MATTER 7

Appropriate Provision for New Infrastructure
Main Matter 7 – Whether or not the plan makes appropriate provision for new infrastructure to support the level of new development proposed (Policies ID1 – ID9)

Question 7.1
Does the Infrastructure Study and Delivery Plan (IDP) (EB IV1) contain the full range of infrastructure necessary to support the development proposed in the plan?

Council’s Response:
7.1.1 Yes, the council considers the Infrastructure Study and Delivery Plan (IDP) (EB-IV1) sets out the full range of physical, social and green infrastructure required to underpin the development proposed in the Local Plan. The detailed scope of the IDP in terms of the infrastructure themes covered is laid out in Table 2 on page 11. The IDP provides evidence on the scale and cost, where known, of the infrastructure requirements that will be required to meet the demands generated by planned development to 2034.

7.1.2 As stated in the IDP, infrastructure is categorised as either critical, essential or place-making. Critical infrastructure is defined as infrastructure that is time-critical to ensuring Local Plan growth can be unlocked whereas essential infrastructure is defined as that necessary to support new development, but where the precise timing for delivery is less-critical. Place-shaping infrastructure is typically those projects that are required to achieve good place-making.

7.1.3 Chapter 15 of the IDP collates a potential pipeline of infrastructure schemes at varying scales by infrastructure type into a schedule of infrastructure delivery. Table 71 on page 202 identifies critical infrastructure as highway improvements along the A61 corridor including the new roundabout junction which forms the second principal access to The Avenue allocation (Policy SS3). Other junction improvements, healthcare, and school place provision are identified as essential infrastructure. This includes the new schools which form part of the comprehensive development of the Avenue allocation (Policy SS3) and the Coalite regeneration area (Policy SS6). In addition, open space, footways, cycleways including new and extended multi-user Greenways across the District are identified as place-making infrastructure that is required as necessary to achieve good-place making.

Question 7.2
Is Policy ID1 justified, effective and clear in terms of the contributions that will be sought towards strategic and local new and improved infrastructure necessary to support the development in the NEDLP? How will strategic and local infrastructure improvements be funded?

Council’s Response:
7.2.1 Yes, the council consider that policy ID1, ‘Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions’ is justified and clear and will be effective in its
provision for ensuring that the necessary physical, social and green infrastructure to support development is secured.

7.2.2 The policy draws on a range of evidence in looking at the potential implications of the Local Plan development principally the IDP (EB-IV1), but also other specific evidence in relation to transport infrastructure (EB-TRA1, TRA5-7), open space (EB-OS1 & EB-OS2) and green infrastructure (EB-IV3).

7.2.3 The policy provides an overarching policy to the Plan on the issue of infrastructure provision and is the one policy that specifically sets out that proposed development should be supported by the appropriate infrastructure and identifies developer contributions. As such, the council consider this to be a sound approach when taken in conjunction with all other policies in the Plan including policies ID2 to ID9, as well as the IDP.

7.2.4 As one of the key infrastructure providers in the district, the County Council fully supports the policy approach as set out in Policy ID1 insofar as it is broadly consistent with its own approach to seeking developer contributions for necessary transport and education provision.

7.2.5 The IDP (EB-IV1) identifies (where known) who will deliver the infrastructure scheme, how it is proposed to be funded, the cost of the scheme, any funding gap and the timeframe for delivery. As referenced in Table 71 of the IDP (EB-IV1) a key means to deliver the necessary infrastructure to support the development proposed in the Local Plan will be through developer contributions as set out in Policy ID1: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.

7.2.6 Where new housing development would give rise to the need for the delivery of new or improved local infrastructure such as road junctions, schools and open space the council will look to developers to fund the full cost of additional facilities as required.

7.2.7 For strategic infrastructure items which may not always be directly attributable to a particular site(s) it is anticipated that other complementary infrastructure funding sources will be looked towards to deliver the necessary infrastructure. This includes the Local Growth Fund, Local Transport Funding, Education Agency Funding and the Football Association Pitch Improvement Programme, for example. In this regard, the strategic transport infrastructure along the A61 corridor that is identified as critical to support the development proposed in the Local plan is mostly funded with monies having already been secured from the Local Growth Fund. The recent County Council cabinet report dated 11th October 2018 provides further details on this including the anticipated A61 Growth Corridor financial profile and delivery programme (see https://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/site-elements/documents/pdf/council/meetings-decisions/meetings/cabinet/11-10-2018-investment-strategy-and-acceptance-of-grant-for-a61-growth-corridor.pdf)
Issue - Will the plan be effective in reducing the need to travel and what effect will providing for new jobs and 6600 new homes have on the capacity and operation of the strategic and local road network?

Question 7.3
Will Policy ID3 be effective in reducing the need to travel and encouraging sustainable modes of transport to reduce the impact of road travel and is it consistent with national policy?

Council’s Response:
7.3.1 Yes, the council consider that Policy ID3, ‘Sustainable Travel’ will be effective in its provision to maximise sustainable travel opportunities using public transport, walking and cycling in order to achieve the mutually beneficial aims of reducing reliance on the private car and promoting active lifestyles. This in turn will have positive consequential effects for improving air quality, health outcomes and the quality of life for people living and working in the District.

7.3.2 Part 2 of the policy sets out that major development proposals should, through the location and design of new development, promote sustainable modes of travel through the following measures:

a. Site specific and area wide demand management measures including active travel planning, such as promoting car clubs and provision of car share spaces so to reduce the demand for travel by private car;
b. Improvements to existing pedestrian, cycle and public transport services and facilities, and provision of new walking and cycling routes. New routes should be permeable for all users and provide direct links to new or existing footpaths, cycling networks, and local facilities;
c. Optimisation of the existing highway network to prioritise walking, cycling, public transport and other forms of sustainable travel such as measures to prioritise the need for pedestrians above the car, and improved cycle and bus lanes, and charging infrastructure for electric vehicles for example.

