

- 4830 Object** **Respondent:** mr peter hopkinson [10451] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: New housing will put further pressure on an already overloaded infrastructure
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4830 - 10451 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None
- 4834 Object** **Respondent:** Mr Martin Briggs-Willis [10460] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: This proposal goes against everything the electorate expects. Replacing open green space and precious natural landscape with buildings that will result in increased pollution and pressure on local services. The council needs to protect our green natural space and represent the local residents and electorate's wishes.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4834 - 10460 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None
- 4987 Object** **Respondent:** Mrs Lynne Scott [9153] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: I object to the release of Green Belt land in the North of the district on the basis that this is where there is most demand. As Brownfield land is available in other parts of the district this should be used first for the construction of the Affordable and Social Housing that is most needed instead of Executive style houses which will fetch the highest prices for developers. This is in accordance with Government policy and will preserve Green Land for future generations.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4987 - 9153 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None
- 5251 Object** **Respondent:** Mr Andrew Goodwin [10686] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: The map currently used by the planning department, does not correctly define the boundaries of Dronfield, it does not mention or show the land to the south of Dronfield between Dronfield and Unstone. There is a large piece of Brownfield site, currently housing the old petrol station, some industrial units and derelict houses, which could be utilised for housing. This implies that there are other brownfield sites that have been missed/deliberately removed from the map in order to justify the exceptional circumstances to remove Green Belt
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5251 - 10686 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None
- 5525 Object** **Respondent:** Mr James Clayton [10834] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: The proposals to build on Greenbelt land are disgraceful anywhere in the county when many Brown field sites are available. Brown field sites in some run down areas would lift the whole appearance and desirability of the area. Nobody wants the green spaces ruined. The large building companies have a mass of land banks with planning permission, but control the amount of houses built to keep house prices at a prime. Are you seriously going to put the profits of these large companies before the people who have elected you.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5525 - 10834 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None

- 5612 Object** **Respondent: mr daniel hockey [10853]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I object to the use of greenbelt land in the dronfield area - I do not believe that there are "exceptional circumstances" that require use of this land. Greenbelt land should not be used unless all possibilities for using brownfield sites have been exhausted, and I do not see any evidence that this is the case.
 Furthermore, I do not believe that the district council has the right to drop any of the 5 purposes of the greenbelt at its own discretion.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5612 - 10853 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None
- 5628 Object** **Respondent: Mr John Fletcher [10864]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I object to several points contained in the local plan which are shown in the attached document.
 John Fletcher
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5628 - 10864 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None
- 5054 Support** **Respondent: Killamarsh Labour Party (Alan Sargeant) [10608]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Killamarsh Labour Party has adopted the view that new housing is vital for Killamarsh, and the Local Plan is therefore welcomed, but there is some concern about the erosion of the Green Belt. The biggest concern, however, is about the importance of addressing infrastructure requirements at the planning stage, placing a responsibility on developers to ensure that infrastructure needs are adequately met, and often before building is underway. Furthermore, any development should seek to minimize damage to the local ecology by relocating wildlife within the local area.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5054 - 10608 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None
- 5637 Support** **Respondent: mr John Walker [10866]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I fully support the plans for new housing and increased commercial facilities at Callywhite Lane.
 The arguments against are the same as those used in the 1970's and are now made by people living on what was then Green Belt.
 The UK population will continue to grow and a roof over our head is more important than grass under our feet.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5637 - 10866 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None
- 4923 Comment** **Respondent: Nottinghamshire County Council (Nina Wilson) [10528]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: No comment
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4923 - 10528 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None

5506 Comment Respondent: Dronfield Civic Society (Mr John Fletcher) [10821]

Agent: N/A

Summary: See attachment for more.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5506 - 10821 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None

5945 Comment Respondent: National Grid (Mr Spencer Jefferies) [11092]

**Agent: AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited
(Leamington Spa office) (Mr Robert Deanwood) [11093]**

Summary: National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5945 - 11092 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None

6404 Comment Respondent: Mr Paul Stock [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The National Planning Policy context has evolved greatly since the adoption of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan. The North East Derbyshire Development Plan must now be in compliance with the policies of the NPPF to be considered sound at Examination. Should policies in the North East Derbyshire Development Plan be in conflict with the Framework then a presumption in favour sustainable development will apply when considering site allocations and applications for planning permission. The Council must ensure that both the emerging Development Plan documents are consistent with national policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6404 - 8388 - North East Derbyshire's Local Plan - None

