

NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION



STATEMENT OF NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

22 OCTOBER 2018

Main Matter 8

**Employment and Housing Allocations -
Site Selection & Soundness**

BLANK PAGE

Main Matter 8 - Whether or not the site selection processes for the employment and housing allocations are soundly based

Issue – Are the proposed employment allocations based on a robust assessment against relevant criteria?

Question 8.1

Is the site selection process for the employment allocations soundly based, including sustainability appraisal and the testing of reasonable alternatives?

Council's Response:

8.1.1 See response to Main Matter 8, Question 8.2 below.

Question 8.2

Is the site selection methodology based on an appropriate set of criteria? Are the reasons for selecting allocated sites and rejecting others clear and justified?

Council's Response:

8.2.1 The site selection process was based upon a clear methodology as described in the Employment Land Availability Assessment (LAA) Report (**EB-EMP5a**). This was derived from a joint methodology for housing, agreed with the other authorities in the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw Housing Market Area. There was no difference for employment sites except for the size criteria for eligible sites. However, the outcome of the assessment under any criteria related to employment development rather than for housing. The outcomes of the assessment are clearly laid out in the results tables of **EB-EMP5b & EB-EMP6**.

8.2.2 As described below for housing sites, the site selection process is soundly based and includes suitability, achievability and deliverability considerations in line with the principles of the NPPF. Similarly, the process relating to the Sustainability Appraisal was the same and described below in the response to Main Matter 8, Question 8.5.

8.2.3 The same assessment methodology was applied to existing as well as additional potential employment sites presented through the 'Call for Sites' and Plan consultation. The conclusions on that work are summarised in table 2 of the Employment Topic Paper (**ED8**), and the full assessment is in Appendix A of the Employment Land Availability Assessment (LAA) Report (**EB EMP5b**). None of the additional employment sites were considered acceptable for further consideration.

8.2.4 The existing supply (employment land availability) (as set out in Authority Monitoring Report 13 (**EB-OTH5**) amounted to 46.44 ha and so there was no requirement to fulfil the recommendation in the ELRU that where "any gaps (in providing sufficient land) are identified, the Council will want to consider

options for how this can be addressed (potentially in the form of new allocations).”

- 8.2.5 The existing supply was considered for de-allocation as indicated in the NPPF (2012), para 22, in that “Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed.”
- 8.2.6 On analysis, most of the sites in the existing supply have a significant level of commitment, some are remaining areas of existing employment areas, some with permissions. Only four sites, offered any scope for de-allocation as employment sites.
- 8.2.7 These sites do have a variety of development issues relating to access, flood risk, marketability, etc. and development for B1,B2 or B8 uses over the Plan period is uncertain. However, the four sites are all within settlement boundaries and adjoin existing employment areas which are well-occupied and well-located. Consequently these four sites are not considered appropriate for de-allocation and are currently retained as employment allocations.

Issue - Are the proposed housing allocations based on a realistic density assumption and robust assessment against relevant criteria?

Question 8.3

Is the general assumption of 30 dwellings per hectare set out in the Housing Topic Paper (EB HOU 7) and Housing Land Availability Assessment and Policy Assessment (EB HOU 6a) appropriate and based on robust evidence? Is that figure too high or too low and why?

Council's Response:

8.3.1 See response to Main Matter 8, Question 8.4 below.

Question 8.4

Do the net developable area assumptions set out in the Housing Topic Paper and Housing Land Availability Assessment and Policy Assessment represent a realistic approach to site capacity and are they based on robust evidence? What approach has been taken where specific site constraints are known?

Council's Response:

8.4.1 The Housing Topic Paper (**EB-HOU7**) explains that the density assumptions that are made in the LAA are 30 dwellings per hectare, assuming 90%, 80% or 70% developable area, as set out in the table below; this corresponds with a gross density of 27 dwellings/ha, 24 dwellings/ha and 21 dwellings/ha respectively.