7.3.3 These measures are consistent with Section 4 and the penultimate core planning principle listed in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2012 (NPPF). Criterion a. is in conformity with paragraphs 35 and 36 of the NPPF, which seeks to exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes include through travel plans. Criteria b. and c. are in conformity with paragraph 35 of the NPPF, which seeks to ensure that priority is given to pedestrians and cyclists and creates safe and secure layouts which minimise conflict between traffic, cyclists and pedestrians.

7.3.4 Part 3 of the policy expects that highway capacity enhancements will be considered as a last resort for dealing with any residual car demand arising from new developments. This is in conformity with paragraph 29 of the NPPF which states that the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel.
7.3.5 In response to representations to the Plan suggesting that the policy wording should include reference to transport assessments, fully reflect the position in paragraph 32 of the NPPF, and should not include non-mandatory requirements as advised in paragraph 154 of the NPPF, (Rep IDs 7937, 7817, 7938 & 8079) it is considered that amendments could be made to Policy ID3 and the supporting text (see Council’s Response to Specific Suggestions for Change - edited (ED7).) This would provide clarity to Policy ID3 and aid its implementation.

**Question 7.4**

Is Policy ID2 justified in terms of requiring contributions to all the schemes listed and should it include reference to the M1 junctions?

**Council’s Response:**

7.4.1. The improvements to transport infrastructure listed in Policy ID2 are justified. The schemes in Part 2 a, b, & c have all been identified through working in close collaboration with both Derbyshire County Council and Highways England to ensure the impact on the road network of the proposed development in the Local Plan is satisfactorily addressed (see the Council’s response to Main Matter 7, Question 7.5).

7.4.2. In addition, the other transport projects anticipated in Part 2 d. relate to a range of complementary sustainable transport measures including strategic walking and cycling routes that take forward proposals included within the Council’s Regeneration Frameworks for Clay Cross, Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh (CD-CSF6 – 9) as referred to in Policies SP1 to 4 of the Plan.

7.4.3. It should however be noted that Policy ID2 is deliberately prefaced by the words ‘where justified’ such that the requirement for contributions to all of the schemes listed will still need to be fully considered and demonstrated through the development management process as and when individual planning applications are submitted.

7.4.4. Through the formal consultation stage on the Publication Draft Plan the County Council in its role as Local Highway Authority has fully supported the approach in Policy ID2 as appropriately reflecting the outcomes of the evidence base. In addition, whilst Highways England broadly supports the Policy ID2 it recommends wording changes to include specific reference to justification being through ‘transport assessments’, and related to the M1 motorway ‘junctions’.

7.4.5. The council would accept both of the changes to Policy ID2 as recommended by Highways England (Rep ID 7937) (see Council’s Response to Specific Suggestions for Change - edited (ED7).)
Question 7.5
What is the likely effect of the proposed scale and distribution of development on the strategic and local highway network and traffic levels, in particular:

• M1 J29a & 30 and surrounding road network;
• A61 corridor

Council’s Response:
7.5.1. The likely effect of the proposed development in the Local Plan on the strategic and local highway network has been investigated at various stages in the preparation of the Local Plan including extensive transport modelling work since 2010 utilising the North Derbyshire ‘SATURN’ model to assess the cumulative traffic impacts of development across the North Derbyshire area. (EB-TRA1a-e, EB-TR4 & EB-TR5a-b).

7.5.2. This work has shown that pressure on the A61 through the southern part of the district will increase as a result of the development proposed in the Local Plan, with increased trips in this area over and above that already assessed to be approximately 25% in both the AM and PM peak hour (EB-TRA7, paragraph 4.7.4).

7.5.3. In the northern part of the district, the evidence highlights that there may be a need to consider mitigation measures at two locations at Dronfield, namely the B6057 Green Lane / Callywhite Lane junction in the centre of the town, and the Approaches to the A61 Bowshaw Roundabout to the north.

7.5.4. The B6057 Green Lane / Callywhite Lane junction comprises a mini-roundabout and priority T-junction in close proximity where increase in traffic of 37% and 30% in the AM and PM peaks are forecast. With increased volumes of traffic, analysis concludes that there is risk that the B6057 Green Lane / Callywhite Lane junction may become unbalanced leading to some queues on some arms during peak hours (EB-TRA7, paragraph 5.4.4 & 5.4.5).

7.5.5. The A61 Bowshaw Roundabout is a conventional roundabout junction. It is anticipated that trips on the arm leading to Dronfield would increase by about 10%, and trips on the A61 by about 27%, and that this could lead to congestion issues in this location (EB-TRA7, paragraph 5.4.6).

7.5.6. On other roads in the district, although the result of planned development will be some increases in traffic, the analysis found that such impacts would be likely to be limited, or could be satisfactorily addressed through the travel planning and transport assessment process as and when individual developments come forward through the development management process, (EB-TRA7, Table 5.1).

7.5.7 In regard to M1 J29a which is adjacent to the Markham Employment Growth Zone, this junction was subject to detailed study in 2014 (EB-TRA5) using a development scenario that included ‘committed developments’ and ‘potential
developments’, and the then latest information about build-out of Markham Vale. Although this evidence highlighted queues would form in the development scenario it concluded that it may be possible to make capacity enhancing modifications to address traffic impacts.

7.5.8 In response to the Publication Draft Plan, Highways England are content that the need for any mitigation is considered and, if necessary, brought forward as and when individual developments which may impact on M1 J29a are determined through the planning application process.

7.5.9 In regard to Junction 30 and the nearby Treble Bob junction, there are issues over the cumulative impact of development across the North Derbyshire Area particularly from development in neighbouring Bolsover. However, the impacts of the proposed development in the NED Local Plan are limited. They are generated from the relatively small quantum of development planned in Killamarsh and Eckington, and do not on their own necessitate the need for improvements to M1 junction 30. The council has together with Highways England, Derbyshire County Council, Chesterfield Borough Council, Bolsover District Council, and Bassetlaw District Council entered into a Statement of Common Ground to this effect (ED16).

