

NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION



STATEMENT OF NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

22 OCTOBER 2018

MATTER 5

**Spatial Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy and
the Distribution of Employment and
Housing Land**

BLANK PAGE

Main Matter 5 – Spatial Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy and the Distribution of Employment and Housing Land (Policies SS2, SS7, SS8, SS9 and SP1 – SP4)

Issue - Is the spatial strategy set out in Policy SS2 and overall distribution of housing development appropriate and justified by a robust and credible evidence base?

Question 5.1 *Were alternative options for the distribution of development considered during the plan's preparation and subject to SA and is it clear why the preferred Spatial Option 1 was selected and alternatives were discounted?*

Council's Response:

- 5.1.1 In accordance with criteria outlined in Policy SS1 the Local Plan aims to direct new growth to the district's most sustainable settlements based on the Settlement Hierarchy (Publication Draft Local Plan paras. 4.28-34 & Table 4.2). In addition growth will occur in Strategic Sites that will promote mixed uses and the re-use of previously developed land. Level 1 Settlements (Clay Cross, Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh) are considered to be the most sustainable locations for new development in terms of the range of services and facilities they provide and support and because they generate the greatest needs for new housing, jobs, services and facilities. In 2011, these four towns contained almost 50% of the district's housing and 48% of the population.
- 5.1.2 The Housing Topic Paper, January 2018 (**EB-HOU7**) at section 3.3 explains that during the preparation of the Local Plan, the Council has considered and consulted on several alternative options for the distribution of development across the District, which were all appraised as part of the Sustainability Appraisal. It summarises the appraisal results and clearly outlines why preferred Spatial Option 1 was selected and alternatives discounted.
- 5.1.3 The Council's response to the Inspector's Main Matter 1, Question 1.7 (paragraphs 1.7.4 to 1.7.6) provides more information on the alternative options and the appraisal results, including why Spatial Option 1 was selected and alternatives discounted.

Question 5.2 How has the supply of housing from existing planning permissions influenced the spatial strategy and distribution of development across the District?

Council's Response:

5.2.1 The spatial strategy is based upon work that has developed over a number of years and is rooted in the nature and character of the District. It is the social, economic and environmental relationships between the towns, villages and rural areas in the district and the need to secure sustainable patterns of development that has been the primary influencing factor determining the spatial strategy. This has been informed, tested and supported through Sustainability Appraisal at all stages (see paragraphs 5.2.3 – 5.2.4 below).

5.2.2 Although the supply of housing from existing planning permissions was not used to determine the spatial strategy; completions and permissions since the base date of the Plan have naturally shaped the distribution of housing, affecting the numbers of dwellings at settlements. At the time of publication of the Publication Draft Local Plan, completions and permissions made up 4,857 (almost three quarters) of the 6600 dwellings requirement. The spatial distribution of completions and commitments at this time were as follows:

- 580 dwellings (9%) in level 1 Settlements;
- 1541 dwellings (23%) on strategic sites;
- 2,197 dwellings (33%) in level 2 settlements; and
- 539 dwellings (8%) in 3 and 4 settlements.

5.2.3 The Housing Topic Paper, January 2018 (**EB-HOU7**), section 3.3 and Sustainability Appraisal Regulation 19 Report (**SubD3a**), section 2.4, explain that the Council's initial appraisal of different spatial options in 2009 found the second option of directing the majority of development to the four main towns and six larger villages to be the best performing option in terms of sustainability. More recent evidence on housing need and existing supply from planning permissions led the Council to update the 2009 spatial options in 2017/18, to reflect the latest evidence and constraints. The updated assessment found Spatial Option 1, delivering the majority of development at the four main towns (level 1 settlements) and strategic sites to be the most sustainable option, as explained in the Council's response to the Inspector's Main Matter 1, Question 1.7 (paragraphs 1.7.4 to 1.7.6).

5.2.4 The updated assessment in 2017/18 only applied to the remaining distribution of 1,743 dwellings, because this was the only housing provision that the Council still had a choice over distributing. On the basis of the spatial distribution of permissions and completions it was necessary to focus the remaining housing requirement (1,743 dwellings) on the four main towns and strategic sites in order to adhere to the spatial strategy of the plan, in line with Spatial Option 1.

