



AMBER VALLEY LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION:

CLOWES DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Matter 12: General Site Specific Issues

Pegasus Group
4 The Courtyard
Church Street
Lockington
Derbyshire
DE74 2SL

Telephone: (01509) 670806 Facsimile: (01509) 672247

PPG Ref: EMS.2400

Date: May 2018

COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of **Pegasus Group**

Matter 12: General Site Specific Issues

i. Are the allocated sites appropriate and deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure, including highways and education, affordable housing and other facilities, and taking account of environmental constraints?

12.1 This Statement is made on behalf of Clowes Developments Limited in relation to the proposed allocation of land at Cotes Park, Birchwood Lane, Somercotes (ref: Policy HGS2).

12.2 The site is considered to be a suitable and deliverable housing site. An outline application for residential development on the site (ref AVA/2017/0211) was submitted in February 2017. The accompanying Transport Assessment demonstrates that the development can be accommodated on the local highway network. The Highway Authority has commented on the proposals and requested some amendments to the proposed access and indicated that outstanding matters could be dealt with by condition. Clowes Developments will be negotiating an appropriate section 106 agreement to make provision for appropriate infrastructure requirements. The Education Authority has indicated that contributions will be required towards secondary and post 16 education facilities.

12.3 The site formerly had consent for employment development. Issues of any environmental impacts were dealt with and addressed as part of this original application.

ii. Has sufficient regard been paid to infrastructure and flood risk? Are any of the infrastructure providers or the Environment Agency opposed to the principle of the development of any of the allocated sites? If so, should these be deleted from the Plan?

12.4 The site does not fall within an area of flood risk. As part of the application a drainage strategy for the site has been submitted demonstrating how surface water flows can be appropriately balanced.

iii. Has the Highway Authority accepted that the scale and location of development in the Plan would not cause significant problems?

12.5 For the land at Birchwood Lane, the Highway Authority has indicated that remaining issues can be dealt with by condition.

iv. Should the development of brownfield sites be undertaken prior to the use of greenfield sites? If so, how would this be achieved and what would be the implications for housing supply and deliverability?

12.6 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages the effective use of brownfield land, but does not include a sequential approach requiring the development of brownfield sites first. This recognises the need to develop both brownfield and greenfield sites to secure the step-change in housing delivery required to significantly boost housing supply.

12.7 The consultation on Draft Revisions to the NPPF refers to the use of brownfield registers and permission in principle as mechanisms to ensure that as much use as possible is made of previously developed land (para 117).

12.8 Adopting a sequential approach to the development of brownfield land would be contrary to the NPPF and would severely constrain housing supply in the district, affecting the ability of the Council to demonstrate a five year supply of housing and ensure that the housing requirements for the district are met within the plan period.

v. Are the detailed requirements for each of the allocations clear and justified? Have the site constraints, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed? Are the boundaries and extent of sites correctly defined?

12.9 For Policy HGS2, the requirements for the allocation clearly set out the requirements for the development of the site. These matters will be addressed as part of any future planning application for the site. The boundary for the allocation is correctly defined, reflecting the land available for development.

vi. Has sufficient regard been given to the Consultation Zones for Hazardous Substances when considering sites for allocation?

12.10 For the land at Birchwood Lane, the proposed allocation is not affected by any consultation zones for hazardous substances.