Question 7.6  
What other specific improvements to the highway network are proposed or will be required? Have the necessary highway improvements been identified in the plan and the IDP including timing/phasing where necessary?

Council’s Response:

7.6.1 In addition to the schemes listed in Policy ID2: Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure, there are two other specific improvements to the highway network proposed in the Plan associated with the allocations at Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate, Dronfield (policy WC1); and the former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross (policy SS4). These are identified in the Plan as follows:

Policy SP1: Dronfield
6. a. A new link road between the eastern end of Callywhite Lane and Chesterfield Road;

Policy SS4: Former Biwaters Site (Egstow Park)
g. A through road from the A61 to Furnace Hill/A6175

7.6.2 In terms of the mechanism and timing for delivery, the Council’s Infrastructure Study and Delivery Plan (EB-IV1) sets this out as follows for the Dronfield scheme:

Essential project – Callywhite Lane Access: New Link Road (T11)
- Delivery Partners: Private Developers
- Cost: Unknown
- Phasing: 10 – 15 years
7.6.3 As stated in 7.6.2 above, the provision of a new link road to fully unlock the development proposed at Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate is identified as a longer term project. The reason for this is that full development of the site and associated new link road is tied up with electrification of this section of the Midland Mainline to facilitate HS2 Phase 2b. It is expected that these works which will involve replacement bridges across the railway line will open up the opportunity for a second access to the site from Chesterfield Road. The timeline for HS2 Phase 2b is that the main civils construction works are set to commence early 2024 with first passengers travelling on full HS2 services by late 2033. Although costs are unknown at this stage, there is the opportunity to maximise cost efficiencies through the delivery of both infrastructure projects at the same time in the later phase of the plan period.

7.6.4 In relation to the former Biwaters Site at Clay Cross, the scheme is already underway through the initial phases of the development of the site, and as such has not been included in the IDP. However, it is expected that this developer-led and funded scheme will be developed to tie in with the build out of ‘Egston Park’ due to be complete in 2033/34.

Question 7.7
How will the proposals for High Speed Rail HS2 affect the plan area? What other proposals are in the plan to increase travel by rail and will they be effective?

Council’s Response:
7.7.1. The Government’s latest route alignment and safeguarding directions for Phase 2b of HS2 issued on 17 July 2017 show that the route marginally affects the Plan area to the east of Killamarsh in the north of the district, and to the east of Long Duckmanton in the south. A connection is also proposed into the existing rail network with a link to the Midland Mainline which runs to the east of Stonebroom and Morton, as shown on the Policies Maps (SubD2c & SubD2e).

7.7.2. The route of HS2 generally affects countryside locations on the eastern edge of the Plan area. However, the latest route alignment also impacts upon the identified Coalite Priority Regeneration Area in that it cuts through the eastern end of the site compromising the implementation of the approved housing scheme in North East Derbyshire. Paragraphs 4.50 to 4.54 of the Publication Draft Plan (SubD1) together with the Statement of Common Ground for Policy SS6: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area (ED17) confirm that a revised scheme will be required for the site.

7.7.3. In addition to HS2, the Plan includes criteria in Policy SP1: Dronfield aimed at increasing travel by rail. Part 5. a. of policy SP1 is supportive towards proposals that maximise the opportunities for improving access to Dronfield railway station. Part 6. a. of policy SP1 earmarks two new strategic pedestrian and cycle routes seeking to create better links between residential areas, the railway station and the town centre. Part 6. c. of policy SP1 also
proposes the extension of the existing car park at Dronfield railway station. All of these projects are included in the schedule of infrastructure delivery in the IPD – see projects T18, T19 & T21 in Table 71 of the IDP (EB-IV1).

7.7.4. Whilst there are currently no plans for a railway station at Clay Cross the policy SS4: Former Biwaters Site seeks to ensure that the development of the site does not preclude pedestrian and vehicular access to a station outside of the site should this come forward in the future.

7.7.5. In the light of the above, and together with Policy ID3: Sustainable Travel (see Q7.3) it is considered the plan will be effective in terms of maximising the opportunities for people to travel by rail.

Question 7.8
Do the IDP and the plan make adequate provision for primary and secondary education facilities to meet the needs arising from the housing growth proposed over the plan period? Should ‘notified sites’ be identified on the Policies Maps?

Council’s Response:

7.8.1 Table 76 of the IDP (EB-IV1) lists the primary and secondary phase education infrastructure priorities in response to the development proposed in the Local Plan. This includes two schemes for new primary schools at The Avenue, Wingerworth (ref: E2, Table 76), and the former Coalite Site, Long Duckmanton (ref: E3, Table 76), as well as the project to refurbish the Heath Primary School earmarked under the Priority Schools Building Programme (ref: E4, Table 76).

7.8.2 The Local Plan then includes a specific requirement for a new primary school within criterion d. of Policy SS3 - The Avenue Strategic Site Allocation. In response to representations regarding the mix of uses on the site, and to tie in with the IDP (EB-IV1), the Council would also accept it is appropriate to include specific reference to a new primary school within Policy SS6 relating to the Coalite Priority Regeneration Area (see Schedule of Proposed Modifications (Pre-Hearing)).

7.8.3 In addition, in anticipation of the need to provide additional school places where capacity issues may arise, the IDP (EB-IV1) includes other potential projects at unnamed primary and secondary phase schools across the district (ref: E6 & E7, Table 76).

7.8.4 As a consequence, the Local Plan includes Policy ID1 dealing with infrastructure delivery and developer contributions. This policy expects development to provide new or improved education facilities on site, or make the necessary financial contribution towards off-site provision where this is required to mitigate the impact of proposed development on school places. It should be noted that the County Council fully supports Policy ID1 and its approach to continue to use S106 agreements as the main source of seeking
developer contributions towards new infrastructure particularly school place provision.