8.4.2 The LAA only deviates from these density assumptions where full planning permission for a different yield has been granted. These assumptions have been carried forward from the 2008 SHLAA methodology, which was subject to consultation with developers and stakeholders. Opportunities to comment on these assumptions were also available during subsequent Local Plan consultations in 2015, 2017 and 2018 at the Regulation 18 & 19 stages. No objections have been made to these density assumptions in principle, although some developers have suggested higher densities will be delivered on their sites.

Site Developable Area Assumptions	
Site Size (ha)	Development Area
< 0.65	100%
0.65 – 5.99	90%
6 – 10	80%
> 10	70%

8.4.3 Paragraph 5.33 of the Housing Topic Paper (**EB-HOU7**) refers to informal discussions with agents and developers which indicate that the overall assumptions the Council is making are appropriate. When investigating completions on major sites between 2014 and 2018¹, the average gross density has been 30.89 dwellings per hectare. The average gross density of sites with outstanding planning permission at 31st March 2018 is 23.59 dwellings per hectare. Sites which involved conversions of existing buildings have not been included within these calculations. The table below shows the different densities achieved on sites of different sizes and compares it to the Council's approach. This demonstrates that the completions and permission densities are generally in line with the Council's assumptions. **Appendix 1** to this Hearing Statement provides a list of sites (completions and planning permissions) along with the relative densities achieved.

Gross Density Comparisons			
Site size	Completions	Permissions	Council's assumptions
up to 0.65 ha	38.98 dw/ha	34.0 dw/ha	30 dw/ha
0.65 ha to 5.99ha	28.70 dw/ha	18.85 dw/ha	27 dw/ha (30 dw/ha – 10%)
6 ha to 10.99ha²	23.90 dw/ha	20.37 dw/ha	24 dw/ha (30 dw/ha – 20%)
11ha and above	0	24.86 dw/ha	21 dw/ha (30 dw/ha – 30%)
Overall	30.89 dw/ha	23.59 dw/ha	

8.4.4 The Council therefore considers that the approach to densities and net vs gross developable areas is appropriate and realistic. The site descriptions to the housing allocations in Policy LC1 also refer to approximate dwellings yields, which provides flexibility in its application. If evidence for a slightly higher or lower yield is deemed more appropriate through the planning application process, the yield suggestion in the allocation does not prevent this.

8.4.5 Where necessary, reductions have been applied to the site yield to take account of site constraints identified through the LAA and Policy Assessment process. This generally includes ecological constraint and impacts on landscape. However, the approach to constraints was carried out on a site by site basis, not a systematic approach to all sites.

8.4.6 The Council's response to Matter 10, Question 10.1a explains the density assumptions on each individual site, also indicating where the landowner/developer does not agree with the proposed yield. Disagreement about site yields only exists for a few sites; in all cases the landowner/developer wishes to see a higher density than suggested by the Council.

¹ For the purpose of calculating densities, the completions also include sites where completions have taken place in 2017/18, even if the whole site has not been completed yet.

² For both completions and permissions, the densities have only been based on one site.

8.4.7 The Council's more cautious approach is considered to be more realistic, and reflective of the issues of 'conversion rates'³ at the planning application process. Recent planning permissions show that the dwelling yield often reduces from the Outline permission to Reserved Matters application, due to detailed considerations on layout and design. Examples are allocation sites with permission EC2, GR1, NW1, SH1, WW1 and WW2.

Question 8.5

Is the site selection process for the housing allocations soundly based, including SA and the testing of reasonable alternatives?

Council's Response:

8.5.1 Chapter 5 of the Housing Topic Paper (**EB-HOU7**) explains the methodology for selecting the most appropriate sites to make up the residual amount of housing needed to meet the requirement (after deducting existing completions and commitments). The site selection process for the housing allocations is soundly based and includes sustainability and deliverability considerations in line with the principles of the NPPF. The Council's response to Main Matter 8, Question 8.6 below explains the detailed criteria which have been used in the selection process.