Question 5.3 Why was 50% selected as the ‘threshold’ for the distribution of new housing to Level 1 settlements? Were alternative figures tested through SA? Would a different figure be justified and if so, why?

Council’s Response:

5.3.1 The specification of “over 50%” was included in the text of Policy SS2 to clarify the Council’s definition of “majority”. It is considered that “majority” means more than half. This was also considered appropriate given these settlements are identified as the most sustainable locations for new development and the plan strategy is to secure the most sustainable patterns and forms of development.

5.3.2 Percentages were not specifically tested through the Sustainability Appraisal, rather the dwelling numbers (informed by permissions and site availability) associated with alternative spatial distributions.. However the percentages associated with each spatial option can be calculated by simply taking the completions, permissions and remainder (1,743dw) for each spatial option and comparing this with the overall target.

5.3.3 Table 5.1 below shows the spatial options that were tested through the Sustainability Appraisal in 2017/18 and table 5.2 shows in the first row the relative percentages. For example, for Spatial Option 1, 1,443 dwellings were tested in the level 1 settlements; when added to the 2,121 dwelling completions and permissions¹ in these settlements and strategic sites, this results in a total of 3,564 dwellings, which is 54% of the total target of 6,600 dwellings. All other options resulted in lower percentages (Option 2: 39%, Option 3: 35%, Option 4: 43% and Option 5: 32%. Overall Spatial Option 1 was considered the most sustainable option, as described at the Council’s response to Inspector’s questions 1.7 (paragraphs 1.7.4 to 1.7.6). It is therefore not considered that a different figure is justified.

Table 5.1: Spatial Options Tested

	Completions and permissions	Spatial Option 1	Spatial Option 2	Spatial Option 3	Spatial Option 4	Spatial Option 5
Level 1 and Strategic Sites	2,121	1,443	465	176	718	0
Level 2	2,197	300	1,278	473	1,025	0
Level 3, level 4 and countryside	539	0	0	1,092	0	0
New Settlement	0	0	0	0	0	1,743
Total	4,857	1,743	1,743	1,743	1,743	1,743

Source: table 2.5 Sustainability Appraisal Regulation 19 Report (SubD3a)

¹ The majority of which(1541 dwellings) are on the two Strategic Sites.

Table 5.2: Spatial options – completions/permissions and remaining choice combined

	Spatial Option 1 (Column 1 + 2 from Table 5.1)	Spatial Option 2 (Column 1 + 3 from Table 5.1)	Spatial Option 3 (Column 1 + 4 from Table 5.1)	Spatial Option 4 (Column 1 + 5 from Table 5.1)	Spatial Option 5 (Column 1 + 6 from Table 5.1)
Level 1 and Strategic Sites	3,564 = 54%	2,586 = 39%	2,297 = 35%	2,839 = 43%	2,121 = 32%
Level 2	2,497 = 38%	3,475 = 53%	2,670 = 40%	3,222 = 49%	2,197 = 33%
Level 3, level 4 and countryside	539 = 8%	539 = 8%	1,631 = 25%	539 = 8%	539 = 8%
New Settlement	0	0	0	0	1,743 = 26%
Total	6,600 = 100%	6,600 = 100%	6,598 = 100%	6,600 = 100%	6,600 = 100%

Source: table 2.5 Sustainability Appraisal Regulation 19 Report (**SubD3a**)

Question 5.4 *Is the spatial distribution of housing development justified having regard to the distribution of strategic and other employment sites in the plan area?*

Council's Response:

5.4.1 The Council considers that the spatial distribution of housing development is fully justified having regard to the distribution of strategic sites and other employment sites in the District. The Council's response to Main Matter 5, Question 5.1 explains that the Local Plan aims to direct new growth to the district's four most sustainable settlements and Strategic Sites.

Of the three Strategic Sites, one is located at the level 1 settlement Clay Cross, one at the level 2 settlement of Wingerworth. The third, at Markham Vale, whilst not associated with a particular settlement, will provide employment land in a regionally significant location on the M1 and is well-positioned between centres of population in North East Derbyshire, Chesterfield and Bolsover.