7.8.5 As stated in section 9.5.2 of the IDP (EB-IV1), the County Council will seek such financial contributions in line with the thresholds and at the levels as set out in its latest Developer Contributions Protocol. In order to deliver the additional capacity the County Council will seek to use contributions to better utilise existing school accommodation. However, where it is not possible to reconfigure or expand existing schools the County Council will advise that a new school is required. With the exception of schools in 7.8.1 above, the County Council has raised no particular issues through the various formal consultation stages on the Local Plan and the preparation of the IDP regarding the need to provide new schools to accommodate the demand for school places arising from the proposed growth in the Local Plan.

7.8.6 Since the publication of the IDP (EB-IV1), the Council has further engaged with Derbyshire County Council on the issue of school place capacity taking account of the latest January 2018 school place projections. This work has informed an updated joint position on the education strategy in response to the development proposed in the Local Plan, as attached at Appendix 1. The focus for this position statement is the Level 1 towns and Strategic Sites as these are the locations where most new housing development is planned, and where practically all of the housing allocations without planning permission are located, and so where the educational demands still need to be addressed.

7.8.7 DCC has formally notified to the District Council the following sites within the District which they wish to safeguard for either future expansion of the existing school, or the provision of a new school or playing field.

i. Land at Renishaw Primary School, Renishaw
ii. Land at Lansbury Avenue, Pilsley
iii. Land at Mickley Infant School, Mickley, Stretton
iv. Land at Unstone Junior School, Unstone

7.8.8 In response to DCC’s request the council would accept it is appropriate to identify and safeguard the above sites as shown for education purposes on the Policies Maps linked to a new policy and text in Chapter 9 – see Appendix 2.
**Question 7.9**

**Have any necessary improvements to waste water treatment infrastructure been included in the IDP and the relevant site allocations where appropriate? Are the Yorkshire Water wastewater assessment results now available?**

**Council’s Response:**

7.9.1 Yorkshire Water (YW) operates and maintains the majority of the wastewater network for the District, whilst Severn Trent Water (STW) provides wastewater services for the south of the district.

7.9.2 Through the work on the IDP (EB-IV1), STW undertook a desktop assessment of the network constraints and connectivity for foul and surface water, and of the potential impacts of the Local Plan development on sewerage infrastructure. The full results of the assessment can be found in the IDP in Appendix 6, and are summarised in Table 15, on page 53 (EB-IV1).

7.9.3 The assessment highlights issues with past pollution events occurring at Westwood Brook and Clay Cross Sewage Treatment Works and the Shirland Sewage Pumping Station (SPS), and identifies the development in the Local Plan (namely at Clay Cross, Morton, Stonebroom, and Shirland) as having ‘low’ or ‘medium’ potential impacts on sewerage infrastructure.

7.9.4 As stated in the IDP (EB-IV1), STW are continuing to undertake works to prevent these pollution events at the sewage treatment works occurring into the future. In addition, it is understood that any necessary further improvement works to waste water treatment works (WwTW’s) will be programmed by STW through the investment periods within Asset Management Plans.

7.9.5 As such, the IDP under reference U2 in Table 72, Section 15.3 includes wastewater capacity at Shirland (SPS) as a potential scheme for the medium term (i.e. within AMP period 2021-2025) should STW determine through subsequent hydraulic modelling that such improvements are required.

7.9.6 It should however be noted that STW has made no specific representations through the formal stages of consultation regarding the proposed housing sites at Shirland. In addition, STW raised no objection to the proposals for housing on these allocated sites in relation to the planning applications submitted to and approved by the Council (planning application refs: 12/00273/OL & 17/01033/OL).

7.9.7 As part of the infrastructure planning work to support the Local Plan, the Council has also engaged with YW regarding the impact of the proposed development in the Local Plan on its WwTW’s.

7.9.8 At the time of writing the IDP (EB-IV1), the results of YW’s detailed modelling were awaited. Since then, the Council has sought further update from YW on this issue. Extract from YW’s e-mail response dated 27th September 2018 is as follows:
“The mathematical modelling for the drainage area plan for the “Chesterfield” area (that includes for NE Derbyshire) has now been completed and verified. It is now being analysed with regard to future “needs” but it is not yet available. I understand it is in effect just “numbers”. The model does include for new development i.e. that which has planning permission and/or is included the local plan information that was available when the modelling work began.

Similarly we are currently assessing what upgrades will be required regarding waste water treatment in term of both growth and water quality requirements. The treatment works that primarily serve the NE Derbyshire are Staveley, Woodhouse Mill and Old Whittington all of which are likely to be subject to works to ensure compliance with revised water quality standards. Growth, as appropriate, will be included in the design of the required engineering works as appropriate.

Note that any major improvements to infrastructure are not planned until post 2020 i.e in “AMP” (Asset Management Plan) 7.

7.9.9 On this basis, it is expected that planned growth over the current investment period of Asset Management Plan 6 (2015-2020) can be accommodated by the existing facilities including the Staveley WwTW’s. Beyond this, based on the expected trajectory to 2034, it is expected that planned future upgrades within Asset Management Plan 7 (2021-2025) and beyond will ensure that sufficient capacity will exist.

Question 7.10
Have any additions to the Greenways been identified in the IDP in conjunction with Derbyshire County Council and how will these be funded and delivered? Is Policy ID7 effective and positively prepared in relation to new greenways?

Council’s Response:
7.10.1 Through the preparation of the Local Plan and the supporting IDP (EB-IV1) the council has engaged with Derbyshire County Council to identify possible opportunities to improve the Greenways network across the district. Table 67 lists these opportunities which in turn are shown on the Policies Maps and linked to Policy ID7: Greenways and Public Rights of Way.