8.5.2 The site selection process was centred upon achieving the most sustainable locations for housing development to ensure the Local Plan Strategy is achieved. The Council's response to Main Matter 5, as well as to Main Matter 1, Question 1.7 clarifies the justification for this strategy, clearly setting out that alternative options for the distribution of development were appraised as part of the Sustainability Appraisal (**SubD3**).

8.5.3 A range of sites were identified through a desktop review of existing data sources and several call for sites exercises, as explained in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 of the Housing Land Availability Assessment (LAA) and Policy Assessment report (**EB-HOU6a**). 460 sites were subsequently assessed within the Housing LAA and Policy Assessment (**EB-HOU6a**). A proportion of these were also assessed against the SA Framework in a cluster analysis process. Appendix A of the Addendum to the Regulation 19 SA/SEA Report (**SubD3b**) provides a list of the reasonable alternatives for site proposals considered throughout the SA/SEA processes. The Appendix also highlights whether sites were allocated or rejected, and the reasons for this, and when they were assessed during the SA/SEA process. Reasonable alternatives for sites have been assessed at several stages of the SA process, with approximately 130 assessed during the

³ The change from the number of dwellings referred to in the outline planning permission to the number applied for in the subsequent reserved matters application

2015 SA/SEA Report (**PS-ILP4**), and 224 assessed during the 2017 SA/SEA Report (**PS-CDLP5**).

8.5.4 Overall, sites have not been allocated for one or more of the following reasons:

- Site is not available for development;
- Site is not physically suitable for development (e.g. incompatible level of flood risk);
- Site is not commercially achievable;
- The site proposal would discord with policy criteria (e.g. unacceptable impacts on landscape or heritage);
- Minor site (below ten dwellings);
- Site does not have extant planning permission and does not conform with the Local Plan strategy;
- Delivery on site is uncertain due to cumulative site issues;
- The site is not suitable for release from the Green Belt;
- Site is located within the Green Belt and is not required.

Question 8.6

Is the site selection methodology based on an appropriate set of criteria? Are the reasons for selecting allocated sites and rejecting others clear and justified?

Council's Response:

8.6.1 The Council considers that the site selection methodology is based on an appropriate set of criteria, which clearly justify why certain types of sites have not been taken forward to allocation, and others have. The site selection methodology and results are set out in chapter 5 of the Housing Topic Paper (**EB-HOU7**). The site selection process followed seven steps to identify the most sustainable and deliverable sites for allocation. These steps and their results are summarised below:

Step 1: Housing Land Availability Assessment and Policy Assessment

8.6.2 The starting point of the site selecting process was a total of 460 sites, with an overall yield of 35,215 dwellings. These were assessed against criteria, as set out within the Housing Land Availability Assessment (LAA) and Policy Assessment (**EB-HOU6a**). The LAA is a technical process which outlines what land is available, suitable, likely to be economically viable in the local market and which has the potential to be delivered. The LAA assessment adopts a 'policy off' approach as the principle of development is being explored in the first instance with criteria such as availability of the site, flood risk, highway access, etc. Tables 1 and 2 in the Housing LAA and Policy Assessment Report (**EB-HOU6a**) explain these in detail. The assessment criteria used to assess sites are in line

with the Joint North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Housing Market Area LAA methodology (**EB-OTH1**) and are considered to be an appropriate measure of the deliverability or developability of a site. These are considered to be appropriate criteria as they assess whether the site can physically come forward.

