	Jobs Centres Facilities	Support
	80	000035DLP	It is considered to be appropriate that Staveley has been redefined in the hierarchy as a ‘Small Town Centre and District Centre’ compared to its previous definition as a ‘Large Town Centre’ (of comparable status to Chesterfield). CBC may wish to consider referring to Chesterfield town centre as a ‘Sub-Regional Centre’ as it was previously defined in the revoked DDJSP and former EMRP due to its important role and status in the retail hierarchy.	Reference in the table of Hierarchy of Centres amended and reference added to 7.16	Jobs Centres Facilities	Comment
	80	000040DLP	paragraph 8.3 states that “There should not be a conflict between historic character and new development if there is high quality sensitive design”. This needs to be prefaced with the phrase ‘In most cases’. Sometimes, depending upon the nature of that historic character or its particular attributes, new development might be inappropriate regardless of the design quality.	Noted, the sentence has been amended as described.	Design and the Built Environment	Objection

80	000041DLP	<p>paragraph 8.4 – It is suggested that the sentence should be reworded that begins “Landscape character is also part of local distinctiveness...” It is considered that this is incorrect because ‘local distinctiveness’ is actually part of ‘landscape character’ i.e. it is the detail and locally distinctive features in the landscape that contribute to its overall character. It is recommended that this sentence is reworded as follows: “Local distinctiveness contributes to landscape character and variations in landscape character and local distinctiveness across the Borough need to be recognised and appropriately responded to in new development and in schemes of management as described in the Landscape Character of Derbyshire (Derbyshire County Council, 4th Edition 2014).</p>	The definition of 'Local Distinctiveness' is broad and can incorporate ambience, language, history and traditions(as originally defined by Common Ground in 1983) which is inextricably linked to, but not congruent with, Landscape Character. Suggest replacing the relevant text with "Landscape character and is also a part of Local Distinctiveness are inextricable linked and its variations in landscape character within across the	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
80	000042DLP	<p>DCC’s Officers would strongly urge that the last sentence of this paragraph is removed, which states “The inclusion of art within a development or provided off-site can help mitigate against any visual or aesthetic impact of the development”. DCC’s Officers would strongly disagree with this statement as no amount of art is going to compensate for an ill-conceived, poorly designed or poor quality development, and developers should not be encouraged to provide art installations simply to facilitate a visually poor development proposal. Given that Chesterfield is Derbyshire’s largest town, it is of significant concern that the LPCD is largely lacking in any consideration of the cumulative traffic impacts of the development proposals and their likely impacts for the town’s transportation networks.</p>	Noted. The sentence has been deleted.	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
80	000044DLP	<p>The LPCD, however, provides little understanding of the potential transportation implications of its land use proposals. As noted in the Government’s ‘Transport evidence bases in plan making and decision taking advice’, it is important for local planning authorities to undertake an assessment of the transport implications in developing or reviewing their Local Plan so that a robust transport evidence base may be developed to support the preparation and/ or review of that Plan.</p> <p>DCC’s Highways Officers have previously provided advice to CBC’s Officers regarding the availability and scope of modelling tools that would assist them in the analysis of traffic impacts which would be the first step in developing a mitigation strategy to ameliorate these traffic impacts. DCC, as the local Highway Authority, using its North Derbyshire Traffic Model has in the past undertaken some traffic forecasting of the potential impacts of likely development. The model’s Traffic Forecasting Report (April 2012), considered the three local authority areas of Bolsover District, North East Derbyshire District and Chesterfield Borough, and although it reflected a slightly different composition of land use proposals than that currently under consideration, nevertheless identified a number of junctions, at which over-capacity issues could potentially arise. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A61 Whittington Moor Roundabout; • Hornsbridge Roundabout; • M1 J29. M1 J29A Eastern Roundabout; • A619 Rother Way Roundabout; • Hall Lane Signals; • Barrow Hill; • A632/Staveley Road signalled junction. <p>Likewise a number of common links where over-capacity issues could arise was similarly identified. These included:</p>	The Borough Council will continue to work with the County Council, as Highways Authority, and neighbouring authorities under the Duty to co-operate, to address cumulative traffic impacts of the development proposals and their likely impacts for the town’s transportation networks so that a robust transport evidence base may be developed, including the development and use of modelling tools such as the North Derbyshire Traffic Model to assist in the analysis of traffic impacts in order to develop a mitigation strategy to ameliorate identified traffic impacts.	Travel and Transport	Objection
80	000046DLP	<p>Section 9.15 of the LPCD notes that: ‘a number of major transport routes have been safeguarded in the Local Plan and identified in the Derbyshire County Local Transport Plan (LTP). The most significant of these being the Chesterfield-Staveley Regeneration Route’. It adds that: ‘Derbyshire County Council is currently reviewing this scheme and will be considering alternative options for and alignments of any major new road infrastructure’. This is not an entirely accurate reflection of DCC’s LTP as it indicates a Staveley Regeneration scheme as having ‘potential for further appraisal in association with land use plans...pending review of impacts of the Markham Vale development and subject to consideration as part of the Staveley Area Action Plan...’</p> <p>It should also be noted that the currently protected route, i.e. that which would be declared on any property search, is not indicated in its entirety on the LPCD Policies Map and CBC is requested to amend the Map to do</p>	Proposals for the Staveley Works Corridor and the CSRR have moved on considerably from the LTP3, which was published in 2011. It is not considered appropriate to show the currently protected route, which neither CBC, DCC or the landowners would want to see delivered in its current form, and which conflicts with other policies and allocations of the plan (including the restoration of Chesterfield Canal, LP2 and the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor). If necessary, the route safeguarded in the LTP could be shown on the Constraints Map until such time as a replacement route has been agreed. In the meantime we would welcome discussion on a suitable, positive	Travel and Transport	Comment
80	000048DLP	<p>The transport evidence base provided on CBC’s website should at least be updated to include reference to the North Derbyshire Highway Assignment Model Local Model Validation and Forecasting Reports.</p>	Noted. Reference to be made if DCC can provide links for website.	Major Transport Infrastructure	Comment

	80	000049DLP	<p>Chapter 9 on Travel and Transport highlights the issue of congestion and the role that public transport has to play in helping to overcome it. There is little consideration in the LPCD, however, of how this could be achieved, particularly when compared to the very detailed plans, for example, for the strategic cycle network. For local journeys, bus services have a critical role to play so it is recommended that the Pre-Submission LP contains more detail on what improvements CBC wants to see, for example, proposals for key bus corridor improvements such as bus priority measures (bus lanes, priority at traffic signal junctions, enforcement etc.) as well as bus stop improvements. The work proposed as part of the A61 corridor improvements could be seen as a pilot for what could be achieved elsewhere.</p> <p>As well as bus infrastructure, it is considered that the Pre-Submission LP could also look to specify the level of bus service which would be expected on particular corridors, for example every 15 minutes during the day Monday to Saturday and hourly in the evening and on Sunday – just to give some idea of what the ambition is. This approach of specifying a level of service could also form part of the requirements set out in Chapter 10 on RPAs in the same way as the cycle and walking routes. Whilst the bus franchising proposals in the new Buses Bill is not something DCC is likely to want to pursue, enhanced partnership arrangements are something DCC could explore. Therefore, it would be very useful if the Pre- Submission LP included some points about expected bus service levels to add strength to any partnership scheme DCC introduces with the bus operators in the area.</p> <p>The issue of a central bus station is also raised a number of times in the LPCD. This needs to be given serious consideration because it needs to be in a location where people and, equally or more importantly, bus operators will actually want to use it. Therefore, a town centre location near to the shops would be preferable to one placed near the railway station which is currently very poorly served by buses and unlikely to be attractive to most bus passengers or operators.</p>	<p>The Borough Council recognises the critical role that bus services can play in helping to overcome congestion, and will continue to work alongside the County Council in seeking to secure the best quality services. However the Local Plan's scope to deliver improved services is limited and it is the role and responsibility of the County Council as transport authority to plan for public transport services, principally through the Local Transport Plan. Agree that the work proposed as part of the A61 corridor improvements could be seen as a pilot for what could be achieved elsewhere.</p> <p>The Borough Council continues to look towards the delivery of a central bus station, in a location which is attractive to both bus users and bus operators. The Council will continue to work with the County Council, bus operators, and others to seek to deliver a suitable and high quality facility.</p>	Travel and Transport	Comment
	80	000050DLP	<p>Rail</p> <p>Improving surface access to the railway station is a key issue. Currently it is located in a bit of a dead end, which makes it particularly difficult to serve by bus services from the surrounding area. To make it more attractive to bus operators to want to serve, it needs to be located somewhere that buses are able to pass en route to other locations without deviating off route. The proposals for a Hollis Lane link are welcome, however, another direct route from the town centre is also required so that buses can circulate easily between the railway station and town centre. It is welcomed, therefore, that there are plans to widen the proposed green bridge across the A61 from Corporation Street (to replace the current footbridge) so that it could also accommodate buses and act as a bus gate to and from the town centre.</p>	<p>Noted. Relevant policies will be revised to reflect the HS2 growth Strategy.</p>	Travel and Transport	Comment
	80	000051DLP	<p>The LPCD (particularly in Chapter 11 on Making Great Places) therefore needs to take on board the potential benefits that HS2 will bring to Chesterfield and plan to capitalise on them. This could involve encouraging more high quality development adjacent to the railway station, for example, as an extension to the current Waterside development plans, and the wider town centre area. This effectively would expand the town centre out to meet the railway station and make an attractive route for people and business between the two (see comments regarding the green bridge above). Also it links to marketing the town as a gateway/ base to the wider area and Peak District through the development of more hotels and leisure facilities. Consideration also needs to be given to the railway station itself and how to accommodate future expansion, for example, another platform to accommodate the HS2 services and additional classic services which are likely to use the station in the future.</p>	<p>Noted. Relevant policies will be revised to reflect the HS2 growth Strategy.</p>	Travel and Transport	Comment
	80	000062DLP	<p>the LPCD recognises the need for Greenway infrastructure provision through development and it is welcomed that this requirement is included in planning conditions, CIL arrangements and Section 106 Agreements. However, it is requested that the provision of strategic cycle infrastructure requirements is supported better in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan shown in Appendix A.</p>	<p>Note support for approach to greenway infrastructure provision in new development through planning conditions, CIL arrangements and Section 106 Agreements. The Borough Council will look to</p>	Infrastructure Delivery	Objection
	80	000063DLP	<p>It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix A Infrastructure Delivery – Health. 	<p>Noted</p>	Infrastructure Delivery	Support
	80	000064DLP	<p>It is noted that the Ashgate Plantation Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) (as defined in the Saved Policies of the Adopted Chesterfield Borough Local Plan (CBLP)) has been included within the area designated as the Holme Hall RPA. It is considered that this SINC should be excluded from the RPA area designated on the Policies Map to avoid confusion and uncertainty and to ensure the SINC is protected from any proposed housing development in the remainder of the RPA.</p>	<p>Ashgate plantation is a local wildlife site and is protected as such. Suggested change to criteria v of LP1 Holme Hall to reference boundary treatment.</p>	Policies Map	Objection