7.10.2 Where development proposals provide the opportunity to improve the Greenway network the council will expect the developer to make provision for new routes on-site and link to existing routes where appropriate in line with Part 3. a. & b. of Policy ID6: Green infrastructure, and Part 2. b. of Policy SDC12: High Quality Design and Place-Making. One such example of this is in relation to the housing allocation CC3: Land off Holmgate Road where a new Greenway through the site is expected as part of the development. In addition, the council may seek developer contributions towards off-site improvements where practicable to do so, such as in relation to the major new
Greenway proposed around the western edge of Killamarsh – Part 5. f. of Policy SP4: Killamarsh.

7.10.3 In addition, working with Derbyshire County Council the council will aim to explore other options for funding improvements to the Greenways network such as through Government grants, lottery funding, and LEP funding as may become available during the plan period, as is referred to in project OS7: Greenways, and Section 14.6 of the IDP (EB-IV1).

**Question 7.11**

*Is the approach in Policy ID8 to safeguard the original and western alternative route for the Chesterfield canal justified?*

**Council’s Response:**

7.11.1 The Council considers that it is appropriate and fully justified to safeguard both the original and the western alternative route for the Chesterfield Canal through Policy ID8 in the Publication Draft Local Plan. The policy approach supports the aims of the Chesterfield Canal Partnership (CCP) which is made up of a range of partners including North East Derbyshire District Council, other councils and stakeholders (see paragraph 9.75 of the Publication Draft Plan SubD1). The primary objective of the CCP is to champion and co-ordinate the preservation, restoration, and sustainable development of the Chesterfield Canal for its historical, ecological and recreational value and for its potential to attract tourism and business development (see the CCP Constitution: EB-IV4).

7.11.2 Much progress has been made with restoration, the canal towpath offers a popular walking route along the entire 46 mile length. Since 1989, 12 miles of the canal have been restored along with 37 locks and 11 bridges; and 2 new marinas have been built. There are less than 9 miles left to restore and detailed plans already exist for every bridge, lock and aqueduct on this stretch.

7.11.3 Within North East Derbyshire a section of the original route of the Canal through Killamarsh was built upon in the 1970’s preventing restoration of a wider section of the original route through the town (see section coloured black and marked ‘E’ on Figure 1 below). Whilst it is not possible to return the original canal route to full navigation in this section, it is important to retain and protect the line of the original canal route for its historical and recreational significance. This is in line with the wider objectives of the CCP (as set out in the Introduction to Next Navigation East: EB-IV5) and objectives D10 Heritage Assets, D11, Natural Assets and N2 Countryside Recreation of the Publication Draft Local Plan.

7.11.4 To address the issue of a link through Killamarsh, in 2004 the CCP commissioned a study to identify and consult upon alternative routes through Killamarsh. The study (undertaken by Jacobs Babtie: EB-IV6) identified six potential routes through the town centre, of which two options were
shortlisted, the ‘central line west’ and ‘central line east’. The latter was preferred by the community (section coloured red and marked ‘F’ on Figure 1 below) and was safeguarded in the 2005 Local Plan (CD-CSF5).

7.11.5 Since 2005 further investigative work has identified significant engineering problems with the ‘central line east’ route. In 2012 the planned re-development of an area of council housing known as the Tarran Bungalows provided the opportunity for the CCP to consider again the western alternative route which passes through the Tarran Bungalows site (see route coloured green and marked ‘N’ on Figure 1); offering a route that is lower cost than ‘central line east’ and providing an attractive setting enabling boats to stop in the town.

7.11.6 In June 2017, the CCP undertook local consultation on the route options and the public expressed a clear preference for the western alternative route. In turn, at the Executive Steering Group Meeting of the Chesterfield Canal Partnership the resolution to support the proposed western canal route in Killamarsh was unanimously agreed and the CCP requested the Council to safeguard the revised alternative route within the new Local Plan (see EB-IV7).

7.11.7 It important to note that the restoration of the Canal is a long term project and whilst it is unlikely that the canal will be restored to full navigation in Killamarsh within the plan period, elements of the scheme could come forward where opportunities arise. Such as for example, the Tarran Bungalows redevelopment which has been designed around the canal corridor which will be maintained as open space until it is linked to other sections and capable of holding water. It is therefore considered both essential and fully justifiable to safeguard the preferred alternative route to ensure it can be delivered in the future. Failure to protect the route would undermine the wider canal restoration and be contrary to the agreed aims of the CCP.

7.11.8 Policy ID8 has attracted only supporting comments through consultation and is considered to be appropriate in principle. However, the Council would accept that changes could be made to improve the policy by adding text to actively seek enhancement/restoration of the canal where new development is proposed/permited on or adjacent to it (as suggested in rep ID 7153 Chesterfield Borough Council). Rep ID 7153, but would accept changes to the policy wording. The wording of the suggested change to the Plan in this regard is set out in the Schedule of Proposed Modifications (Pre-Hearing).

7.11.9 In addition, up to date plans have been provided by Derbyshire County Council detailing the extent of land that is required for the canal corridor through the District (ED20). The Council intends to update the Policies Maps to reflect this.
Question 7.12
Is Policy ID9 based on robust evidence and are the designations on the Policies Maps justified? Are any modifications necessary for soundness?

Council’s Response:
Robust evidence & designations
7.12.1 The Council believes that Policy ID9: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities is based on robust and up-to-date evidence as follows:

- Recreation Research Report, Main Report, September 2017 and ward based analysis (EB-OS1)
- Playing Pitch Strategy, Assessment Report, January 2017 (EB-OS3a)
- Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy and Action Plan 2016 - 2033, April 2017 (EB-OS4a)
- Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy, Assessment Report, March 2017 (EB-OS4b)

7.12.2 The Recreation Survey provides a comprehensive evidence base on urban green space, recreations sites and allotments throughout the district to support the open space and recreation policies in the Local Plan. The research comprises both, a local needs assessment and a recreation audit. The audit provides the council’s latest assessment of all existing open space.
and recreation facilities in North East Derbyshire and updates the survey’s undertaken in 2005/06 and 2012).