- 8.6.3 The LAA assessment shows which sites are physically suitable or unsuitable for development. However, the LAA does not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for housing development, because not all sites will be suitable for development due to policy constraints. Therefore the Council has also conducted a further policy assessment on the potential housing sites. The Policy assessment of sites uses a number of criteria which assess whether housing development on a site is in line with National or emerging Local Policy or not. Criteria include impact on heritage assets, proposed Local Settlement Gap policy, etc. Table 4 in the Housing LAA and Policy Assessment Report (**EB-HOU6a**) explains these in detail. It is considered that these are an appropriate measure to assess policy compliance, as they address both national and local policies which are used to determine planning applications.
- 8.6.4 The assessment criteria have been developed in consultation with other experts such as NEDDC Officers from Environmental Health, Engineering and Development Management; Derbyshire County Council Highways Department, Landscape Team, Waste and Minerals Authority and Archaeology Team; Natural England, Environment Agency, English Heritage, Highways Agency, Coal Authority, Derbyshire Wildlife Trust, National Trust and Local Developers. The advice and comments received from these stakeholders and developers were used to establish the Site Assessment Matrix within appendix A to the Housing LAA and Policy Assessment Report (**EB-HOU6a**).
- 8.6.5 Appendix C of the Housing LAA and Policy Assessment Report (**EB-HOU6b**) includes the detailed assessment of the sites, clearly indicating which issues were identified that make the site unsuitable, unavailable, unachievable or not in line with policy. They were therefore rejected from further consideration. The results show that 6,380 dwellings are deliverable/developable within the next 15 years, and in line with policy.

Step 2: Initial Sieve

- 8.6.6 Subsequent to the LAA and Policy Assessment, a number of sites and supply were excluded from further consideration. These included:
- Sites in settlements with limited and very limited sustainability (level 3 and 4)
 - Sites near neighbouring Districts
 - Small sites
 - Post Plan Completions

8.6.7 The Council's response to Matter 11, Question 11.8 justifies the removal of these sources of potential supply in detail. At this stage, the remaining developable dwellings in sustainable locations (on non-Green Belt land) which may be developed within the Plan Period totalled 4,771 dwellings.

8.6.8 It is considered clear which sites were rejected from further consideration at this step.

Step 3: Removal of sites with planning permission

8.6.9 Many sites considered developable within the Housing LAA and Policy Assessment, and remaining after the initial site sieve as described above, also have planning permission. In order to not to double count these, the sites with planning permission were filtered out. The remaining supply at this step is 1,503 dwellings. Appendix 4 to the Housing Topic Paper provides a list of the sites making up this supply.

Step 4: Planning application decision pending

8.6.10 The next step was to identify those remaining LAA sites which are within the planning system and pending a decision on a planning application. It is considered that these are on suitable and available sites, in sustainable locations, and due to their planning status can be delivered within the first five years after adoption of the Local Plan. The Housing Topic Paper, paragraph 5.26, clearly identifies the four sites which were included as an allocation at this stage. Since the publication of the Housing Topic Paper, two out of the four pending sites have been granted permission, and another is nearing a decision. The remaining supply at this step is 1,169 dwellings.

Step 5: Focus on four main towns

8.6.11 To be able to meet the Local Plan Strategy, the remaining housing provision should focus on the main towns. Without any further provision in the level 1 towns, it would not be possible to achieve the Council's distribution strategy. This step therefore explored the sites in the four main towns in further detail, investigating potential cumulative issues and focussing on the ability of the site to deliver. It was found that the only remaining sites in level 1 settlements are located in Clay Cross.

8.6.12 The results show that three sites with an overall yield of 155 dwellings are suitable, available and achievable. These are recommended for allocation. However, the other sites, with an overall Plan Period yield of 321 dwellings, have many constraints which cumulatively makes it very uncertain that a suitable and achievable development can come forward. Due to this uncertainty, it is not recommended to allocate these sites.

- 8.6.13 Overall, this means that only 155 dwellings are remaining to meet the remaining requirement of 1,349 dwellings⁴.
- 8.6.14 The consequence of the approach of this step also means that the sites listed at Appendix 4 of the Housing Topic Paper (**EB-HOU7**), which didn't have an application pending and which weren't located in a level 1 settlement, were not selected for allocation. The site selection process is clear about the focus on the level 1 settlements, and thereby rejecting sites in level 2 settlements. For clarity, Appendix 2 to this Hearing Statement includes a list of sites that were rejected at this stage.

Step 6: Density considerations

- 8.6.15 The Council has also considered the appropriateness of its density assumptions to ascertain whether the densities of developments should be optimised. It was found that the applied density assumptions are appropriate. The Council's response to Matter 8, questions 8.3 and 8.4 explains this in more detail.