80	000065DLP	Careful consideration will need to be given by CBC's Officers to the proposed Peak Resort at Unstone, which has been in the planning pipeline for approximately 20 years and on which preparatory work has recently been carried out on the site. The site has planning permission for a large leisure and tourism related development and is washed over by Green Belt as defined on the LPCDs Policies Map. A potential option might be to identify the site as a Major Redevelopment Site Within the Green Belt, which would ensure that the site is developed for an appropriate Green Belt use, as currently proposed. Given the uncertainty over the site's future delivery, however, it is considered appropriate for CBC to continue to identify the site as being washed over by Green Belt, which will provide appropriate protection for the site should the application proposals fail to be delivered.	Noted. Site has permission and has commenced and is therefore extant. There is no planning need to give the site an allocation.	Policies Map	Comment
80	000066DLP	It should also be noted that the currently protected route, i.e. that which would be declared on any property search, is not indicated in its entirety on the LPCD Policies Map and CBC is requested to amend the Map to do so.	Proposals for the Staveley Works Corridor and the CSRR have moved on considerably from the LTP3, which was published in 2011. It is not considered appropriate to show the currently protected route, which neither CBC, DCC or the landowners would want to see delivered in its current form, and which conflicts with other policies and allocations of the plan (including the restoration of Chesterfield Canal, LP2 and the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor). If	Policies Map	Comment
80	000067DLP	The emerging Derbyshire and Derby Minerals Local Plan (EDDMLP) consultation paper 'Towards a Strategy for Safeguarding Minerals Related Infrastructure' (April 2016) put forward options for ensuring the long term protection of such facilities. This is to ensure that the minerals which are produced within Derbyshire and Derby are supplied to the market in the form required, for example, ready mixed concrete and coated roadstone, and the potential to transport them in sustainable ways is maintained. Safeguarding should also ensure that, if development is proposed at or potentially near to any of the identified locations, the significance of the site in terms of retaining supply can be considered fully before decisions are made. This reflects guidance in the NPPF which recognises the role of district and borough council plans in two-tier areas in ensuring adequate safeguarding is provided. The corresponding Safeguarding Support Paper identified 4 ready mix concrete and 1 coated roadstone sites in Chesterfield that merited consideration for safeguarding. None of these facilities are within mineral related development sites and therefore the Mineral Planning Authorities request that the LPCD should include recognition of this situation and some mechanism for ensuring that appropriate safeguarding is provided.	Noted. Suggest inclusion of a criteria in CS2 'Ensure the long term protection of safeguarded Minerals Related Infrastructure as identified in the DDMLP and shown on the Policies Map' subject to further detail from DCC in terms of site plans.	Policies Map	Comment
80	000068DLP	Chapter 1, paragraph 1.19 states "Everyone has the opportunity to have a healthier lifestyle, through improved walking and cycling routes....." This bears relevance to the developing Derbyshire Key Cycle Network and is supported. As such it is disappointing that this network is not shown on the Policies Map. CBC is requested to include it.	The proposed Strategic Cycle Network is included in the plan on page 80.	Policies Map	Comment
80	000069DLP	Paragraph 1.25 states that "Railway infrastructure such as the track bed between Seymour Junction and the Clowne Linear Park in Bolsover is safeguarded, for future use as a rail transport route and as a walking and cycling route in the meantime". However, the proposed cycle route should be shown on the Policies Map. Paragraph 1.25 goes on to say..."Extensions to existing greenways and new routes are secured, in particular to connect Chesterfield town centre with the north of the borough and Dronfield". Again these should be identified on the Policies Map and CBC is requested to include them.	Agree - Proposals map to be amended.	Policies Map	Comment
80	000070DLP	The Policies Map shows neither the built strategic walking and cycling network to be protected or safeguarded nor the proposed sections to complete the desired infrastructure and connectivity across the Borough. It is requested that the built and proposed network is added to the Map.	Proposals map to be amended	Policies Map	Comment
80	000071DLP	Chapter 9 sets out the strategic walking and cycle plan for the Borough and recognises the positive impact that this will have on both the healthy living agenda and the impact on increasing the visitor offer to raise tourism generated income. The Local Plan aligns with the East Derbyshire Greenway Strategy, The Rights of Way Improvement Plan and DCC's third LTP. Paragraph 9.7 refers to the strategic cycle plan and points to an illustration of this in Diagram 7. This should be reflected on both the Constraints Map and the Policies Map.	As the network may change over the plan period it would not be appropriate to include it on the Policies Map, but it can be included on the constraints map which is a living document and will be updated regularly.	Policies Map	Comment
80	000072DLP	The Constraints Map shows a network of strategic walking and cycling routes as a series of broken green lines. These follow both built and proposed sections which in itself might be misleading with regard to availability or intent. The network shown is also incomplete with both further built route and proposed routes not shown. It is requested the Map is updated to differentiate between built and proposed sections and include the missing sections given below.	Agree that changes can be made for clarity subject to DCC providing the most up-to-date data.	Policies Map	Comment

	80	000073DLP	In coalfield areas it is sometimes necessary to remove coal measures lying close to the surface to enable a proposed development to proceed. In some cases, the volume of coal involved is very small and the prior removal is considered as part of the overall planning application assessment procedure. In other cases the volume of coal is more significant and the issue has to be referred to DCC as the Mineral Planning Authority. In line with the NPPF it is proposed to include a policy in the EDDMLP, setting out the criteria that DCC and Derby City Council will apply to any prior extraction proposal they receive but it would be helpful if the LPCD included a corresponding reference, if not a specific policy.	Agree. Can add relevant wording to correspond with EDDMLP.	Location of Development	Objection
	80	000074DLP	The introductory section of the LPCD rightly explains the role and purpose of the Local Plan but it does not inform readers of the existence and purpose of other local plans that will form part of the complete Development Plan for the area. It does not inform readers that the emerging Minerals and Waste Local Plans being prepared by DCC and Derby City Council will be a relevant consideration in the assessment and determination of some development proposals in the area. It is particularly important in two-tier planning authority areas that the Local Plan contains such information given the requirements of 'Duty to Co-operate' and the need for all these plans to complement each other to deliver the policies and objectives of national planning policy which underpin their preparation and content.	The following text has been added to the 'What is a Local Plan' section; "Alongside the Chesterfield Borough Local Plan, there are also the emerging Minerals and Waste Local Plans being jointly prepared by Derbyshire County Council and Derby City Council, which will be a relevant consideration in the assessment and determination of some development proposals in the area. "	Vision	Comment
CS1	80	000003DLP	The overall spatial strategy of concentration and regeneration set out in Policy CS1 is fully supported as the most appropriate and sustainable growth strategy for the Borough to adopt in the LPCD.	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS1	80	000004DLP	The continued identification of Regeneration Priority Areas (RPAs) is fully supported.	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS1	80	000005DLP	The housing provision requirement for the Borough of 4,629 new homes over the period 2016 to 2033 (272 per annum (pa)) is supported in principle, as it would meet the full objectively assessed housing needs (OAHN) of 244 dwellings pa in the Borough over the Plan period based on extensive evidence in the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 (SHMA). DCC's Officers consider that the SHMA is a very robust piece of evidence.	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS1	80	000006DLP	The specific identification of Markham Vale and the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor as key employment areas in Policy CS1 is fully supported.	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS1	80	000007DLP	As more than sufficient land has been identified in the LPCD to meet the Borough's future housing and employment land needs on brownfield and greenfield sites outside the Green Belt, the policy approach to Green Belt in Policy CS1 is fully supported, which seeks to ensure that the existing Green Belt in the Borough will be maintained and enhanced.	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS1	80	000008DLP	Strategic Gaps and Green Wedges are considered to play an important and complementary role to the Borough's Green Belt in providing a more localised function of preventing the coalescence of neighbouring settlements such as between Brimington and Tupton; Ringwood and Hollingwood; Lowgates / Netherthorpe/ Woodthorpe and Mastin Moor; and Old Whittington and New Whittington. Green Wedges play important roles in providing access to the countryside from urban areas and contributing to good health and wellbeing. The continued definition of Strategic Gaps and Green Wedges in the LPCD is therefore fully supported as set out in Policy CS1.	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS1	80	000009DLP	CBC's Strategic Housing Requirement Review Paper (SHRR) sets out more detail to justify the LPCD's housing provision requirement. However, it is considered that the approach to calculating shortfall may not be wholly robust and may require further consideration by CBC. This is because the LPCD covers the period from 2016 to 2033. Importantly, the Adopted LPCS covers the period from 2011 to 2031. It is considered that CBC should give further consideration to this issue, particularly to be satisfied that the adopted approach set out in the SHRR is robust and will stand up to scrutiny at the Examination in Public of the Local Plan in due course.	The updated SHMA will provide a consistent baseline for the Local Plan and for considering any shortfall. This will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	80	000010DLP	As CBC's SHMA was published in 2014, it may not have considered the potential impacts of HS2 on the Borough's future housing needs. Although HS2 is not scheduled to be complete until 2033, which coincides with the end of the Local Plan period, it is possible that demand for new housing may increase in the Borough in the years up to 2033 on the back of the town being served by HS2. It is suggested, therefore, that CBC may wish to undertake further work on its SHMA to consider the potential impacts of HS2 on the Borough's future OAHNs.	The updated SHMA will provide a consistent baseline for the Local Plan and for considering any shortfall. This will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper. Further work on the potential impact of HS2 is being undertaken as part if	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	80	000011DLP	The ELR study is unlikely to have taken into account the potential impacts of HS2 and recent Government proposals for its route refinement to provide for a new spur to serve Chesterfield railway station with high speed trains. If subsequently confirmed by Government, this could make Chesterfield a more desirable location for businesses to set up, particularly towards the end of the Local Plan period. CBC's Officers may therefore need to carry out or commission further work to assess the Borough's future employment land requirements should the refined HS2 route be confirmed.	Noted. The employment land requirement will be reviewed to take into account HS2.	Spatial Strategy	Objection