- 4663 Object** **Respondent: Mr IAN LIMB [10307]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Disappointment expressed over how the consultation process was not more widely advertised and publicised by NEDDC. Requests made that the consultation period should be twice as long.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4663 - 10307 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5134 Object** **Respondent: Amy Nolan [10630]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Comment made that a consultation period of 6 weeks is not enough time for residents to properly consult on the plan. There is feeling in Dronfield that the local council is not listening and that politicians in power have absented themselves from dialogue with residents. This is simply not acceptable for an organisation that seeks to communicate with its public effectively. Statement made that the Dronfield plan is unsound and the objectives aren't deliverable.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5134 - 10630 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5413 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
 Summary: Object to the revised spatial distribution and the inclusion of substantial green belt releases around Eckington, Dronfield and Killamarsh. The spatial approach taken in February 2015 should be continued.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5413 - 10724 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5961 Object** **Respondent: Ms Rhian Harding [10774]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern raised over complexity of the plan and the consultation process. Statement that the process can not meet equality and diversity standards as it is exclusive of so many people.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5961 - 10774 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6235 Object** **Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]** **Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]**
 Summary: We have evaluated the Plan in the context of Paragraphs 160 and 172, where these are considered to be directly referable to Rough Close Works and EPC-UK's operations. As it stands there are serious concerns that the Plan has not been prepared in line with the requirements of the NPPF in relation to hazardous substance sites. This therefore raises questions over the consistency of the Plan with the Framework; as required by Paragraph 151.
 Objections raised to any form of new development within and adjacent to the hazardous consultation zones associated with Rough Close Works.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6235 - 540 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

- 6259 Object** **Respondent: Geoff Hall [10888]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Disappointment with the Dronfield consultation event. Suggestions that a speaker should have given a presentation to people.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6259 - 10888 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6316 Object** **Respondent: Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
 Summary: Strata Homes object to the Policies Map and wish to include this site as a housing allocation site next to the proposed allocation of land off Whitecotes Lane for housing in Chesterfield Borough Council.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6316 - 10158 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6633 Object** **Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: At present the Draft Local Plan is unsound because of a number of unresolved matters which are summarised as:-

 -no Statement of Co-operation justifying the defined HMA, its relationship with other neighbouring authorities and the resolution of any unmet housing needs;
 -a proposed housing requirement which is not based on an up to date OAHN;
 -the lack of flexibility in the HLS in order to pass the Government's proposed Housing Delivery Test and maintain a 5 YHLS throughout the plan period;
 -an out-of-date whole plan viability assessment;
 -no evidence to justified policy requirements on housing standards and self-build.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6633 - 4414 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6657 Object** **Respondent: Mr Matt Slack [11286]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
 Summary: M Slack objects to the Clay Cross Policies Map and states that it is a failure to not include the Land opposite of Rykneld House within the Clay Cross Policies Map.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6657 - 11286 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5117 Support** **Respondent: Mr C Pratt [6423]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I support the draft local plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5117 - 6423 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

- 5119 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Muriel Pratt [8331]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I would like to express my SUPPORT for the plan. I hope this plan will be adopted with minimum delay.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5119 - 8331 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5556 Support** **Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We can confirm that we support the vast majority of policies at a strategic level. However, we have several suggestions for alterations and/or additions that we consider will deliver better environmental outcomes and increase the 'soundness' of the Plan, from an environmental perspective.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5556 - 10840 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5583 Support** **Respondent: NHS Hardwick Clinical Commissioning Group (Jean Richards) [1647]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The local plan presents high level objectives for health and wellbeing which support the CCGs strategic objectives and our continued strategic partnership.

 The local plan considers social infrastructure and states an aim of providing services wherever practicable, in multi-use, flexible and adaptable buildings, or co-located with other social infrastructure uses which encourage dual use and increase public access. We fully support this approach and would like to work with the district council to ensure that the assets of all organisations in our strategic partnership are used as efficiently as possible and freeing resources for the delivery of services to residents.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5583 - 1647 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6049 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Whilst acknowledging that there are some areas where the draft plan identifies that further work is needed (ie: update of the SHMA, retail study and the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites), overall the council is of the view that the plan has been positively prepared, is justified, effective and consistent with national policy as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6049 - 8156 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6245 Support** **Respondent: Messrs S & K Whittam & Grayson [8368]** **Agent: IBA Planning Limited (Mr Nick Baseley) [4560]**
 Summary: S Whittam and K Grayson support the shift to a single new Local Plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6245 - 8368 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6267 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Hardwick [8097]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Overall supports the Draft Plan and would urge the Council to progress the Plan with speed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6267 - 8097 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