Step 7: Green Belt

- 8.6.16 Due to the supply in the four main towns not meeting the requirements, the site selection methodology turns to the last resort of exploring Green Belt sites. The Green Belt Topic Paper (**EB-GB3**) sets out the site selection process of Green Belt sites. The Green Belt Review (**EB-GB2**) assessed many Green Belt land parcels to measure how well the land contributes to the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt. It identified land parcels which met these Green Belt purposes less robustly. The Council's Response to Matter 6, questions 6.3 and 6.6 explain the approach. Out of the 46 parcels identified which do not or only partially meet Green Belt purposes, 19 parcels are located adjacent to Dronfield, Eckington or Killamarsh.
- 8.6.17 The resulting parcels were then subject to a LAA and Policy Assessment. 13 parcels, indicated in amber in Appendix C of the Green Belt Topic Paper (**EB-GB3**), are considered developable within the Plan Period. They were explored in further detail to choose the most appropriate sites, as their overall yield of 1,618 dwellings is more than needed to meet the remaining requirement. It was found that there is little difference between the remaining parcels to easily select one parcel over the other. To ensure that each of the three settlements is able to grow, the Green Belt site selection focused on each individual settlement and select the most deliverable site(s) in the settlement. The preferred sites are clearly

⁴ The Housing Topic Paper defines the remaining requirement as 1,409 dwellings, at 31st March 2017. Due to more up to date monitoring of completions and commitments, the remaining requirement would now be 1,349 dwellings (1,562 residual amount, as explained at Matter 11, question 11.7, minus 214, from two sites with pending planning applications)

indicated in table 3 of the Green Belt Topic Paper (**EB-GB3**), and the reasons for rejecting the other sites set out in paragraphs 3.18 to 3.20 of the topic paper.

- 8.6.18 The Council considers that the site selection process as described in the Housing Topic Paper (**EB-HOU7**) and Green Belt Topic Paper (**EB-GB3**) clearly sets out the reasons for selecting certain types of sites and not taking forward others.

Appendix 1

Appendix 1: Density calculations on sites which have been completed between 2014 and 2018, and sites with planning permission at 31/03/2018

Density on sites which are completed, or where completions have taken place in 2017/18				
Application Ref.	Address	Units	Approx gross area (ha)	Density (dw/ha)
Site size: up to 0.65 ha				
NED/15/00034/FL	Former Site Of The Double Six, Birkinstyle Lane, Stonebroom, Alfreton, DE55 6LD	10	0.25	40.00
NED/16/01113/RM	117, Pilsley Road, Danesmoor, Clay Cross, Chesterfield, S45 9BU	10	0.29	34.48
NED/13/00804/FL	SITE OF FORMER, H B WALKER and SON LTD, NETHERTHORPE LANE, Killamarsh, S21 1DA	11	0.3	36.67
NED/07/01253/FL	2-5 Bronte Street, Mickley, Alfreton	17	0.3	56.67
NED/16/01060/FL	Land West Of 20, Masefield Avenue, Holmewood, Chesterfield	10	0.41	24.39
NED/10/00790/RM	LAND AT, CALVER AVENUE, North Wingfield, CHESTERFIELD, S42 5PW	25	0.6	41.67
Site size: 0.65 ha to 5.99ha				
NED/16/01320/FL	Croft House, The Green North Wingfield	22	0.67	32.84
NED/13/00704/FL	LAND TO THE EAST OF HARDWICK DRIVE AND T, 45 - 57, PENROSE CRESCENT, Arkwright Town, Countryside, CHESTERFIELD, S44 5BS	18	0.7	25.71
NED/13/00805/FL	LAND AT, 5 - 14 KEATS WAY and, LAND TO REAR OF 1 - 7 SCOTT CLOSE, Grassmoor, CHESTERFIELD, S42 5DJ	25	0.9	27.78
NED/16/00524/RM	THE WOOLPACK, 26, TOWN END, HIGHAM & STONEBROOM, Higham, ALFRETON, DE55 6BL	16	1	16.00
NED/13/00675/FL	SITE OF FORMER, STANDALL TOOLS, MICKLEY LANE, DRONFIELD WOODHOUSE, Dronfield Countryside	24	1	24.00
NED/16/01236/RM	LAND TO THE EAST & NORTH OF, 119, TOP ROAD, Calow, CHESTERFIELD, S44 5TE	20	1.08	18.52
NED/16/00964/FL	Land East Of 3 And 4, Carlyle Road, Stonebroom	30	1.1	27.27
NED/13/01024/FL	Site Of Former, Edward Revill Endowed School, Burnside Avenue, Shirland	42	1.1	38.18
NED/12/01050/FL	LAND OPPOSITE, BIRKIN LANE WEST & R/O 308 - 328, NORTH WINGFIELD ROAD, NEW TUPTON, Grassmoor, CHESTERFIELD	61	1.2	50.83
NED/15/01083/RM	Land North West of, 24 Matlock Road, Wessington	32	1.23	26.02
NED/16/00609/RM	117, CHESTERFIELD ROAD, North Wingfield, CHESTERFIELD, S42 5LF	50	1.3	38.46
NED/13/00819/RM	LAND BETWEEN, SITWELL VILLAS and 85, STRETTON ROAD, Morton, ALFRETON	35	1.6	21.88
NED/14/01293/FL	Evergreen & Vacant land to the East of, Derby Road & North of junction with, Brassington Lane, Tupton	25	1.6	15.63
NED/13/00287/FL	THE BUNGALOWS, OFF SHEFFIELD ROAD, Killamarsh, S21 1EF	52	1.8	28.89