7.12.3 The Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy (ES-OS4a & ES-OS4b) which are both based on detailed assessment reports, provide a strategic framework for the maintenance and improvement of existing playing pitches and indoor sport facilities over the next five years. Both strategies have been prepared in line with Sport’s England guidance, namely Sport England’s Playing Pitch Strategy Guidance and the Sport England guidance ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities for Indoor and Outdoor Sport Facilities’. Sport England has been closely involved in the preparation of this evidence and fully supports them as providing a robust evidence base to underpin the Policy ID9: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities.

7.12.4 The Council considers that the open space designations as shown on the Policies Maps are justified by the evidence base and will serve to protect urban green space, recreation sites and allotments as well as formal sport sites as appropriate through the planning application process.

Modifications to Policy ID9

7.12.5 Whilst Sport England generally support the Plan, they did raise objections to Policy ID9 and its explanatory text (Rep ID 7719) during at the Publication Draft Plan stage and suggested changes to the wording of the policy, its supporting text and Appendix C of the Plan regarding cost calculations. In particular, they consider that greater clarity is required as to how the use of the Playing Pitch Demand Calculator would operate alongside the financial contributions listed in Appendix C and the Accessibility Standard in Table 9.2 of the Publication Draft Local Plan.

7.12.6 The Council’s response is set out in the Council’s Response to Specific Suggestions for Change, Part 4 (Chapter 9, ED6D). In summary, the Council acknowledges that both Policy ID9 and the explanatory text need to reflect the different approaches taken for urban green space, recreation sites and allotments on the one side and formal sport sites on the other as they are based on different evidence base documents and analysis.

7.12.7 Whilst urban green space, recreation sites and allotments were assessed through the Council’s Recreation Study (EB-OS1) and local standards apply, formal sport sites were assessed through the Playing Pitch Strategy (EB-OS3b) and Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy (EB-OS4a). Therefore, the Council proposes splitting those elements into two different sections within both the explanatory text and Policy ID9. This means that the local standards and calculations of financial contributions in Appendix C of the Local Plan will apply to urban green space, recreation sites and allotments only whereas formal sport sites will be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy (EB-OS3b) and contributions will be calculated by the Playing Pitch Demand Calculator.

7.12.8 Through discussion Sport England have indicated that they are content that this approach would address the concerns they have raised through their
representations to Policy ID9: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities, and Appendix C of the Publication Draft Local Plan. This agreement is currently being formalised through the preparation of a joint Statement of Common Ground between the Council and Sport England.
### Appendix 1 to Q7.8 – Joint Position Statement of North East Derbyshire District Council & Derbyshire County Council

#### Clay Cross

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LP Ref:</th>
<th>Planning App Ref:</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Nos. of Dw reflecting emerging LP or with permission</th>
<th>Local Plan Trajectory</th>
<th>Normal Area School</th>
<th>Net Cap</th>
<th>NOR</th>
<th>5 yr Proj.</th>
<th>Additional Demand for Places</th>
<th>Capacity of School to accommodate additional pupils</th>
<th>Ability of Normal Area School to Expand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 completed in 2017/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharley Park Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 5 yr – 316 dw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10 yr – 250 dw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 15 yr – 249 dw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharley Park Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS4</td>
<td>17/00666/OL</td>
<td>Former Biwater Strategic Site</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>10 completed in 2017/18</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Insufficient capacity</td>
<td>Yes (see overview below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Land at Stretton Rd</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11 to 15 yr – 120 dw</td>
<td>Shapley Park Primary</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Insufficient capacity</td>
<td>Yes (see overview below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Land north of Clay Ln</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 to 5 yr – 15 dw</td>
<td>Holmgate Primary</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sufficient capacity</td>
<td>No mitigation required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CC3  n/a  Land off Holmgate Rd  15  11 to 15 yr. – 15 dw  Holmgate Primary  240  214  203  3  Sufficient capacity  No mitigation required.

CC4  n/a  Land at Broadleys  10  11 to 15 yr. – 10 dw  Sharley Park Primary  420  405  417  2  Insufficient capacity  Yes (see overview below)

**Secondary Phase**

SS4  CC1  CC2  CC3  CC4  As above  Former Biwater Strategic Site; Land at Stretton Rd; Land north of Clay Ln; Land off Holmgate Rd; Land at Broadleys  995  As above  Tupton Hall School  1849  1533  1595  150 plus 60 post-16  Insufficient capacity (including other committed development)  Yes (see overview below)

**Overview:**

**Primary Phase**

The cumulative effect of development at Clay Cross proposed in the draft Local Plan generates the need to provide for an additional 199 primary school places.

Within the Clay Cross/Danesmoor/Lower Pilsley primary planning area there are 3 primary schools, namely Holmgate, Park House and Sharley Park Primary Schools. Taking into account current approved planning applications (including the Biwaters site) along with local plan allocations which do not have permission there is a demand for an additional 236 primary places within this planning area, with a projected capacity of 36 places.

Development at the former Biwaters Strategic Site SS4 will generate the bulk of the new demand for additional primary places i.e. over 80%. The development of the site has been granted planning permission but without land reserved within the site for a new primary school or any financial contribution secured towards its provision, contrary to the need identified by the County Council. This was due to the abnormal remediation costs and impact on overall development viability.

In the absence of land and funding for a school to serve the development, Derbyshire County Council is working to secure an alternative strategy to address the education need arising from the former Biwaters Strategic Site. Capacity for expansion across schools within the wider locality will need to be considered. As part of this process options are also being considered for the potential expansion of Sharley Park Primary School. This existing site size is a constraining factor to expansion and an option of expanding onto the site of the former Danesmoor Infant School on the opposite side of Pilsley Road is under consideration. The projected capacity includes figures for Park House Primary School as follows: Net Capacity – 206; NOR – 213; 5yr projection – 210.