5.4.2 The majority of housing allocations are located within the four main towns (level 1) and strategic sites, followed by level 2 settlements, in particular Holmewood and Wingerworth. This aligns with the location of both existing and proposed employment sites. Of the new employment land, other than strategic sites, three quarters is located within the four main towns; this is one third if the strategic sites are included. (Publication Draft Local Plan Table 6.2 and Policies WC2 and WC3).

5.4.3 This approach will enable the integration of homes, jobs, services and facilities in the most accessible locations. By focussing the majority of development in and around the main towns which are well served by public transport and access to services sustainable development will be achieved in line with objectives.

5.4.4 Aside from the specific distribution of housing and employment, the broader context should be considered.

5.4.5 The housing and employment land evidence shows that provision is aligned at District level (see response to Main Matter 4, Question 4.8) However, even at this level there is limited direct relationship between residents and workplace jobs owing to the significant commuting patterns between the District and Chesterfield and Sheffield which disconnect employment directly from residents. The Employment Land Review Update (**EB-EMP2**) (para 6.8) and the North Derbyshire & Bassetlaw SHMA (**EB-HOU2**) (para 3.1) point this out, and point to how employment forecasts and modelling assumptions account for it to a greater or lesser extent. The Plan's purpose, as described above at Main Matter 5, Question 5.1, is to increase the opportunities for sustainable travel including through improving connectivity with the main urban areas to the north, south and east of the District through the distribution of development, in line with objective D12, Sustainable Transport.

- 5.4.6 It is also important to note that allocations for housing and employment land are only part of the relationship between people, housing and jobs. Many house moves are not into new housing, and the reasons to move house are not all related to work. Plus new employment land provision has particular locational requirements that do not necessarily align with areas of housing need. Furthermore town centres increasingly offer significant employment opportunities and being better served by public transport give greater access to services to help achieve more sustainable development, in line with Local Plan objectives D1, D4, D5 & D12..
- 5.4.7 The Council's approach to employment site identification is based upon sound evidence with the aim of establishing an employment land portfolio in appropriate locations to meet market demands.

Question 5.5 Overall, will the spatial strategy set out in Policy SS2 and distribution of housing development set out in Table 4.3 contribute to the plan's vision and objectives for the District?

Council's Response:

5.5.1 The Council considers that the strategy of focusing the majority of new housing development on the four main towns and strategic sites, with the remaining development in the level 2 settlements; and of focusing new employment at the Principal Protected Employment Areas and Strategic Sites, will contribute to the Local Plan's Vision and Objectives.

5.5.2 The matrix on page 27 of the Publication Draft Local Plan sets out the relationship between the Plan's objectives and policies, demonstrating that Policy SS2 contributes to the achievement of the majority of the Local Plan's Objectives, for example:

- Objectives D1 and D5 by making sufficient provision for the delivery of housing and employment which meets the objectively assessed housing and employment needs and supports the growth of the local economy;
- Objective D12 by making provision for housing in the most sustainable settlements where opportunities for travel using sustainable forms of transport are more available;
- Objectives N1 and S1 by supporting and enhancing the role of the four main towns of Clay Cross Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh and thereby ensuring the vitality and viability of their town centres;

5.5.3 The spatial strategy will accommodate sustainable growth whilst continuing to preserve and promote the distinct character of different areas and share the economic benefits of regeneration and sustainable growth in the wider Sheffield City Region and D2N2 Local Economic Partnership (paragraph 3.4 of the Publication Draft Local Plan). This will be achieved through

- growth and expansion of the towns of Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh, which will meet the development needs of communities in the northern part of the district.
- protection of the high quality and open nature of the countryside in the West of the District by focussing the majority of development in level 1 and 2 settlements, rather than the level 3 and 4 settlements which are more prominent in the West of the District;
- encouraging economic revival of Clay Cross by supporting and enhancing its role as a main town;
- delivering developments at the former Avenue and Biwaters sites; and helping the East of the District capitalise on the close location to the M1 motorway and Markham Vale

Issue - Is the proposed settlement hierarchy soundly based and justified by the evidence?