NED/13/00291/FL	TARREN BUNGALOWS SITE, WEST STREET, PIPEYARD LANE & EAST SIDE OF PITT STREET, Eckington	77	1.8	42.78
NED/15/00614/DISCON	Land to the Rear of 10 to 52, Ashover Road, Old Tupton, Tupton	67	2.36	28.39
NED/15/00211/FL	LAND TO THE REAR OF, 61 - 119, NETHERMOOR ROAD & 15 - 21 DEERLANDS ROAD, Wingerworth, CHESTERFIELD	52	2.7	19.26
NED/14/01289/RM	LAND TO THE SOUTH OF, PIONEER HOUSE & TO THE REAR OF 1 - 59, ADLINGTON AVENUE, Wingerworth, CHESTERFIELD	159	5.17	30.75
NED/14/00888/RM	Allotments, Masefield Avenue, Holmewood	188	5.86	32.08
Site size: 6 ha to 10.99ha				
NED/15/00336/RM	Windwhistle Farm, Southend, Grassmoor, Chesterfield, S42 5EY	163	6.82	23.90

Density on sites with planning permission at 31/03/2018				
Application Ref.	Address	Units	Approx gross area (ha)	Density (dw/ha)
Site size: up to 0.65 ha				
NED/17/01322/FL	Manor Farm, Upperthorpe Road, Killamarsh	10	0.22	45.45
NED/14/01100/FL	Land To The Rear Of 2 To 6, Westhill Lane, Grassmoor	11	0.24	45.83
NED/16/00300/DISCON	LAND SOUTH OF, SUNNINGDALE PARK and, POPLAR DRIVE & TO WEST OF, 21 ELVIN WAY, Tupton, CHESTERFIELD, S42 6EG	14	0.41	34.15
NED/07/00865/FL	THE OLD STATION, STATION ROAD, Killamarsh	14	0.43	32.56
NED/16/00665/FL	Land Between Locko Road, Lower Pilsley	13	0.49	26.53
NED/15/00383/OL	83A, Clay Lane, Clay Cross, Chesterfield, S45 9AW	10	0.52	19.23
NED/15/00661/FL	Land on the South side of, the Junction between Crofters Close and, Boiley Lane, Killamarsh	13	0.53	24.53
NED/12/00170/OL	Former Danesmoor County Infant School, Pilsley Road, Clay Cross, Chesterfield	28	0.64	43.75
Site size: 0.65 ha to 5.99ha				
NED/16/00724/OL	Mile Hill House, Mansfield Road, Hasland, Chesterfield, S41 0JN	10	0.66	15.15
NED/16/00276/OL	Land Between Poplar Grove And Park House Farm, Pilsley Road, Lower Pilsley	16	0.71	22.54
NED/15/00667/OL	Land to the south of Ankerbold House, Ankerbold Road, Old Tupton	15	0.85	17.65
NED/15/00502/OL	Land between 205 and 235 Chesterfield Road, Holmewood	15	1.05	14.29
NED/16/00621/FL	South of Sunningdale Park & Birkin Park, Birkin Avenue, Tupton	29	1.07	27.10
NED/16/00257/FL	Land to the Rear of 181 Chesterfield Road, Holmewood	25	1.14	21.93