CS10	80	000001DLP		Duplicate Record	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS10	80	000026DLP	In the context of the potential need for Chesterfield Borough to accommodate higher levels of housing growth associated with the growth ambitions of the SCR and D2N2 LEPs, the policy approach set out in Policy CS10: Flexibility in Delivery of Housing is supported in principle. This policy and background text indicates that CBC proposes to allocate reserve housing sites which will only normally be granted planning permission if CBC is unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable sites from other sources and where the sites accord with the strategy of concentration and regeneration.	Noted	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	80	000027DLP	it is noted that CBC's preferred option is for one reserve site only at Dunston Grange rather than a mix of smaller sites across the above locations, in order to secure the necessary infrastructure and a comprehensive master planning approach. The broad approach above is supported in principle, as the identification of a single large reserve site would be more likely to provide a critical mass of development to support a mix of housing, employment, other services and important on and off-site infrastructure	Noted	Homes and Housing	Support
CS10	80	000028DLP	Dunston Grange reserve site: DCC's Conservation and Design Officers, however, have previously raised significant concerns about residential development at Dunston through work they have carried out to assist CBC in assessing a range of sites in CBC's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process. Particular concern has been expressed about potential residential development extending northwards towards the B6050, which appears to be the main direction of growth for the Dunston Grange reserve site. In this location, there is potential for significant landscape and visual impacts as a result of the quality of the landscape in this locality, as well as the potential to impact on the setting of Dunston Hall, Grange and Farm, which are all designated heritage assets. CBC is requested, therefore, to reconsider the extent of the proposed allocation of the reserved site at Dunston Grange identified on the Policies Map with a view to revising the allocation to exclude land to the north-west in the vicinity of the B6050.	Noted. DCC have been requested to review the LVIA submitted by the promoters of Dunston Grange. All sites will be subject to further assessment before being taken through to the next stage of the plan.	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS11	80	000030DLP	The proposed approach to affordable housing set out in Policy CS11 and the background text is fully supported and is consistent with national planning policy	Noted	Homes and Housing	Support
CS12	80	000031DLP	It is welcomed that paragraphs 6.13 to 6.17 make reference to the Derby, Derbyshire, Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) and East Staffordshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA)(2014). Paragraph 6.14 makes appropriate reference to the recommendations of the GTAA that there was a requirement for 4 Traveller pitches in Chesterfield Borough over the period 2014 – 2019 with no further requirement from 2019 to 2034. It is noted that planning permission has been granted for 2 pitches since the GTAA was published leaving a residual requirement for 2 pitches up to 2019. The indication in paragraph 6.13 that CBC's officers are currently assessing a range of council-owned sites and will publish a further consultation in due course setting out a range of potentially suitable sites is supported and welcomed. In the context of this on-going work, the continued inclusion in the LPCD of Policy CS12 is supported, which sets out a range of criteria for the assessment of any potential sites that come forward for Traveller pitches, in line with the recommendations of national policy guidance for Travellers in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (March 2012).	Noted	Homes and Housing	Support
CS13	80	000032DLP	The specific identification of Markham Vale and the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor as key employment areas in Policy CS1 and in Policy CS13: Economic Growth is fully supported.	Noted	Jobs Centres Facilities	Support
CS14	80	000033DLP	Policy CS14: Tourism and the Visitor Economy states that CBC will promote and enhance tourism development in the Borough where it is: a) 'Located in areas that can accommodate additional visitor numbers without detriment to the environment.....' The Local Plan identifies Chesterfield as the visitor hub of the Peak District and wishes to encourage visits to the Peak Park. However, it is not clear how the detriment to the environment would be assessed, which requires further clarification in the background text to the Policy.	Noted. Suggest clarification would be helpful with reference to compliance with CS8, CS9 and CS15.	Jobs Centres Facilities	Comment
CS15	80	000036DLP	Policy CS15 is supported which incorporate the important sequential and retail impact tests set out in the NPPF, including the need for Retail Impact Assessments (RIA) to be submitted in support of retail proposals above a range of thresholds.	Noted	Jobs Centres Facilities	Support
CS16	80	000037DLP	Policy CS16 is supported which incorporate the important sequential and retail impact tests set out in the NPPF, including the need for Retail Impact Assessments (RIA) to be submitted in support of retail proposals above a range of thresholds.	Noted	Jobs Centres Facilities	Support

CS16	80	000038DLP	Policy CS16 should be strengthened to indicate that larger scale retail proposals located outside the defined town, district and local centres, which would be likely have a harmful impact on the vitality and viability of these centres, will not be permitted in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.	This would be a repetition of the policy already set out in the NPPF and is not considered necessary "There should be no need to reiterate policies that are already	Jobs Centres Facilities	Comment
CS17	80	000039DLP	It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including: • The essential value of social infrastructure and sense of local identity to enhance the quality of life of the Borough's residents;	Noted	Social Infrastructure	Support
CS18	80	000043DLP	It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including: • Design of safe environments to minimise opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour;	Noted	Design and the Built Environment	Support
CS20	80	000045DLP	Policy CS20: Influencing the Demand for Travel discusses transport and accessibility considerations. Although the points covered in the Policy are largely accepted, it is recommended that the Policy is strengthened by the inclusion of a more hierarchical approach to the management of travel demand, thereby providing a policy basis to strengthen delivery of sustainable transport networks. Possible wording which could be adopted, for example, would seek to provide interventions as follows (in order of priority): a) site specific and area wide travel demand management (measures to reduce travel by private car and incentives to use walking, cycling and public transport for appropriate journeys, including intensive travel planning); b) improvements to walking and cycling facilities and public transport services that are provided early in the build out period of new developments and that are sufficient to encourage sustainable modes of transport; c) optimisation of the existing highway network to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport that are provided early in the build out period of new developments, such as measures to prioritise the needs of pedestrians above the car and improved or new cycle and bus lanes; and d) highway capacity enhancements to deal with residual car demand where the initiatives required under points (a) to (c) above are insufficient to avoid significant additional car journeys.	Accept that it would be beneficial to amend Policy CS20 set out a more hierarchical approach to the management of travel demand which provides a policy basis to strengthen delivery of sustainable transport networks. Amend CS20 to read: "a) site specific and area wide travel demand management (measures to reduce travel by private car and incentives to use walking, cycling and public transport for appropriate journeys, including intensive travel planning); b) improvements to walking and cycling facilities and public transport services that are provided early in the build out period of new developments and that are sufficient to encourage sustainable modes of transport; c) optimisation of the existing highway network to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport that are	Travel and Transport	Objection
CS20	80	000053DLP	It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including: • Giving priority to walking, cycling and public transport;	Noted	Major Transport Infrastructure	Support
CS21	80	000047DLP	CS21: Major Transport Infrastructure makes provision for the safeguarding of land for major new transport infrastructure for a number of schemes including a Hollis Lane Link Road. Due to differences in land levels and other constraints, delivery of a Hollis Lane Link Road would represent a significant engineering challenge which consequently may require land outside of the envelope shown on the Policies Map.	Noted. Policy CS21 will be revised to reflect the HS2 growth Strategy.	Travel and Transport	Comment
CS21	80	000052DLP	The proposals for a Hollis Lane link are welcome, however, another direct route from the town centre is also required so that buses can circulate easily between the railway station and town centre. It is welcomed, therefore, that there are plans to widen the proposed green bridge across the A61 from Corporation Street (to replace the current footbridge) so that it could also accommodate buses and act as a bus gate to and from the	Noted. Relevant policies will be revised to reflect the HS2 growth Strategy.	Major Transport Infrastructure	Support
CS4	80	000012DLP	Under the Duty to Cooperate, CBC is requested to liaise with DCC on an ongoing basis to identify and secure the necessary strategic infrastructure that would be required to support the development of the proposed allocation and the reserve sites in order to ensure that they provide for a sustainable form of development	Under the Duty to Cooperate, CBC is fully committed to engaging with DCC as a key partner and infrastructure provider on an ongoing basis to identify and secure the necessary strategic infrastructure that would be	Infrastructure Delivery	Comment
CS4	80	000013DLP	DCC's Officers are concerned about the 2nd paragraph of the Policy and would argue that the provision of 'strategic' infrastructure does not have to be included on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 123 list and can be funded through Section 106 contributions. DCC's Officers have particular concerns about the inclusion of contributions towards primary phase school provision being included on CBC's CIL Regulation 123 list as explained in more detail below. It is suggested, therefore, that paragraph 2 of Policy CS4 should be reworded to indicate that: 'Not all infrastructure will be able to be funded via CIL. Some infrastructure will be secured by Section 106 agreements. Where an infrastructure project is included in the Council's CIL Regulation 123 list then a development, if liable, will be required to contribute via the CIL.'	Agree that the provision of 'strategic' infrastructure does not have to be included on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 123 list and can be funded through Section 106 contributions. Amend 2nd sentence of paragraph 3.2 to read: "Other more strategic infrastructure requirements which are included on the Regulation 123 Infrastructure List will be met via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). "	Infrastructure Delivery	Objection