4998 Comment **Respondent: Chesterfield Gospel Hall Trust (Mr Adrian Rowles) [7578]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Generally:
Overall a very balanced and well thought out document. The only comment is that insufficient emphasis is placed on bold proposals to alleviate the situation on the A61. We would strongly recommend a working together with Chesterfield Borough Council on these issues.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4998 - 7578 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

5000 Comment **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Comments made on the Dronfield drop in session and whether it was long enough. Comments made that there was a queue to get in and the wait to speak with one of the planners was lengthy. Statement made that although drop-in sessions were not centre specific this was not publicised enough. Concern that the public does not get enough of a say in the process, further concerns raised over length of the Local Plan document and the planning language included, making it difficult for many to understand. Statement that the engagement process is flawed. Concern whether comments carry weight, questions raised over when the public comments will be available to view.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5000 - 9167 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

5003 Comment **Respondent: Mrs Helen Bell [10369]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Statement made over concerns about the consultation process methodology. For example a period of 6 weeks is nowhere near enough time to enable myself and other residents to comment on a 270 page plan and associated studies which underlie the plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5003 - 10369 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

5034 Comment **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Questions raised over change in circumstances from September 2012 consultation on the Local Strategy to the 2017 draft Local Plan. Questions raised over 2012 predictions in population and how it correlates to the proposed 860 houses in Dronfield. Question raised over the change in figures from 285 houses to 860 and whether this will all be affordable if green belt is used. Questions raised over exceptional circumstances and questions of why the new local plan is not following the same policies as the 2012 local strategy. Questions raised over why the Alma site is not included in the plan. Statement that the Council by action is going against a plan which is still at the draft stage. Statement that Council has no sound or accurate evidence of local housing need and that all developments should start with 100% affordable housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5034 - 9167 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

5045 Comment **Respondent: Don Longley [10604]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The whole plan needs to be made clear and written in plain language that people understand.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5045 - 10604 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

5056 Comment **Respondent: Alexandra Pollard [10478]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over the amount of planning terms used in the Local Plan making it difficult to understand.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5056 - 10478 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

- 5163 Comment** **Respondent: Severn Trent Water Ltd - Birmingham office (Ms Dawn Williams) [7768]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Thank you for giving Severn Trent Water the opportunity to comment on your consultation. We currently have no specific comments to make, however we have set out some general information and advice below.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5163 - 7768 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5175 Comment** **Respondent: Morton Parish Council (Ms Tina Frost Morris) [7882]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Since the initial local plan started in 2011 total housing completions within Morton have reached 53 with a further potential planning application for another 48, this should be taken into account within the plan. If an additional 100 homes are built, it would grow the village by 20%+ which cannot be supported by the infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5175 - 7882 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5202 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The quality of the English and the arguments within the plan fall way below that which should be produced by competent and qualified professionals. Plan complex and consultation is not an inclusive process.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5202 - 9166 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5276 Comment** **Respondent: Network Rail (Frances Cunningham) [10699]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: No comments to make.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5276 - 10699 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5293 Comment** **Respondent: Stenfold Resources Ltd (Mr Philip Barltrop) [8177]** **Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**
 Summary: Local Plan Format
 In reading and seeking to comment on this draft Local Plan it has been difficult to understand the proposals for level 3 and 4 settlements as well as the countryside areas.
 The lack of comprehensive plans to cover the whole District is not a transparent approach and it is not useful to simply say that there would be 'no changes'. It is not reasonable to have to refer back to the previous version of the Local Plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5293 - 8177 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 5339 Comment** **Respondent: Mr John Hinchcliffe [10701]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Comment on the Consultation Process. Statement that the document is not easy to understand and that without an infrastructure plan it is meaningless. Statement that Dronfield should have had a longer drop-in session and consultation.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5339 - 10701 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

5349 Comment Respondent: **Rikki Dobson [10747]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: Statement that there is too much planning jargon for a start, simple plain English would have been better.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5349 - 10747 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

5368 Comment Respondent: **Barlow Parish Council (Miss Amanda Preston) [7555]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: Further to your letter dated 24th February 2017, I would like to inform you that the Parish Council have no objections to the plan. However it would be helpful to show a map of the limit of the Greenbelt boundaries for Barlow.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5368 - 7555 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