NED/14/00249/OL	Land To The East Of, Prospect House, Highstairs Lane, Stretton	28	1.2	23.33
NED/13/00176/OL	Bradley Lomas Electrolok Ltd, Church Street, Eckington, Sheffield, S21 4BH	22	1.3	16.92
NED/16/00419/FL	Land North And West Of Creg Ny Baa Brackenfield Lane Wessington	43	1.5	28.67
NED/16/01302/FL	Fanny Avenue, Killamarsh	26	1.7	15.29
NED/14/00312/OL	Land to the South of, 205 Chesterfield Road, Holmewood	40	1.74	22.99
NED/17/00566/OL	Land to the rear of 14A and 54 High Street, Stonebroom	35	1.8	19.44
NED/17/00200/OL	Land South West Of Grange Farm, Milken Lane, Ashover	10	1.98	5.05
NED/17/00841/RM	Land At The Junction Of Narrowleys Lane And, Moor Road, Ashover	26	2.3	11.30
NED/16/00216/FL	Land Between Old Canal And North Side, Primrose Lane, Killamarsh	30	2.87	10.45
NED/15/00153/OL	Land South of Sports Ground at the Corner of Rupert Street and Hallgate Lane, Pilsley	85	3.11	27.33
NED/12/00273/OL	LAND BETWEEN MAIN ROAD and, BURNSIDE AVENUE, & R/O PROPERTIES ON THE NORTH SIDE OF HALLFIELDGATE LANE, SHIRLAND, Shirland, ALFRETON	92	4.46	20.63
NED/14/00562/OL	Land To The, South Of Allotments at, Ducksett Lane Accessed From Staveley Lane, Eckington	90	4.66	19.31
Site size: 6 ha to 10.99ha				
NED/14/00763/OL	Hanging Banks, Derby Road, Wingerworth	222	10.9	20.37
Site size: 11ha and above				
NED/14/01290/OL	Land On The West Side Of, Chesterfield Road, Holmewood	550	19.14	28.74
NED/16/00525/OL	THE FORMER AVENUE SITE, DERBY ROAD, Wingerworth, CHESTERFIELD, S42 6NB	469	23.2	20.22
NED/14/00145/OL	Former Coalite Site On The North West And South East, Buttermilk Lane, Coalite	660	25.75	25.63
NED/17/00247/RM	Biwater Industries (Clay Cross) Limited, Market Street, Clay Cross	See Housing Topic Paper, Paragraph 33		

Appendix 2

Appendix 2: Sites not selected for allocation at Step 5 of the Housing Site Selection Process, due to their location in a level 2 settlement and their planning status

LAA references	Settlement	Yield
CAL/1603	Calow	14
H&H/701	Holmewood	53
NW/1606b	Holmewood	27
NW/1605	North Wingfield	28
NW/2201	North Wingfield	41
NW/2501	North Wingfield	103
PIL/1601	Pilsley	77
PIL/2102	Pilsley	100
S&H/703	Shirland	70
S&H/1604b	Stonebroom	16
TUP/701b	Tupton	144
TUP/702	Tupton	19
TOTAL		692