CS4	80	000014DLP	<p>It is considered that paragraph 3 of the Policy should be amended to read:</p> <p>‘Section 106 contributions will not be sought for infrastructure projects that are included in the Council’s CIL Regulation 123 list.’</p> <p>Otherwise it could be inferred that Section 106 contributions would not be sought for those types of infrastructure rather than the projects themselves.</p>	<p>The Regulation 123 list is clear on what infrastructure can be funded by CIL. It would not be possible to infer otherwise and the proposed change appears to make no material difference to the policy.</p>	Infrastructure Delivery	Objection
CS4	80	000015DLP	<p>There is no mention about how the Local Plan would address the potential loss of infrastructure as part of a planning application for proposed development. This needs to be addressed in Policy CS4 and the background</p>	<p>Plan policies would ensure no loss of infrastructure unless replacement is available, therefore there is no CIL can help to fill the funding gaps that remain once existing sources of funding have been taken into account and the Borough Council has always been clear that infrastructure to support development and growth in the Borough could be provided through a variety of alternative funding mechanisms. The Council's priorities for CIL expenditure are set out in the CIL Expenditure Strategy (approved by Cabinet in xxxx 2017). CIL remains a relatively new infrastructure</p>	Infrastructure Delivery	Objection
CS4	80	000016DLP	<p>CIL can help to fill the funding gaps that remain once existing sources of funding have been taken into account. However, it is not clear how CBC intends to prioritise the allocation of funding to projects when only a projected £17.5 million is to be collected, especially where the funding gap for a project would demand a large percentage of the CIL. DCC would welcome the revision of the Regulation 123 list to ensure that the demands on the CIL pot (such as for primary education provision) are not excessive and that infrastructure to support the development of the Borough is provided through a variety of alternative funding mechanisms.</p>	<p>Whilst DCC has indicated a wish to see funding for the primary education requirements of development to be secured through individual Section 106 contributions and a revision of the Regulation 123 list to facilitate this, the current Regulation 123 List was prepared in close consultation with DCC prior to the CIL charging scheme taking effect. CIL remains a relatively new infrastructure delivery mechanism in Chesterfield. Any required revisions to the CIL Regulation 123 List will be</p>	Infrastructure Delivery	Comment
CS4	80	000017DLP	<p>Infrastructure Delivery - there is confirmation in Policy CS4 that the strategic infrastructure requirements of the Borough would be met through the CIL. Until there is evidence that CBC’s CIL income is adequate to fund the necessary education infrastructure requirements generated by new housing development, DCC would wish to see funding for the primary education requirements of development to be secured through individual Section 106 contributions. CBC’s Regulation 123 list should be revised to facilitate this requirement.</p>	<p>Noted. A viability study is underway and the results will be reflected in the next version of the local Plan.</p>	Infrastructure Delivery	Objection
CS4	80	000018DLP	<p>Paragraph 3.5 indicates that CBC is committed to ensuring the viability and deliverability of schemes. However, no further detail is provided of any particular viability or deliverability issues in the Borough and how these issues would be addressed. Further detail is therefore required in paragraph 3.5 and this also needs to be reflected in Policy CS4.</p>	<p>Agree. Add to para 3.1 "Although Minerals and Waste Local Plans are County Council responsibilities, it is recognised that minerals and waste management facilities are important in supporting the growth of the</p>	Infrastructure Delivery	Objection
CS4	80	000019DLP	<p>The Plan also seeks to provide appropriate infrastructure. Whilst the provision of mineral and waste management sites and facilities are matters for the respective Minerals and Waste Local Plans, it is requested that the LPCD acknowledges the importance of such elements in the support and growth of the local economy in its area. This would help establish the links between the respective plans and support the measures it includes</p>	<p>Noted. Officers are meeting regularly with DCC Education to discuss the requirements across the borough and related to specific sites.</p>	Infrastructure Delivery	Objection
CS4	80	000029DLP	<p>Proposed reserve site at Dunston Grange: it is noted there is a proposal to include reserve sites (option 3) and CBC’s preference would be for Dunston Grange. If that option were to be adopted in the Local Plan, there would be a need to consider the provision of a site for a new primary school subject to further assessment of the capacity of current schools in the area to</p>	<p>Concerns noted, but no change required. Policy CS5 is sufficiently robust to ensure that any impacts are acceptable. Policy is consistent with the NPPF. The Local Plan has been assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal in terms of impact, including in combination effects, on European sites such as SPAs. The HRA</p>	A Changing Climate	Comment
CS5	80	000020DLP	<p>The provision of renewable energy could have an impact on the bird species protected through the SPAs. It may be prudent for CBC to collect further data on bird visitor numbers, where they are staying and where they are from to ensure that CBC can screen out any ‘in combination’ effects or alternatively ensure that mitigation is put in place to prevent harm arising to any European Sites.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	Environmental Quality	Support
CS8	80	000021DLP	<p>It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of people from the harmful effects of development; 	<p>Noted</p>	Environmental Quality	Support
CS9	80	000022DLP	<p>It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of green infrastructure, green spaces and open land, their accessibility and connectivity and need for their long term maintenance and management 	<p>Noted</p>	Environmental Quality	Support

CS9	80	000023DLP	In Chapter 5, the LPCD recognises Greenways as an integral part of the Green Infrastructure resource and Policy CS9 states that development should “....c) increase the opportunities for cycling walking and horse riding, and h) in cases where loss of a green infrastructure asset is unavoidable, provision for alternatives should be made to ensure a net gain in quantity, quality or function.” This policy is welcomed and supported.	Noted	Environmental Quality	Support
PS1	80	000058DLP	It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including: • Specific measures, for example, relating the town centre;	Noted	Making Great Places	Support
PS3	80	000059DLP	Chapter 10 includes the addition of a new policy LP2 to restore the Chesterfield Canal. This policy also states that “.....New developments should include provision for safe and convenient walking and cycling access to the canal”. It should also be noted, however, that the Chesterfield Waterside development is integral to ensuring the final position of the Trans Pennine Trail through provision of an off-road joint walking and cycling route alongside the canal to beyond the basin to connect to the railway station, thereby replacing the current split route that remains unsatisfactory. This may be reflected in Chapter 11: Chesterfield Waterside but again it only alludes to enhancing the footpath and cycle network to the site, not through the site to the railway station. This is essential to ensure full connectivity to promote sustainable transport within the Borough.	Proposals to enhance the TPT and links to the railway station are already set out in the outline planning permission for Chesterfield Waterside and associated masterplan. However for the avoidance of doubt policy PS3 will be amended with the following text at the end of criteria (d) "through the site and making links to the wider Trans Pennine Trail and Chesterfield Railway Station"	Making Great Places	Objection
PS3	80	000060DLP	It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including: • Specific measures, for example, relating to Chesterfield Waterside	Noted	Making Great Places	Support
PS5	80	000061DLP	It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including: • Specific measures, for example, relating to Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor	Noted	Making Great Places	Support
RPAs	80	000054DLP	DCC would expect all the housing schemes within the RPAs to contribute to education infrastructure as required subject to further assessment of the capacity of current schools to expand.	This is covered by policy CS4. Currently contributions are sought towards education infrastructure via CIL (which can include the use of contributions from the	Regeneration Priority Areas	Comment
RPAs	80	000055DLP	Chapter 10 includes the addition of a new policy LP2 to restore the Chesterfield Canal. This policy also states that “.....New developments should include provision for safe and convenient walking and cycling access to the canal”. It should also be noted, however, that the Chesterfield Waterside development is integral to ensuring the final position of the Trans Pennine Trail through provision of an off-road joint walking and cycling route alongside the canal to beyond the basin to connect to the railway station, thereby replacing the current split route that remains unsatisfactory. This may be reflected in Chapter 11: Chesterfield Waterside but again it only alludes to enhancing the footpath and cycle network to the site, not through the site to the railway station. This is essential to ensure full connectivity to promote sustainable transport within the Borough.	Proposals to enhance the TPT and links to the railway station are already set out in the outline planning permission for Chesterfield Waterside and associated masterplan. However for the avoidance of doubt policy PS3 will be amended with the following text at the end of criteria (d) "through the site and making links to the wider Trans Pennine Trail and Chesterfield Railway Station"	Regeneration Priority Areas	Comment
RPAs	80	000056DLP	It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including: • Specific measures, for example, relating to Chesterfield Canal,	Noted	Regeneration Priority Areas	Support
RPAs	80	000057DLP	It is welcomed that improving the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities is recognised and promoted throughout the LPCD, including: • Specific measures, for example, relating to river corridors,	Noted	Regeneration Priority Areas	Support
CS10	81	000001DLP	Supports inclusion of cricket pitch within site (see comments of John McCollum) given decline in cricket facilities. Would have positive benefits for the health and wellbeing of residents.	Noted. This will be considered along with the final stages of site assessment.	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS13	82	000003DLP	Suggest that shops (A1) are included within the policy to generate 83 ha of employment land over the course of the local plan period given that large foodstores can generate significant employment growth. Paragraph 3 should be reworded accordingly - the NPPF recognises retail as an employment generating use.	The council recognised that retail and service sector employment is a significant source of of existing and future growth in jobs (projected to reach 19.5% of jobs by 2036). Retail related employment has already been	Jobs Centres Facilities	Objection
CS16	82	000004DLP	National policy does not require a RIA in centres. The first bullet point should be amended to refelect this. The second bullet point relating to local centres and retail parks is too complex and should be simplified. The retail threshold set out in the third bullet point is too low (in light of 25000sqm threshold set out by NPPF) and is not supported by an up to date retail study (2010 is the most recent published study).	Noted. Suggest first bullet is amended to refer only to District Centres. AM??	Jobs Centres Facilities	Objection
CS2	82	000005DLP	Support the expansion of the Chatsworth Road local centre however suggest that the boundary should be expanded further to include the whole site outlined in red on the attached plan to enable a more comprehensive retail scheme to come forward.	The boundary as drawn reflects the predominantly retail aspects of the previous use. A planning application for the wider site is currently under	Policies Map	Objection