---

1 This projected capacity includes figures for Park House Primary School as follows: Net Capacity – 206; NOR – 213; 5yr projection – 210.
consideration. The development of a comprehensive strategy by the County Council to provide school places within this school planning area will also address the need for school places created by sites CC1 and CC4.

Potential sources of funding to expand Sharley Park Primary School will be sought from private developers through developer contributions secured from the development of the land at Stretton Road CC1, and at Broadleys CC4 as well as any other residential developments coming forwards within the area. The costs over and above these contributions however would be borne by the County Council.

The other two sites at Clay Lane, and Holmgate Road, Clay Cross both fall within the normal catchment area of Holmgate Primary School. This school has the capacity to expand to accommodate the limited number of additional pupils generated by these developments. Developer contributions where appropriate would be sought to fund the required number of school places.

Secondary Phase

The cumulative effect of Local Plan housing allocations across Clay Cross generates the need to provide for an additional 150 secondary school places, and 60 post-16 places, 26 secondary and 10 post 16 places being generated by sites not yet permitted. To be added to this is the number of additional places required to accommodate pupils deriving from planning applications approved on non-Local Plan sites in the previous 3 years (166 secondary and 67 post-16, based on 1,104 dwellings). When this is added to the demand generated by the Local Plan this totals a requirement for 316 secondary and 127 post 16 places.

Tupton Hall School has the capacity to expand to accommodate additional growth, and on the basis of current projections and previously approved developments, developer contributions would be required where in line with the 3 tests set out in the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the NPPF 2018 to provide the capacity to accommodate the additional pupils created by future development.
### Dronfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LP Ref:</th>
<th>Planning App Ref:</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Nos. of Dw reflecting emerging LP or with permission</th>
<th>Local Plan Trajectory Dev Dates</th>
<th>Normal Area School</th>
<th>Net Cap</th>
<th>NOR 5 yr Proj.</th>
<th>Additional Demand for Places</th>
<th>Capacity of School to accommodate additional pupils</th>
<th>Ability of Normal Area School to Expand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Land off Shakespeare Cr &amp; Sheffield Rd</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0 to 5 yr – 25 dw 6 to 10 yr – 175 dw 11 to 15 yr – 35 dw</td>
<td>Dronfield Infant</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Insufficient capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dronfield Junior</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Insufficient capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Land North of Eckington Rd</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0 to 5 yr – 25 dw 6 to 10 yr – 175 dw</td>
<td>Holmesdale Infant</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sufficient capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northfield Junior</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sufficient capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stonelow Junior</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Land at Stubley Ln</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0 to 5 yr – 5 dw 6 to 10 yr – 35 dw</td>
<td>Gorsebybrigg Primary</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR1</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Land off Shakespeare Cr &amp; Sheffield Rd; Land North of Eckington Rd;</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Dronfield Henry Fanshawe</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>72 secondary &amp; 29 post-16</td>
<td>Insufficient capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEDDC Local Plan Examination  
Council’s Response to MIQ’s - Matter 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land at Stubley Ln</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Overview:**

**Primary Phase**
The cumulative effect of development at Dronfield proposed in the draft Local Plan totals 475 dwellings which generates the need to provide for an additional 95 primary aged school pupils.

The Dronfield primary planning area consists of 4 infant and 4 junior schools (Dronfield Infant; Holmesdale Infant; Lenthall Infant; Unstone St Mary’s Infant; Dronfield Junior; Northfield Junior; Stonelow Junior; Unstone Junior). There is limited capacity within the local system to accommodate the likely numbers of additional pupils generated by the Local Plan sites and recently approved developments. Where a development falls within the normal area of a school without sufficient capacity and no scope for expansion, contributions would be sought for use at another local school within this or a neighbouring planning area.

DR1 is within the normal area of Dronfield Infant School and Dronfield Junior School which are projected to be at capacity with limited scope for expansion. Minimal expansion and the application of the normal area admission criteria to gradually reduce the number of pupils from the Sheffield conurbation in favour of pupils within the normal area would cater for the modest demand generated by housing allocation DR1.

However, both these schools are unable to expand further due to constrained sites. Should growth in excess of this Local Plan allocation come forwards, capacity at schools other than this normal area school will be assessed. Where necessary contributions would be sought to enable the delivery of school places to accommodate the pupils arising from the development.

Sufficient capacity at the normal area schools of Holmesdale Infant, Northfield Junior, and Stonelow Junior Schools are currently projected to accommodate the pupils arising from DR2.

DR3 falls within the Dronfield Woodhouse primary planning area and the normal area of Gorseybrigg Primary School. There is currently sufficient capacity to accommodate the majority of pupils arising from DR3. On this basis, it is anticipated that a contribution towards the small number of pupil places, in line with DCC’s Developer Contributions Protocol, would be sought in order to expand facilities at Gorseybrigg Primary, which has the ability to expand to provide the additional capacity as required.

**Secondary Phase**
The cumulative effect of development at Dronfield proposed in the draft Local Plan totals 475 dwellings. This generates the need to provide for an additional 72 secondary and 29 Post16 pupils.