Question 5.6 Is the Settlement Hierarchy Study Update (EB SS1) based on robust and relevant criteria and evidence?

Council's Response:

5.6.1 The Settlement Hierarchy Study Update, 2017 provides information about settlements in North East Derbyshire District and the services and facilities they provide and is considered to be based upon robust and relevant criteria and evidence. The Study brings together updated evidence from a range of sources to provide a baseline against which needs, issues and opportunities within and affecting the District's settlements can be identified. It can also be used to inform the development of policies and proposals that will shape the future of these settlements.

5.6.2 The criteria used to develop the settlement hierarchy is based upon the factors influencing sustainable development as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012). This is explained in Paragraphs 2.1 – 2.4 & 3.7 of the Settlement Hierarchy Study (**EB-SS1**) and helped to identify a range of factors which are considered to be most relevant to the sustainability of a settlement and should form part of the methodology for assessing settlement sustainability, these are:

- the number of people already living in the settlement;
- the provision of shops, services, and other community facilities in recognised town or local centres or elsewhere within a settlement;
- the availability of employment opportunities in a settlement; and
- the availability of public transport services to and from a settlement.

5.6.3 Paragraphs 3.10 – 3.34 & Appendix C of the Settlement Hierarchy Study (**EB-SS1**) provide a detailed explanation of the approach taken to each of the sustainability factors; and identify the relevant sources of evidence used.

5.6.4 Evidence sources used include the 2011 census for population data, 2015 Business Register and Employment Survey (BRES) for employment data; along with in-house studies of services and facilities (including public transport services) drawing upon published data from Derbyshire County Council and other bodies as appropriate ; which is considered to be extensive, relevant and robust.

Question 5.7 *Is it clear how the Update has informed the hierarchy and the designation of settlements within Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4 and does the proposed settlement hierarchy reflect the role and function of different settlements?*

Council's Response:

- 5.7.1 The council considers the position of settlements in the Local Plan settlement hierarchy reflects the role and function of the district's settlements having been informed by the evidence contained in the Settlement Hierarchy Study Update, 2017 (**EB-SS1**).
- 5.7.2 As set out in Table 4.2 of the Local Plan, at the top of the hierarchy are those settlements identified as "Level 1: Towns". These are the towns of Clay Cross, Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh. They play a key role in the District, providing services used by a wide catchment, having high numbers of jobs, the best infrastructure in terms of facilities and services, and which are well connected by public transport.
- 5.7.3 Paragraph's 3.3 to 3.7 & 5.4 of the Settlement Hierarchy Study Update, 2017 (**EB-SS1**) discuss this and cross-refer to the Appendices D, E, F, G & H which provide the detailed evidence to support the positioning of these settlements at the top of the settlement hierarchy.
- 5.7.4 Eleven settlements are then categorised as "Level 2: Settlements with Good Level of Sustainability". These settlements are regarded as the most sustainable settlements outside of the towns which generally have good levels of sustainability including a reasonable level of local social infrastructure, some local employment opportunities and good accessibility by public transport.
- 5.7.5 A further twenty six settlements are identified as "Level 3: Settlements with Limited Sustainability" whereby residents generally have to travel outside of the settlement for most of their daily needs.
- 5.7.6 At the bottom of the hierarchy, nine settlements are identified as "Level 4: Very Small Villages and Hamlets with Very Limited Sustainability" where the provision of facilities and services, job opportunities and public transport is very limited or even non-existent in some settlements.
- 5.7.7 The detailed ranking of the District's settlements against the key sustainability factors together with the justification for the grouping of settlements into the different levels is discussed in Section 5 of the Settlement Hierarchy Study Update, 2017 (**EB-SS1**).

Question 5.8 How do the strategic sites relate to the settlement hierarchy?