CS7	82	000001DLP	Consider the approach taken by CS7 to be too onerous on sites outside of Flood Zone 1 and request that an element of flexibility be applied.	The policy approach set out in CS7 for areas outside flood zone 1 allows for greater flexibility when applying the flood risk sequential and exceptions tests set out in	Sustainable Management of the Water Cycle	Objection
CS8	82	000002DLP	Request further clarification as to the requirements for the Air Quality Assessment (AQA). Suggest that this should apply to any development proposed in or adjacent to an AQMA and major development outside of AQMAs that are likely to significantly increase vehicle movements.	Noted. Further clarification will be provided in the next version of the Plan.	Environmental Quality	Objection
CS9(b)	83	000001DLP	Support the allocation as an open space. Many in the area wish to see it remain a green space as it provides recreational and wellbeing benefits.	Noted	Open Spaces	Support
CS10	84	000001DLP	Linkview do not object and actively support the principle of a residential allocation on the site. Linkview do not wish this to be prejudicial to it being able to explore the full potential range of potential alternative uses and users that may be attracted to the site. Linkview request that a broad flexible mixed-use allocation be made to the site rather than one that solely allocates it for residential use. Linkview request that a bespoke site specific site policy be included within the local plan that facilitates the broadest range of mixed uses. It is accepted that whatever use or uses are proposed for the site will need to satisfactorily demonstrate compliance with applicable development management policies.	Noted. The site is currently being assessed as part of the LAA and these comments will be taken into consideration when examining whether the site should be considered 'available' for residential use.	Homes and Housing	Comment
	85	000001DLP	The plan appears to give conflicting messages as to what time period the 83 hectare employment land requirement figure applies. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Paragraph 1.3 states 'by 2033' •Strategic objective S6 and Policy CS1states 'between 2016 and 2033' •CS13 refers to 'between 2011 and 2031' •The ELR refers to projections over the period 2011 to 2036. This gives an annual requirement of between 3.3 and 4.9 hectares/year. A figure of 4.9 hectares/ year is well above the highest requirement figure set out in the 2016 ELR. The 3.6 hectare requirement covers the SCR highest jobs growth target and assumes this continues, so is highly aspirational. A high figure could be partly justified due to a greater concentration on B2/B8 uses. Paragraph 7.9 of the Draft Plan refers to an employment land supply figure of 174 hectares; which suggests an oversupply even with the higher requirement figure.	The draft Local Plan period ranges from 2011 to 2033 (two years additional to the existing Core Strategy which covers a period to 2031). The Employment Land Requirements paper sets an employment land target of 83 ha from 2011-2036 which equates to 3.32 hectares per annum. Applying this target rate of development throughout the plan period (2011-2033) would give an EL target of 73.04 hectares. Subtracted from this figure are any net additional gains resulting from land developed since 2011 and any losses of existing employment land are added to the target. Para 1.3 – “There will be 83 ha of land provided by 2033 for new high quality employment...” Change to – there will be 73 hectares of land provided by 2033 for new high quality employment Strategic Objective S6 - “Provide 83 ha of new employment land between 2016 and 2033” Change to - Provide 73 ha of new employment land between 2016 and 2033 CS13 – “A range of sites suitable for employment use will be identified in the Local Plan: Sites and Boundaries for approximately 83 ha of new	Strategic Objectives	Comment
CS10	85	000003DLP	Support the preferred option which is planning to meet the OAN for housing as set out in the SHMA, as well as recent backlog, and planning for reserve site(s) to allow for greater flexibility. Planning for a single reserve site in order to enable a more strategic approach to master-planning and infrastructure provision is sound, although there could be a risk that this does not sufficiently widen choice to enable the extra homes to be delivered as quickly as necessary where there is an issue with demonstrating 5-year supply.	Noted. It is acknowledged that further work is required on the mix of reserve sites, how to phase and what triggers would be, and any monitoring required.	Homes and Housing	Support

CS10	85	000004DLP	<p>SCC intend to consult on a Draft Sheffield (Local) Plan in summer 2017. This will include options for the release of Green Belt land but they have significant concerns about whether some of the strategic site options being considered would be deliverable in the short-medium term.</p> <p>SCC also expect some options to be ruled out, following public consultation, because of land ownership or environmental issues.</p> <p>In light of this, SCC would like to explore with Chesterfield whether there is any scope for them to meet some of Sheffield's housing needs, particularly in the short to medium term. The main aim would be to provide additional flexibility in supply over the period to, say 2028/29.</p> <p>Given comments above about the supply of employment land in Chesterfield, SCC wonder whether there could be scope to reallocate some of this land for housing?</p>	<p>The new Local Plan will meet the OAN of the borough. Under the duty to cooperate any requests from neighbouring areas to accommodate housing will need to be justified by evidence. If this is forthcoming and the council can identify surplus sites that are deliverable, in principle there are no objections to assisting SCC to meet housing needs across the wider area. In terms of re-allocating employment land, the scope for this is being investigated and will be detailed in an Employment Land Topic paper to support the next stage of the plan.</p>	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS20	85	000002DLP	<p>The Joint Transport Study Evidence Base suggests there may be increased traffic flows into / out of south Sheffield.</p> <p>The study also identifies potential interventions, including use of a rail line to serve Brimington, with potential park and rail to serve Sheffield and Chesterfield. SCC would welcome discussion regarding the potential of this idea.</p> <p>The idea of providing a rail connection through Sheffield from Stocksbridge to Waverley, with onward routes to</p>	<p>The Borough Council would welcome discussion on the potential for sub-regional rail connectivity, both to accommodate commuter trips and as a means of opening up development sites, including improved connections between Sheffield and Chesterfield/North Derbyshire. The Borough Council agrees that high quality infrastructure for walking and cycling to serve potential stations would maximise likely usage of such</p>	Travel and Transport	Comment
CS10	86	000001DLP	<p>Would like to see a cricket pitch at Mullan Park incorporated into the Local Plan. A Letter of support is attached from the Derbyshire Cricket Foundation.</p> <p>Currently designated as LAA site 295, but would like to see the developer release the former cricket ground (in situ until 1987) to meet the requirement for the provision of the cricket pitch within the area.</p> <p>Use of the former site (as depicted in the attached map) would leave ample space for housing development. The site also had planning permission for a COU to a cricket ground as recently as 2005.</p> <p>The DLP states that where a need is identified, developments must contribute to public open space, sports and play provision .</p> <p>Representee has had three separate phone conversations in August 2016, November 2016 and January 2017 with Peter Waterfield, Land Manager for William Davis, who stated that as a development on the site would require a green space, he could see no reason why that space should not be a cricket ground.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be considered along with the final stages of site assessment.</p>	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS9(b)	86	000002DLP	<p>The loss of cricket clubs (~10 over 30 years) goes against the aims of DLP section 5.11. The existing cricket facilities at Cutthorpe are too small and hold water.</p> <p>The LP strategy states that the quantity and quality of provision should be maintained. And where necessary, increased or enhanced to cater for new development.</p> <p>The quantity and quality of cricket facility provision has not been maintained. Allocating part of Mullan Park would create ~70 extra games per year and engage more school children in sport through community outreach work, increasing health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be considered along with the final stages of site assessment.</p>	Open Spaces	Comment
CS1	87	000001DLP	<p>The Plan is unclear in terms of the size/nature of the [RPAs at Mastin Moor, Poolsbrook and Duckmanton] giving rise to concerns over the scale and nature of cross boundary impacts. There needs to be ongoing cross boundary strategic planning in relation to these sites including consideration of infrastructure requirements and highway improvements</p>	<p>Agree for the need to continue cross boundary working and evidence base development. Consider that the proposed new policy LP1 provides sufficient clarity as to the type of developments to come forward in the RPAs. Suggest addition of wording as follows: The level of housing growth for each RPA may be exceeded if the</p>	Spatial Strategy	Comment
CS1	87	000002DLP	<p>concerned that the SHMA is in need of review</p>	<p>The SHMA has been updated and will inform the next</p>	Spatial Strategy	Comment
CS1	87	000003DLP	<p>SUPPORT CBC seeking to meet their own housing requirement, but should avoid significantly over or under providing</p>	<p>Noted</p>	Spatial Strategy	Support