5684 Comment Respondent: **Mr Edward Throp [10272]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: Concerns over consultation process and why there were not more options for face to face meetings with Council representatives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5684 - 10272 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

5989 Comment Respondent: **Advance Land & Planning Limited (Mr Andy Williams) [9755]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: We suggest that the overall provision of housing for the District should be increased. The housing provision for Holmewood should likewise be increased and our client's Site NW/2103 (enlarged as indicated on the attachment), should be acknowledged as suitable, available and achievable and so allocated for at least 230 dwellings, capable of delivery in the first 5 years of the Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5989 - 9755 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

6211 Comment Respondent: **CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: The Plan needs a clearer placemaking agenda
Policies SS1;SS4-SS8;SP1-SP4;SDC13;ID1-ID8
In CPRE's view the structure of the Local Plan needs to be improved in order to articulate the way in which this suite of policies should work together to achieve genuine placemaking. Whilst we would generally support each of policies, we are not satisfied that they will be effective when set against the unseemly haste with which all local planning authorities are seeking to increase the rate of development. It is therefore essential that the totality of what NED is aiming to achieve, in terms of sustainable places, through the proper, integrated implementation of these policies, is clearly articulated.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6211 - 7581 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

- 6240 Comment** **Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]** **Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]**
 Summary: EPC-UK supports the Council in meeting their strategic objectives and development aims and targets, and welcome and support improvements made to the draft Plan to now make reference to our clients operation and to impose some provisions within the policy framework which seek to take account of the hazardous nature of the site.
 Would be willing to meet with officers to explain our concerns with the draft Local Plan in more detail, and to seek to agree further amendments to the Plan such that we can withdraw our current objections.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6240 - 540 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6583 Comment** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Brailsford [11278]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
 Summary: The absence of either a Policy Map or a Green Belt Map covering the whole of the District leaves a policy vacuum in regard to some areas, because much of the District falls beyond any of the maps. This is a major deficiency and calls into question the validity of the consultation.
 Higham is a significant settlement equally as sustainable as some of the settlements which feature on Policies Maps and deserves consideration for a reasonable level of housing provision.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6583 - 11278 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6589 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Neil Mowatt [11279]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
 Summary: The absence of either a Policy Map or a Green Belt Map covering the whole of the District leaves a policy vacuum in regard to some areas, because much of the District falls beyond any of the maps. This is a major deficiency and calls into question the validity of the consultation.
 Wessington is a significant settlement equally sustainable as some of the settlements which feature on Policies Maps. Wessington deserves better consideration.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6589 - 11279 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6596 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Grey [11280]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
 Summary: Mr Grey points out that the absence of either a Policy Map or a Green Belt Map covering the whole of the District leaves a policy vacuum in regard to some areas, because much of the District falls beyond any of the maps.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6596 - 11280 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None
- 6684 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Perez [11288]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
 Summary: Mr Perez points out that the absence of either a Policy Map or a Green Belt Map covering the whole of the District leaves a policy vacuum in regard to some areas, because much of the District falls beyond any of the maps.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6684 - 11288 - The Consultation Draft Local Plan - None

6018 Comment **Respondent: Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern that the Mount Saint Mary's School is not included within Spinkhill's SDL. Statement that the college should be included as part of the Spinkhill SDL. Long historical relationship between the college and the village of Spinkhill.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6018 - 11116 - Local Plan Context - None

6541 Comment **Respondent: Harworth Estates (Mr T Love) [4431]** **Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**
 Summary: Harworth Estates points out that certain specific weaknesses of the consultation draft do remain and these must be addressed if the Local Plan is to pass the test of soundness. It would be imperative to deliver the district's objectively assessed needs in a manner spatially appropriate to respond to the distribution of growth and development need. The respondent also refers to the Runnymede Borough Council case with regards to housing delivery in a Green Belt setting and argues that all opportunities must be taken into account to be considered justified and positively prepared.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6541 - 4431 - Local Plan Context - None

6568 Comment **Respondent: Messrs FS, FJ & WV Rodgers [11276]** **Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**
 Summary: Messrs Rodgers point out that certain specific weaknesses within the consultation draft do remain and these must be addressed if the Local Plan is to pass the test of soundness. It would be imperative to deliver the district's objectively assessed needs in a manner spatially appropriate to respond to the distribution of growth and development need. The respondent also refers to the Runnymede Borough Council case with regards to housing delivery in a Green Belt setting and argues that all opportunities must be taken into account in order that the Local Plan can be considered justified and positively prepared.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6568 - 11276 - Local Plan Context - None