Council's Response:

- 5.8.1 The strategic site allocation for mixed use development at the Former Biwaters site is located at the Level 1 town of Clay Cross which sits at the top of the Plan's settlement hierarchy. This town is one of the district's most sustainable locations for new development in terms of the range of jobs, shops and other facilities and services it provides and supports and because of its very good connectivity by public transport.
- 5.8.2 The strategic site allocation at The Avenue is located at Wingerworth which is a Level 2 settlement in the Plan's settlement hierarchy. Wingerworth has a generally good level of local social infrastructure, some local employment opportunities and good accessibility to the towns.
- 5.8.3 The strategic site allocation at Markham Vale together with the Coalite Priority Regeneration Area are located at Long Duckmanton. Whilst Long Duckmanton is categorised as a Level 3 settlement in the Plan's settlement hierarchy the council considers there are particular reasons relating to the remediation of these sites and their strategic location close to the M1 motorway which support the allocation of these primarily employment-led strategic sites in this location.

Question 5.9 *Having regard to paragraph 184 of the NPPF, is it clear which policies should be regarded as ‘strategic policies’ for the purpose of Neighbourhood Plans (NP)? Does the plan provide an appropriate framework for NPs and what is the up-to-date position with NP preparation in the District?*

Council’s Response:

5.9.1 The method and outcome of the identification of strategic policies is set out at **Appendix 1**. It is considered that this provides an appropriate framework for Neighbourhood Plans in that it sets out those policies which are strategic in nature and which if go unchecked would unbalance the Plan’s strategy. Whilst at the same time providing sufficient flexibility for neighbourhood plans to develop their own local policies tailored to the individual needs and aspirations of their area.

5.9.2 The Adopted Neighbourhood Plans in the District are:

- Holymoorside and Walton Neighbourhood Plan (November 2017),
- Ashover Parish Neighbourhood Plan (February 2018),
- Wingerworth Neighbourhood Plan (July 2018).

5.9.3 In addition, four other neighbourhood plans are in preparation as follows:

Neighbourhood Area	Formal Stage	Comment
Brampton	Area Designated	Area designated by both NEDDC and PDNPA. NEDDC is lead LPA
Brackenfield	Area Designated	Steering Gp convened
Dronfield	Pre-submission Plan consultation	Town Council has consulted on Draft Plan (Reg 13).
Wessington	Pre-submission Plan consultation	Parish is preparing Submission Draft NP (Reg 15)

Issue – Are other settlement policies justified and soundly based?

Question 5.10 What approach has been taken to identifying the settlement development limits and are they appropriately drawn on the Policies Maps? Are Policies SS7 and SS8 clear and have they been positively prepared?

Council's Response:

- 5.10.1 Settlement Development Limits have been defined around the district's settlements as categorised as Level 1, 2 and 3 in the Plan's settlement hierarchy. They have been drawn in a coherent and consistent manner following a number of guiding principles as set out in the Settlement Development Limits Review (**EB-SS2**, paragraph 2.1). In addition, a consistent methodology, utilising GIS mapping, aerial photography together with information from the monitoring of planning permissions and completed developments has been used in drawing up the boundaries. The council has also taken account of all representations received in relation to the definition of the Settlement Development Limits and made changes where appropriate.
- 5.10.2 The council considers the approach to identifying settlement development limits and their definition on the Policies Map is robust and soundly based.
- 5.10.3 Policy SS7: Development on Unallocated land within Settlements with Settlement Development Limits adopts a permissive approach to the principle of development on unallocated sites within Settlement Development Limits subject to the criterion listed a. to d. The use of settlement boundaries linked to Policy SS7 in this way is seen as a fundamental part of the Plan's strategy and securing the achievement of a sustainable pattern of development across the district. By clearly distinguishing between the built framework of settlements where development is acceptable in principle; and the open countryside, where policies are more restrictive, the Policy SS7 gives clarity and certainty to all those involved in the planning process.
- 5.10.4 The council therefore contends that Policy SS7 is clear and is positively prepared in line with the 2012 NPPF (paragraph 15 & 17 (5th bullet)).
- 5.10.5 Policy SS8: Development in Small Villages and Hamlets relates to settlements that fall within Level 4 of the Plan's settlement hierarchy. These are generally small in scale and lack the employment, services and facilities, and levels of public transport, afforded by the district's larger settlements. As such the policy approach at these small villages and hamlets is to restrict development to limited infill development, or development that may be allocated through an adopted Neighbourhood. The purpose of the latter being to allow local communities to take a slightly less restrictive approach to new development in their local context as justified through the preparation of a neighbourhood plan.
- 5.10.6 Through the consultation at the Publication Draft Plan stage, a representation suggests that the Policy SS8: Development in Small Villages and Hamlets is unclear and appears to place too greater restrictions on Level 4 settlements

compared with other countryside locations. This is not the intention of the policy and the Council would agree that further clarity is required. The Council therefore accepts it would be appropriate to make amendments to Policy SS8 as follows:

- amend the supporting text at paragraph 4.56 to clarify that the absence of a SDL means these settlements effectively fall within the open countryside in policy terms and should be considered as such;
- amend Policy SS8 Criterion 1 to clarify that infill development should be in accordance with countryside and Green Belt Policies as appropriate; and
- amend Policy SS8 Criterion 2 to more closely reflect the wording of Policy SS9: Development in the Countryside (see **Rep ID 7930** in **(ED7)**)

5.10.7 With these changes it is considered that Policy SS8 is clear in its intentions and is positively prepared in that it supports appropriate development in the Level 4 settlements. .

Question 5.11 Is Policy SS9 clear and has it been positively prepared?

Council's Response:

- 5.11.1 Policy SS9: Development in the Countryside applies to countryside locations outside the defined settlement boundaries of the Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 settlements. It also includes all other areas including the small villages and hamlets categorised as Level 4 settlements in the Plan's settlement hierarchy.
- 5.11.2 The policy sets out to restrict development unless it falls within one of stated categories of development set out in the criteria a. to g. of the policy. These generally relate to small scale employment and tourism uses and development which has an essential need to be located in the countryside. Part 2 of the policy SS9 expects all development to respect the form, scale and character of the landscape through its siting, scale, design and use of materials.
- 5.11.3 Through the consultation at the Publication Draft Plan stage a number of representations have been made suggesting changes to Policy SS9. The Council would accept that in the interests of clarity changes could be made to the policy in response to some of these representations (**Rep IDs 7161, 7141, 7941, 7991, 8000 & 8005**). The detailed changes the Council consider would be appropriate are set out in the Council's Response to Specific Suggestions for Change – edited (**ED7**).
- 5.11.4 Subject to the above changes the Council consider the policy is clear and is positively prepared in that it supports appropriate development in the countryside in line with the NPPF in particular Section 3: Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy.

Question 5.12 How will Policies SP1 – SP4 support and enhance the roles of Dronfield, Clay Cross, Eckington and Killamarsh?

Council's Response:

5.12.1 Policies SP1 to SP4 are the Plan's area specific based policies that seek to maintain the important role of the four main towns. All of the policies take forward the key themes and proposals from the Regeneration Frameworks for the towns. In particular the policies include proposals that will help to improve access and movement around the towns maintain and enhance open spaces and other green infrastructure and improve important heritage assets such that development continues to support their continued regeneration as envisaged by the Council through the Regeneration Frameworks which are reflected in Policies SP1 to SP4.

CONSIDERATION OF STRATEGIC POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out the strategic matters expected to be contained in a Local Plans.

NPPF Paragraph 156:

Local planning authorities should set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:

- A. the homes and jobs needed in the area
- B. the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development
- C. the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat)
- D. the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities
- E. climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape

Neighbourhood Plans and Strategic Policies

A local planning authority should set out clearly its strategic policies in accordance with paragraph 184 of the NPPF and provide details to a qualifying body and to the independent examiner.

NPPF Paragraphs 184 & 185:

184 (pt) Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.

185. Outside these strategic elements, neighbourhood plans will be able to shape and direct sustainable development in their area. Once a neighbourhood plan has demonstrated its general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan and is brought into force, the policies it contains take precedence over existing non-strategic policies in the Local Plan for that neighbourhood, where they are in conflict. Local planning authorities should avoid duplicating planning processes for non-strategic policies where a neighbourhood plan is in preparation.