CS10	87	000004DLP	Recognise the approach intended within the Plan. The next iteration should clearly set out in terms of numbers and site areas	Noted. The sites (including Reserve Sites and RPAs) in the Draft Local Plan are the potential sites and will be subject to further assessment before being taken through to the next stage of the plan where sites	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS13	87	000006DLP	the methodology used does not appear to follow government guidance by taking into account forecasts, and past take up rates in line with the NPPG 'Economic Development Needs Assessments' The [policy] should include a table indentifying which sites contribute to the target	Concerns noted. An updated employment land paper will be released prior to the next iteration of the local plan going to consultation. This will set out an updated employment land supply position and review the	Jobs Centres Facilities	Objection
CS5	87	000007DLP	Object to allocation given the impact on local residents and the setting of Bolsover castle	Concerns noted, but no change required. Policy CS5 is sufficiently robust to ensure that any impacts are	A Changing Climate	Objection
RPAs	87	000005DLP	recommended that CBC reconsiders the policy wording of CS 1 to 'maximise development opportunities in RPAs', and the policy wording of LP 1 that allows the level of housing growth in RPAs' to be exceeded'	Suggest change to CS1 as follows: The council will maximise regeneration benefits to existing communities offered by development opportunities in the following areas. Suggest addition of wording to LP1 as follows: The level of housing growth for each RPA may be exceeded if the landscape and, infrastructure	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
CS1	88	000001DLP	The Plan is unclear in terms of the size/nature of the [RPAs at Mastin Moor, Poolsbrook and Duckmanton] giving rise to concerns over the scale and nature of cross boundary impacts. there needs to be ongoing cross boundary strategic planning in relation to these sites, particularly the highway network, given the close proximity to Markham Vale and Coalite	Agree for the need to continue cross boundary working and evidence base development. Consider that the proposed new policy LP1 provides sufficient clarity as to the type of developments to come forward in the RPAs. Suggest addition of wording as follows: The level of housing growth for each RPA may be exceeded if the	Spatial Strategy	Comment
CS1	88	000002DLP	concerned that the SHMAA is in need of review	An updated SHMA has been prepared and will be taken into account in preparing the next iteration of the	Spatial Strategy	Comment
CS1	88	000003DLP	SUPPORT CBC seeking to meet their own housing requirement, but should avoid significantly over or under providing	Noted	Spatial Strategy	Support
CS10	88	000004DLP	Recognise the approach intended within the Plan. The next iteration should clearly set out in terms of numbers and site areas	Noted	Homes and Housing	Comment
CS13	88	000006DLP	the methodology used does not appear to follow government guidance by taking into account forecasts, and past take up rates in line with the NPPG 'Economic Development Needs Assessments'. The [policy] should include a table indentifying which sites contribute to the target	Noted. Further work on the employment land target and the sites required to meet this is underway and will form part of the next version of the Local Plan.	Jobs Centres Facilities	Objection
CS5	88	000007DLP	Object to the allocation given local residents and the setting of Renishaw Hall	CS5(a) ensures that impacts on heritage assets and their settings and impacts identified by affected local communities will be addressed if proposals come forward. The current and draft NPPF continues to	A Changing Climate	Objection
RPAs	88	000005DLP	recommended that CBC reconsiders the policy wording of CS 1 to 'maximise development opportunities in RPAs', and the policy wording of LP 1 that allows the level of housing growth in RPAs' to be exceeded'	Suggest wording in CS1 is revised: 'The council will seek to maximise regeneration benefits to communities from development opportunities in the following	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
	89	000002DLP	begin paragraph with reference to the NPPF requiring a positive approach to the historic environment in plan making	Noted. New text to be inserted at start of paragraph 8.15 "The NPPF requires a positive approach to the conservation and enjoyment of the historic	Historic Environment	Comment
	89	000003DLP	Revise to provide for the requirements of NPPF Para.139 in relation to non-designated archaeology which may warrant consideration as scheduled monument. Add reference to the Chesterfield Canal and the duty to co-operate with adjoining authorities	Reference to Chesterfield Canal has been added at the end of para 8.16.	Historic Environment	Comment
	89	000004DLP	supporting text to Policy CS19 should make reference to the importance of industrial heritage	Reference added in para 8.15	Historic	Comment
	89	000005DLP	All references to 'English Heritage' should be amended to 'Historic England'	References have been updated accordingly	Historic	Comment
	89	000007DLP	add text be relating to the need to identify solutions within any Major Transport Infrastructure proposals to safeguard the route of the Chesterfield Canal in line with draft Policy LP2	Additional text inserted at end of paragraph "Proposals for the CSRR will need to identify solutions to	Major Transport Infrastructure	Comment
	89	000015DLP	It is recommended it include all designated heritage assets or none and be renamed accordingly	Noted, the constraints map will be updated	Constraints Map	Comment
Canal Corridors	89	000009DLP	policy is welcomed in relation to this heritage asset. It is recommended that all references to 'preserve' in relation to heritage assets are replaced with 'conserve' in line with NPPF terminology	Noted, references have been updated accordingly	River and Canal Corridors	Support
CS19	89	000006DLP	additional text should be included in respect of consideration of heritage assets in line with NPPF terminology i.e. references to harm and significance, and how impact will be assessed. The word 'preserve' is replaced with 'conserve' in line with NPPF terminology.	References have been updated accordingly	Historic Environment	Comment

PS1	89	000010DLP	policy relates specifically to policy CS15 but policy CS19 is equally applicable. Consider additional supporting text to para 11.7 setting out that other policies will also be relevant. Heritage impact assessments should be required for major development applications to establish impact on heritage assets and their setting including zones of theoretical visibility impacts in respect of views to and from key landmarks e.g. the Crooked Spire etc	Text added at end of para 11.7	Making Great Places	Comment
PS2	89	000011DLP	additional text should be included requiring a heritage impact assessment to be submitted	Additional bullet point added: "iv considered the impact upon heritage assets and their setting and identified any means of mitigation	Making Great Places	Comment
PS3	89	000012DLP	additional text be included in the policy requiring a heritage impact assessment to be submitted	The site already benefits from Outline Planning Permission. The need for an assessment is considered sufficiently covered by the requirements of the NPPF	Making Great Places	Comment
PS4	89	000013DLP	additional text be included in the policy requiring a heritage impact assessment to be submitted	Additional text added to bullet point e) "through submission of a heritage impact assessment	Making Great Places	
PS5	89	000014DLP	BP I) should be revised to read ‘...heritage assets and their setting...’ additional text be included in the policy requiring a heritage impact assessment to be submitted	"and their setting" added to bullet point L	Making Great Places	Comment
RPAs	89	000008DLP	references to ‘preserve’ in relation to heritage assets are replaced with ‘conserve’ in line with NPPF terminology reference elements as heritage assets to ensure they are considered appropriately e.g. Poolsbrook area, Bullet Point (BP) iv	References have been updated accordingly	Making Great Places	Comment
	90	000003DLP	Recommend as large a contingency as possible (at least 20%) in housing land supply	Agree that there needs to be sufficient flexibility to allow for non-implementation. This will be set out in a	Spatial Strategy	Comment
CS1	90	000002DLP	The calculation of OAHN and proposed housing requirement will not meet the housing needs of the borough: - does not meet LEP growth aspirations - no adjustments for market signals - delivering affordable housing need - meeting unmet housing need from Sheffield	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS10	90	000004DLP	Assumptions about lapse rates, non-implementation, lead in times and delivery rates should be correct and realistic. The housing supply should include the widest possible range of sites. Disagree with the approach to 5 YHLS, in particular use of Liverpool approach rather than Sedgefield in addressing shortfalls More information need about trigger mechanisms for the release of reserved sites where there is no 5 YHLS	Agree on the need for realistic assumptions. These will be set out in a Housing Topic paper, along with the approach to addressing the shortfall based on the updated SHMA evidence. It is acknowledged that	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS11	90	000005DLP	Whole plan viability evidence is required The change from 15 dwellings to 11 dwellings affordable housing threshold should be fully justified	The proposed threshold follows recent government guidance and is being tested through a whole plan viability appraisal and the results will inform the next	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS11	90	000006DLP	Requirement for 25% adaptable and accessible homes should be fully justified including assessment of the impact on viability The policy should be revised in line with the NPPG guidance the wheelchair accessible homes should be applied only to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling	The proposed policy is being tested through a whole plan viability appraisal and the results will inform the next stage of the Plan. CS11 also allows for flexibility with any requirements being subject to viability which can assessed on a site basis. Agree that policy CS11	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS18	90	000007DLP	The percent for art requirement should be removed from the policy in line with paragraph 204 of the NPPF, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations (2010) and the NPPG (ID 23b-004-20140306) which states that “planning obligations should not be sought – on for instance, public art – which are clearly not necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms”.	The reference to the NPPG refers to a previous version of the guidance. The reference to Public Art has been deleted from the latest version of the NPPG (ID: 23b-004-20150326)	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
CS1	91	000002DLP	The Local Plan fail to identify the full and objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in accordance with the NPPF. - The data used is significantly out of date and should be updated - the OAN falls short of economic requirements and should include an uplift to reflect LEP targets - land should be over-allocated by 20% in line with the Local Plans Expert Group findings	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper. Agree that there needs to be sufficient flexibility to allow for non-implementation. This will be set out in a Housing Topic paper.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS10	91	000003DLP	There is an ambiguous and unreasonable approach to allocating sites for housing - it is not clear what sites are proposed to be allocated and no evidence of allocations being deliverable or developable - Sites LAA 294 and 295 should be identified as potential housing allocations to meet present needs not as part of a strategic location	The sites (including Reserve Sites and RPAs) in the Draft Local Plan are the potential sites and will be subject to further assessment before being taken through to the next stage of the plan where sites sufficient to meet the OAN will be proposed. This will	Homes and Housing	Objection