Dronfield Henry Fanshawe Secondary School has scope to expand to meet this level of demand and a feasibility study has been undertaken to determine that it is possible to provide an additional teaching block on the site. Developer contributions will be sought from the housing sites proposed in the Local Plan.
## Eckington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LP Ref:</th>
<th>Planning App Ref:</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Nos. of Dw reflecting emerging LP or with permission</th>
<th>Local Plan Trajectory Dev Dates</th>
<th>Normal Area School</th>
<th>Net Cap</th>
<th>NOR 5 yr Proj.</th>
<th>Additional Demand for Places</th>
<th>Capacity of School to accommodate additional pupils</th>
<th>Ability of Normal Area School to Expand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Eckington South</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0 to 5 yr – 15 dw 6 to 10 yr – 175 dw 11 to 15 yr – 210 dw</td>
<td>Shared normal area: Birk Hill Infant Eckington Junior Eckington Camms Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>14/00562 /OL</td>
<td>Land at Staveley Ln</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0 to 5 yr – 90 dw</td>
<td>330 infant 439 junior</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>103 (44 infant 59 junior)</td>
<td>Sufficient capacity</td>
<td>No mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>13/00176 /OL</td>
<td>Bradley Lomas Ltd</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0 to 5 yr – 22 dw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Secondary Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC1</th>
<th>EC2</th>
<th>EC3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The Eckington School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckington South; Land at Staveley Ln; Bradley Lomas Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Sufficient capacity</th>
<th>No mitigation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1453</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>77 secondary &amp; 31 post-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview:**

**Primary Phase**

The cumulative effect of development at Eckington proposed in the draft Local Plan totals 512 dwellings which generates the need to provide for an additional 103 primary aged school pupils.

Derbyshire County Council was consulted on the planning applications for EC2 and EC3 in 2014 and 2013 respectively, with capacity available at the shared normal area schools, no contributions were requested. Current projections indicate that sufficient capacity exists within the local system to accommodate the likely numbers of additional primary-aged pupils generated by the Local Plan sites and recently approved developments.

**Secondary Phase**

Although The Eckington School is close to the Sheffield conurbation, the admissions policy is set under the exceptional rule of Feeder Schools (Greenwich Agreement) in order to favour pupils coming from the 10 Derbyshire primary phase feeder schools. Current projections indicate that sufficient capacity exists within the local system to accommodate the likely numbers of additional secondary and post16 aged pupils generated by the Local Plan sites and recently approved developments.

Should demographic or additional growth come forwards causing the normal area school (The Eckington School) to have insufficient capacity with no further scope for expansion, contributions would be sought for use at other local schools within this or a neighbouring planning area.
### Killamarsh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LP Ref:</th>
<th>Planning App Ref:</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Nos. of Dw reflecting emerging LP or with permission</th>
<th>Local Plan Trajectory Dev Dates</th>
<th>Normal Area School</th>
<th>Net Cap</th>
<th>NOR</th>
<th>5 yr Proj.</th>
<th>Additional Demand for Places</th>
<th>Capacity of School to accommodate additional pupils</th>
<th>Ability of Normal Area School to Expand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KL1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Land at Westhorpe</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0 to 5 yr – 50 dw 6 to 10 yr – 175 dw 11 to 15 yr – 105 dw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Land off R'ham Rd</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6 to 10 yr – 70 dw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL3</td>
<td>16/00216/FL</td>
<td>Land off Primrose Ln</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11 to 15 yr – 30 dw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL4</td>
<td>16/0695/FL pending</td>
<td>Land at 28 Ashley Ln</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11 to 15 yr – 14 dw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL5</td>
<td>07/00865/FL</td>
<td>The Old Station, Station Rd</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 to 5 yr – 14 dw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL6</td>
<td>15/00661/FL</td>
<td>Land off Boiley Ln</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11 to 15 yr – 13 dw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview:

**Primary Phase**
Currently of the 471 dwellings identified on sites KL1 to KL6, 414 dwellings are yet to be approved. Significant capacity exists within the local system at primary level to accommodate the likely numbers of additional pupils generated by the proposed Local Plan allocations and recently approved developments. At primary level, the three schools operate a shared normal area (Killamarsh Infant and Nursery School, Killamarsh Junior School and St Giles Primary School), therefore development are assessed against the combined capacity of these schools.

**Secondary Phase**
The cumulative effect of development at Killamarsh proposed in the draft Local Plan totals 471 dwellings which generates the need to provide for an additional 71 secondary and 29 Post16 pupils.

Although The Eckington School is close to the Sheffield conurbation, the admissions policy is set under the exceptional rule of Feeder Schools (Greenwich Agreement) in order to favour pupils coming from the 10 Derbyshire primary phase feeder schools. Current projections indicate that sufficient capacity exists within the local system to accommodate the likely numbers of additional secondary aged pupils generated by the Local Plan sites and recently approved developments.

Should demographic or additional development pressure come forwards, causing the normal area school to have insufficient capacity with no further scope for expansion, contributions would be sought for use at other local schools within this or a neighbouring planning area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Westhorpe; Land off Rotherham Rd; Land off Primrose Ln; Land at 28 Ashley Ln; The Old Station, Station Rd; Land off Boiley Ln</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Avenue Strategic Site Allocation, Wingerworth – New Primary School

Overview:
Proportionate contributions were sought by Derbyshire County Council from 5 developments on the Avenue site in order to provide a 1 form entry primary school to accommodate the additional growth generated by the predicted development of 1145 dwellings. Shortfalls in some of these Section 106 agreements and a reduction in numbers on site has reduced the income and impacted on the delivery of the primary school. Derbyshire County Council is actively pursuing options for the delivery of the school. Any shortfall in funding is expected to be met from Derbyshire County Council’s Basic Need allocation.
Notified sites for Education

Insert new sub-title, paragraph and policy after para. 9.65 as follows:

Safeguarded land for Education Facilities

Derbyshire County Council has formally notified to the District Council a number of sites within the District which they wish to safeguard for either future expansion of an existing school, or the provision of a new school or playing field.

New Policy IDX: Safeguarded land for Education Facilities

Land is safeguarded as shown on the Policies Map from any development that could prejudice the provision of a new school, expansion of the existing school, or playing field at:-

- Land at Renishaw Primary School, Renishaw
- Land at Lansbury Avenue, Pilsley
- Land at Mickley Infant School, Mickley, Stretton
- Land at Unstone Junior School, Unstone