Principles adopted in identifying strategic policies

For a policy to be strategic it should:-

Deal with one of the elements identified from NPPF para 156 listed A-E above, and:

Apply generally across the district either to deliver spatially significant land use outcomes (as opposed to the form of development) or have a significant, district-wide impact upon one of the elements A-E.

In addition the policies that apply directly to a strategic site (SS3-6) are strategic policies.

Consequently policies are considered to be strategic under the following aspects.

Primary Strategic Aspects of the Plan:

1. Delivers spatially significant land use outcomes
2. Has a significant and strategic, district-wide impact
3. Strategic site

Secondary Strategic Aspects of the Plan:

- A. The homes and jobs needed in the area
- B. The provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development
- C. The provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat)
- D. The provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities
- E. Climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape

SUBMISSION DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICIES – Strategic Policy determination

Policy Number (Strategic)	Policy Title	Primary Strategic Aspects (If any)	Secondary Strategic Aspects (if any)
Chapter 4: Spatial Strategy			
SS1 (S)	Sustainable Development	1	A, B, C, D, E
SS2 (S)	Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development	1	A, B, C, D, E
SS3 (S)	The Avenue	3	-
SS4 (S)	Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross	3	-
SS5 (S)	Markham Vale	3	-
SS6 (S)	Coalite Priority Regeneration Area	3	-
SS7 (S)	Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits	2	A, B
SS8 (S)	Development in Small Villages and Hamlets	2	A, B, E
SS9 (S)	Development in the Countryside	1	A, B, E
SS10 (S)	North East Derbyshire Green Belt	1	A, B, E
SS11 (S)	Local Settlement Gaps	1	A, E
Chapter 5: Living Communities			
LC1 (S)	Housing Allocations	1, 2	A
LC2 (S)	Affordable Housing	2	A
LC3	Exception Sites for Affordable Housing	-	-
LC4	Type and Mix of Housing	-	-
LC5	Residential Extensions	-	-

LC6	Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings in the Countryside	-	-
LC7	Removal of Agricultural and Other Occupancy Conditions	-	-
LC8 (S)	Provision for Traveller Sites	1	A
Chapter 6: Working Communities and Economic Development			
WC1 (S)	Dronfield Regeneration Area	1	B
WC2 (S)	Principal Protected Employment Areas	1, 2	B
WC3 (S)	Employment Areas	1, 2	B
WC4 (S)	Development on Employment Land	-	-
WC5 (S)	Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Uses	1	B, D
WC6 (S)	Visitor Economy & Tourism Development in the Countryside	2	B, E
WC7 (S)	Tourist Accommodation in the Countryside	2	E
Chapter 7: Sustainable Places			
SP1	Dronfield	-	-
SP2	Clay Cross	-	-
SP3	Eckington	-	-
SP4	Killamarsh	-	-
Chapter 8: Sustainable Development & Communities			
SDC1	Re-use of Building in the Green Belt and Countryside	-	-
SDC2	Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows	-	-
SDC3	Landscape Character	-	-
SDC4	Biodiversity and Geodiversity	-	-
SDC5	Development within Conservation Areas	-	-

SDC6	Development Affecting Listed Buildings	-	-
SDC7	Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology	-	-
SDC8	Registered Parks and Gardens	-	-
SDC9	Non-designated Local Heritage Assets	-	-
SDC10 (S)	Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation	2	E
SDC11 (S)	Flood Risk and Drainage	2	E
SDC12	High quality Design and Place-Making	-	-
SDC13 (S)	Environmental Quality	2	E
SDC14	Land potentially affected by Contamination or Instability	-	-
SDC15	Development near Hazardous Uses	-	-
Chapter 9: Infrastructure & Delivery			
ID1 (S)	Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions	2	D
ID2 (S)	Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure	2	D
ID3 (S)	Sustainable Travel	2	D, E
ID4	New Social Infrastructure	-	-
ID5	Loss of Existing Social Infrastructure	-	-
ID6 (S)	Green Infrastructure	2	E
ID7 (S)	Greenways and Public Rights of Way	2	E
ID8	Chesterfield Canal	2	C, D
ID9 (S)	Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities	2	B, D, E