CS11	91	000004DLP	No evidence is provided to justify the change in affordable housing threshold from 15 to 11 and no viability testing The council should consider devising area specific targets to reflect variations in residential sub markets Object to the mix of homes outlined on page 49 The evidence supporting the provision of 25% M4(2) compliant dwellings is not robust or justified The policy does not provide flexibility to consider site specific constraints The policy should be re-worded in respect of M4(30) standard to make clear provision only applies to dwellings where the LA is responsible for allocating/nominating a person to live in that dwelling.	The proposed threshold follows recent government guidance and is being tested through a whole plan viability appraisal and the results will inform the next stage of the Plan. CS11 also allows for flexibility with any requirements being subject to viability which can be assessed on a site basis. The council's CIL evidence reflects variations across the borough and is used to inform negotiations on affordable housing. This is considered sufficiently flexible to allow for site specific considerations such as a contaminated parcel of land within a high CL zone for example. The proposed	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS18	91	000005DLP	The percent for art requirement should be removed from the policy in line with the NPPG (ID 23b-004-20140306) which states that "planning obligations should not be sought – on for instance, public art – which are clearly not necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms".	The reference to the NPPG refers to a previous version of the guidance. The reference to Public Art has been deleted from the latest version of the NPPG (ID: 23b-	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
CS20	91	000006DLP	Policy should be re-worded to be consistent with paragraph 39 of the NPPF through the addition of an additional criterion : "vii Local Car Ownership Levels"	An additional criteria will be added to policy CS20 as suggested	Travel and Transport	Objection
CS1	92	000001DLP	Object to OAN figure. It is too low and will constrain supply.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	92	000002DLP	Object to boundary of SG1. ARUP evidence clear that section B of SG1 has low risk of Brimington and tapton merging, and may need refining to support future growth. Promoted site should not be in gap. Brimington Common is sustainable location.	Noted. Although the evidence does indicate that SG1 could be refined to support future growth, this is considered by the council as being beyond the plan period. Sufficient sites are available to meet housing	Spatial Strategy	Objection
	93	000004DLP	RPA's purpose, achievability and viability is not adequately justified with regard to the sites within these areas.	The purpose of the RPAs was established in the Core Strategy. The sites (including Reserve Sites and RPAs) in the Draft Local Plan are the potential sites and will be	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
	93	000018DLP	SFRA is out of date and is relied on as evidence to support urban and brownfield development that forms a significant part of the spatial strategy.	The SFRA is being updated through joint working with the Environment Agency on the 'Chesterfield Floor Risk Investigation' and with Derbyshire County Council on	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	93	000001DLP	SHMR uses the SHMA 2014 which is based on out of date information.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS1	93	000002DLP	OAHN does not take account of economic growth in relation to housing provision, with there being inadequate housing requirement to support the level of economic growth planned for.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS1	93	000006DLP	GB release is necessary to achieve levels of housing delivery needed for level of economic growth sought by the plan with regard to the SCR.	Sufficient land is available outside the Green Belt to deliver the borough's OAN and allow for flexibility.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	93	000007DLP	GB release is necessary to ensure adequate amount, flexibility and variety in a deliverable housing land supply to ensure the proposed and also a revised higher OAHN is met, including affordable housing provision.	Sufficient land is available outside the Green Belt to deliver the borough's OAN and allow for flexibility.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	93	000008DLP	Housing requirement should be higher at 326dpa to support the level of economic growth envisaged by the plan and when accounting for all updated relevant OAHN calculation factors should be 469dpa.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	93	000009DLP	A Green Belt review is necessary to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, with GB land to the South and West of Chesterfield Town Centre weakly fulfilling GB purposes. Land to West of Walton Hospital only weakly fulfills GB purposes. The GB status of the site should not make it sequentially less appropriate than other non-GB sites.	Sufficient land is available outside the Green Belt to deliver the borough's OAN and allow for flexibility.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	93	000010DLP	Land to west of Walton Hospital off Whitecotes Lane (2.2Ha) is a sustainable site that performs better than some draft allocations and is a reasonable alternative to proposed allocations. It should be allocated for housing to ensure that the plan can meet OAHN and economic growth requirements with sufficient flexibility to adapt to changes.	The submitted sites will be subject to assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making. As the sites	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	93	000011DLP	Land off Harehill Road (3.95Ha) within NEDDC is a sustainable site that performs better than some draft allocations and is a reasonable alternative to proposed allocations. It should be allocated for housing to ensure that the plan can meet OAHN and economic growth requirements with sufficient flexibility to adapt to changes. The site only fulfills Green Belt purposes weakly. It should be promoted through cross-boundary working between CBC and NEDDC.	Any submitted sites within the borough will be subject to assessment using the council's Land Availability Assessment Methodology before a decision is taken on whether to progress to the next stage of plan-making. As the sites are within the Green Belt they are	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS10	93	000003DLP	Reserve sites deliverability in question and threatens plans flexibility to increase supply if required.	The sites (including Reserve Sites and RPAs) in the Draft Local Plan are the potential sites and will be	Homes and Housing	Objection

CS10	93	000014DLP	Housing requirement should be increased to 469dpa to account for economic growth and to allow greater flexibility with release of GB land through a review, otherwise the plan is not effective.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper. Sufficient land is available outside the Green Belt to	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS11	93	000015DLP	A higher housing requirement of 469dpa is appropriate to meet OAHN as revised, and for it to be deliverable, and deliver more affordable housing and a greater range of housing, the release of GB land is necessary.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper. Sufficient land is available outside the Green Belt to	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS13	93	000016DLP	The housing requirement needs to be increased to match the planned economic growth or economic growth needs to be reduced to balance.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Jobs Centres Facilities	Objection
CS18	93	000017DLP	Plan is not clear if the sustainable design policy is supported by viability evidence and takes into account Building Regulations.	A Whole Plan Viability Assessment supports the Local Plan and assesses the combined impacts of Local Plan	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
CS2	93	000013DLP	New housing requirement of 469dpa should be inserted.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Location of Development	Objection
CS3	93	000012DLP	Repeats paragraph 14 of the NPPF and so superfluous.	Noted.	Strategic	Objection
	94	000004DLP	RPA's purpose, achievability and viability is not adequately justified with regard to the sites within these areas.	The purpose of the RPAs was established in the Core Strategy. The sites (including Reserve Sites and RPAs) in the Draft Local Plan are the potential sites and will be	Regeneration Priority Areas	Objection
	94	000010DLP	Land at Brookside Glen (13.5Ha) is a sustainable site that performs better than some draft allocations and is a reasonable alternative to proposed allocations. It should be allocated for housing to ensure that the plan can meet OAHN and economic growth requirements with sufficient flexibility to adapt to changes.	All sites will be subject to further assessment before being taken forward to the next stage of the Plan. As the sites are within the Green Belt they are unlikely to	Homes and Housing	Objection
	94	000011DLP	Land at Brookside Glen (13.5Ha) only fulfills Green Belt purposes weakly and a new well defined boundary could be provided. The site can be developed to mitigate against flood risk, ecological impacts and visual/landscape impacts. Footpaths across the site can be accommodated and enhanced. It is a logical and deliverable allocation for the Local Plan.	All sites will be subject to further assessment before being taken forward to the next stage of the Plan. As the sites are within the Green Belt they are unlikely to pass the first stage.	Homes and Housing	Objection
	94	000018DLP	SFRA is out of date and is relied on as evidence to support urban and brownfield development that forms a significant part of the spatial strategy.	The SFRA is being updated through joint working with the Environment Agency on the 'Chesterfield Floor Risk Investigation' and with Derbyshire County Council on	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	94	000001DLP	SHMR uses the SHMA 2014 which is based on out of date information.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS1	94	000002DLP	OAHN does not take account of economic growth in relation to housing provision, with there being inadequate housing requirement to support the level of economic growth planned for.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS1	94	000006DLP	GB release is necessary to achieve levels of housing delivery needed for level of economic growth sought by the plan with regard to the SCR.	Sufficient land is available outside the Green Belt to deliver the borough's OAN and allow for flexibility.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	94	000007DLP	GB release is necessary to ensure adequate amount, flexibility and variety in a deliverable housing land supply to ensure the proposed and also a revised higher OAHN is met, including affordable housing provision.	Sufficient land is available outside the Green Belt to deliver the borough's OAN and allow for flexibility.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	94	000008DLP	Housing requirement should be higher at 326dpa to support the level of economic growth envisaged by the plan and when accounting for all updated relevant OAHN calculation factors should be 469dpa.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS1	94	000009DLP	A Green Belt review is necessary to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, with GB land to the South and West of Chesterfield Town Centre weakly fulfilling GB purposes. Land to West of Walton Hospital only weakly fulfills GB purposes. The GB status of the site should not make it sequentially less appropriate than other non-GB sites.	Sufficient land is available outside the Green Belt to deliver the borough's OAN and allow for flexibility.	Spatial Strategy	Objection
CS10	94	000003DLP	Reserve sites deliverability in question and threatens plans flexibility to increase supply if required.	The sites (including Reserve Sites) in the Draft Local Plan are the potential sites and will be subject to further assessment before being taken through to the next stage of the plan where sites sufficient to meet	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS10	94	000014DLP	Housing requirement should be increased to 469dpa to account for economic growth and to allow greater flexibility with release of GB land through a review, otherwise the plan is not effective.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper. Sufficient land is available outside the Green Belt to	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS11	94	000015DLP	A higher housing requirement of 469dpa is appropriate to meet OAHN as revised, and for it to be deliverable, and deliver more affordable housing and a greater range of housing, the release of GB land is necessary.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper. Sufficient land is available outside the Green Belt to	Homes and Housing	Objection
CS13	94	000016DLP	The housing requirement needs to be increased to match the planned economic growth or economic growth needs to be reduced to balance.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Jobs Centres Facilities	Objection
CS18	94	000017DLP	Plan is not clear if the sustainable design policy is supported by viability evidence and takes into account Building Regulations.	A Whole Plan Viability Assessment supports the Local Plan and assesses the combined impacts of Local Plan	Design and the Built Environment	Objection

CS2	94	000013DLP	New housing requirement of 469dpa should be inserted.	The updated SHMA will inform the next stage of the Local Plan and be detailed in a Housing Topic paper.	Location of Development	Objection
CS3	94	000012DLP	Repeats paragraph 14 of the NPPF and so superfluous.	Noted.	Strategic	Objection
	95	000001DLP	the vision should show much stronger recognition of our global responsibilities and the need to mitigate and adapt to these threats. Some of the wording used in the vision is very passive, for example, "Proposals for renewable and low carbon energy generation are supported." Instead we consider that the overriding imperative of meeting climate change targets requires a more proactive approach, for example, "Opportunities for renewable and low carbon energy generation for new developments are prioritised and maximised to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases."	Noted. The policy is considered sufficiently positive and complies with national guidance. No change.	Vision	Objection
	95	000002DLP	not clear why in paragraph 1.23 "Current levels of car parking are maintained, but most new public car parking takes the form of park and ride or park and walk schemes." Given the emphasis on reducing car use and encouraging sustainable forms of transport, it is not clear why levels of car parking should be maintained for the next 20 years which seems a very inflexible and unhelpful requirement. There is clear evidence (which we can provide) at both a workplace and national level showing the importance of combining disincentives to driving with incentives for alternative travel. The Association of Town and City Management 2016 report on innovative practices in parking provision suggest that although parking is highly emotive, "an opportunity cost often comes with the loss of other uses that parking provision may replace, potentially taking footfall and spend with it. More cars could also contribute to undesirable changes to the public realm that come with roads and traffic." The report offers effective solutions to reducing levels of parking with no loss of retail custom. We would urge the Borough to look at best practice elsewhere, to better manage the existing parking space and look at ways of reducing it further to improve the public realm.	Providing a balance between sufficient parking to support economic activity and highways safety, and encouraging modal shift, is challenging. Reductions in parking (disincentives) must be balanced with improvements. Maintaining existing parking levels with the level of growth would result in proportionally less parking being available. However it is acknowledged that a more flexible approach would be appropriate and therefore the wording has been amended to "Appropriate levels of car parking are provide to meet the residual demand, but and most new public car parking takes the form of park and ride or park and	Strategic Objectives	Objection
	95	000004DLP	Transition Chesterfield fully supports policy S1: "Minimise greenhouse gas emissions in line with Government targets, increase the use of renewable energy and help the borough adapt to the effects of climate change." suggest that policy S8 needs to be strengthened accordingly by adding the words in red: "Ensure that new	Noted	Strategic Objectives	Support
	95	000005DLP	development is designed to a high [energy efficiency] standard, promotes architectural quality, protects and enhances the boroughs historic environment and reflects local distinctiveness."	Policy S8 has been reworded to include reference to energy efficiency: "Ensure that new development is designed to a high standard that, promotes	Strategic Objectives	Objection
CS18	95	000014DLP	Policy CS18 on Design contains no specific requirements and is a step backwards from the old CS6 which requires specific standards for residential and non-residential buildings. The rather woolly specifications ('minimise water use, seek to use less energy, make use of renewable energy' etc) are too easily side-stepped by developers. There needs to be clear and specific targets that developers need to meet that go beyond merely meeting regulatory standards. For example there is no good reason why all new developments should not have solar PV panels on their roofs, particularly large warehouse developments at Markham Vale etc. This will help future-proof residents and tenants from rising energy prices, and help contribute to reduced greenhouse gases and air pollution. We urge the council to specify more specific and ambitious requirements in this policy.	The Deregulation Act 2015 effectively removed the ability of Planning Authorities to require energy efficiency measures (or other measures) for new housing other than those 'Optional Requirements' set out in the building regulations. This was reinforced by the dropping of the proposed Zero Carbon Homes target. The Optional Requirements only apply where a condition is placed on a planning application, which	Design and the Built Environment	Objection
CS20	95	000003DLP	the local plan needs to include a requirement for increasing incentives for low emission vehicles such as electric vehicles by providing electric charging points in carparks. Chesterfield is currently sorely lacking in EV charging points compared to other towns and cities. Although Policy CS20 refers to "provision of opportunities for electric vehicles where appropriate" this could be reworded more positively as "ensure opportunities for electric vehicles are provided at all major carparks".	A new policy on electric vehicle charging is being prepared and will be incorporated into the next iteration of the Local Plan.	Travel and Transport	Objection
CS20	95	000015DLP	Policy CS20 on reducing the demand for travel is generally supported except for the suggested change in wording to support for electric vehicle charging. We would also like to see more positive wording to reduce the demand for parking and ensure there is a presumption to reduce parking through provision of alternative means of transport and sustainable design.	Policy CS20 has been reworded to reflect more positively the hierarchy of transport interventions and provide more detail on how levels of car parking will be assessed. A new policy relating to electric vehicle	Travel and Transport	Support
CS20	95	000016DLP	We welcome the news in paragraph 9.7 that the council is working with Derbyshire County Council and local partners to identify and designate a similar network of walking routes, and will be the subject of further work during the Local Plan period to improve, promote and where appropriate, extend them.	Noted	Travel and Transport	Support
CS20	95	000017DLP	Paragraph 9.11 refers to the lack of a single bus interchange in the borough, and suggests that New Beetwell St serves a similar function to an interchange. However we consider that Chesterfield would benefit from a properly integrated public transport interchange, preferably next to or near the railway station.	Noted. The HS2 Growth Strategy is relevant and will be reflected in the next stage of the plan.	Travel and Transport	Objection

CS21	95	000018DLP	As noted in our previous submission Transition Chesterfield does not support policy CS21 Major Transport Infrastructure. In particular we do not support the Chesterfield Staveley regeneration route or the Staveley northern loop road which will create further induced traffic, further air pollution problems and cannot be justified on traffic, health and environmental grounds. Instead an integrated and sustainable transport solution should be considered. We recommend a combination of a shuttle light rail service (running on the existing rail line with a station at Barrow Hill), cycle and walking routes together with a good bus service. This would minimise traffic generated by the development. We also object to the removal of references to rail provision from the old policy which limits the provision of this more sustainable option in the future.	Noted. The northern loop road has permission, and the regeneration route is a project in DCC Local Transport Plan. There is currently no evidence to support a business case for a light rail service.	Major Transport Infrastructure	Objection
CS5	95	000006DLP	Transition Chesterfield supports policy CS5 on Renewable Energy but thinks it can be strengthened by the following changes to the wording: "Opportunities for renewable energy generation will be prioritised and maximised particularly where they have wider social, economic and environmental benefits, provided that the direct and cumulative adverse impacts of the proposals on the following assets are acceptable, or can be made so: a) the historic environment including heritage assets and their setting; b) natural landscape and townscape character; c) nature conservation; d) amenity – in particular through noise, dust, odour, and traffic generation."	Noted. The policy is considered sufficiently positive and complies with national guidance. No change.	A Changing Climate	Objection
CS5	95	000007DLP	We would also like to express our disappointment that the existing policy is rarely implemented, even where opportunities exist. For example, there was no mention of renewable energy in the planning conditions for Walton Works despite opportunities for capturing the heat from Robinsons Works and this being a priority site for district heating. We support further development of district heating, which should be based on Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and recommends the Council mandates the connection to CHP for the developments listed, rather than making it optional. The Royal Hospital should also be included as one of the District Heating	Noted. The policy is considered sufficiently positive and complies with national guidance. The district heating opportunity areas are based on evidence in the Renewable Energy Study. No change.	A Changing Climate	Objection
CS7	95	000008DLP	Transition Chesterfield supports policy CS7 on flood risk, particularly the provisions for SUDS but urge the council to improve its training and knowledge of SUDS as several very poor quality schemes have been given planning permission, and opportunities to incorporate SUDS have been missed largely due to the lack of expertise within the council.	Noted. The council relies heavily on comments from DCC as Lead Local flood authority in terms of the design and approval of SuDs schemes.	Sustainable Management of the Water Cycle	Support
CS8	95	000009DLP	the wording of policy CS8 on a healthy environment which suggests that developments that makes an AQMA worse can be considered. In areas that are exceeding air quality standards no development should be permitted that will worsen air quality and endanger the health of local residents. The causes of air pollution should be addressed at source, for example, by reducing traffic, reducing traffic speeds (very effective for diesel vehicles) or the introduction of clean air zones as is done in other cities with air quality problems, incentivising low emission vehicles and restricting the dirtiest, oldest vehicles. Buses as well as cars need to be upgraded or replaced with low emission vehicles wherever possible.	The sentence "unless there are significant material considerations that would outweigh the harm" to be deleted.	Environmental Quality	Objection
CS9	95	000010DLP	Transition Chesterfield supports policy CS9 on green infrastructure and biodiversity, especially the aim to increase tree cover in the Borough. This policy could also note that increased tree cover helps provide an urban cooling effect and mitigate the impacts of air pollution and climate change. New woodland areas could provide multiple benefits including amenity, ecological value, fuelwood. There are also many areas – too numerous to mention - of other amenity open space which would be suitable for native tree planting, or fruit/nut tree	Paragraph 5.8 has been amended to read: "Tree and woodland plantingIncreased tree cover will help the borough to respond to climate change, provides an urban cooling effect, can mitigate the impacts of some forms of air pollution, provide and flood alleviation	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	Support
CS9(b)	95	000011DLP	Transition Chesterfield supports policy CS9 and the protection of open space and allotments but cautions that CBC needs to have up to date evidence in support of the need for such sites to prevent speculative developers challenging the need for these, and planning permission being granted due to a lack of evidence rather than a lack of need.	Noted. An updated assessment of Public Open Space is currently being prepared.	Open Spaces	Support
PS2	95	000020DLP	We support policy PS2 on the Chatsworth Rd Corridor and in particular that the strategic walking and cycling routes through this area are enhanced and not fragmented by development. Redevelopment of this area provides a great opportunity to open up the River Hipper for amenity as a greenway/quietway and to link the river with other habitats as a green corridor.	Noted	Making Great Places	Support
PS4	95	000021DLP	We would like something added to policy PS4 to the effect that any development in this area enhances any cycling/walking infrastructure for this largely unsustainable out of town development.	A further criteria has been added to PS4 "e)make appropriate provision for walking and cycling access to	Making Great Places	Objection
RPA5	95	000019DLP	We support the policy LP1 on the regeneration of priority areas, which will support projects that improve the quality of the area and the existing housing stock through refurbishment and/or redevelopment. This presents an opportunity to upgrade the energy efficiency of existing houses through projects such as Energiesprong which can refurbish homes to net zero carbon levels.	Noted	Regeneration Priority Areas	Support