4700 Comment **Respondent: Dr Clare Freeman [10223]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The local plan is not consistent with and does not uphold the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework. There s no justification for taking land out of the Greenbelt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4700 - 10223 - National Planning Policy - None

5203 Comment **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Statement that proposals in Dronfield are not sustainable. The proposal to build 860 more dwellings (an increase in 10%) without a commensurate increase in local employment will drive up commuting, CO2 emissions and pollution; that is not sustainable and is contrary to the above NPPF requirement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5203 - 9166 - National Planning Policy - None

- 5204 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Duty to Co-operate. The only evidence in the plan of the council discharging this duty is co-operation with Bolsover District Council with respect to the Coalite Regeneration Area (paragraph 4.58). There is no evidence of any co-operation with either Chesterfield or Sheffield Councils. This is a major oversight, particularly with respect to the plan for Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5204 - 9166 - Relationship with other Local Plans and the Duty to Co-operate - None
- 5382 Comment** **Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Planning Advisor) [4266]** **Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**
 Summary: In terms of the Green Belt review and the subsequent draft housing allocations within Green Belt, there is no evidence that this has been undertaken in consultation with the adjoining Local Authorities and this lack of cooperation potentially makes the plan unsound.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5382 - 4266 - Relationship with other Local Plans and the Duty to Co-operate - None
- 5982 Comment** **Respondent: Advance Land & Planning Limited (Mr Andy Williams) [9755]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Council has yet to produce a Duty to Cooperate Statement, cannot properly assess whether the emerging Plan will deliver the full and objectively assessed housing need for the area and any unmet need of neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5982 - 9755 - Relationship with other Local Plans and the Duty to Co-operate - None
- 6376 Comment** **Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**
 Summary: The Plan refers at Paragraph 1.16 to the Duty to Cooperate and outlines that a Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate will be issued at the next stage of the Plan preparation.
 It is essential to understand at this early stage of the Plan preparation:
 * the extent of discussions with SCC and the requirement for any additional housing to be delivered by NEDDC; and
 * whether this could impact upon the spatial strategy as set out within the Plan at Policies SS1 and SS3.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6376 - 8171 - Relationship with other Local Plans and the Duty to Co-operate - None
- 6536 Comment** **Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: It is noted that NEDDC is currently in the process of updating its evidence base on a number of matters, including objectively assessed housing needs. It is important that this exercise is undertaken through a process of pro-active engagement with relevant neighbouring authorities, including those within the north Derbyshire / North Nottinghamshire HMA and the SCR. Suitably robust evidence will need to be published alongside the Local Plan in due course to demonstrate that the duty to cooperate is being fulfilled.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6536 - 10071 - Relationship with other Local Plans and the Duty to Co-operate - None

6607 Comment **Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council has not produced an up to date Duty to Co-operate Statement. Before the pre-submission LP consultation a Duty to Co-operate Statement should be prepared setting out the Council's compliance with the legal requirements of the Duty and the outcomes of collaborative working in order to find the LP sound.

A Statement of Common Ground explaining cross boundary working as proposed in the recently published Housing White Paper may also be required.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6607 - 4414 - Relationship with other Local Plans and the Duty to Co-operate - None

6673 Comment **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: Paragraph 1.16 of the consultation document refers to the legal requirement of the Duty to Cooperate. Notwithstanding this the document does not set out how the requirement is being addressed in terms of co-operation with the neighbouring authorities. Therefore the Council will need to prepare a Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Co-operate Statement, without which the Local Plan should not be found sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6673 - 11287 - Relationship with other Local Plans and the Duty to Co-operate - None

6708 Comment **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: The document does not set out how the requirement is being addressed in terms of co-operation with the neighbouring authorities. Therefore the Council will need to prepare a Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Co-operate Statement, without which the Local Plan should not be found sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6708 - 8407 - Relationship with other Local Plans and the Duty to Co-operate - None

CHAPTER: 1: Introduction Figure 1.1: North East Derbyshire in context

5041 Object **Respondent: Mrs Sandra Fraser [8828]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: No plans for transport infrastructure elsewhere in the area then despite the great need in Killamarsh for road improvements?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5041 - 8828 - Figure 1.1: North East Derbyshire in context - None

5414 Object

Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]

Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]

Summary: The release of major housing sites in the green belt on the north side of the district is not in accordance with the findings of the Council's Growth Strategy and Action Plan

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5414 - 10724 - Local Strategies and Initiatives - None

6283 Comment

Respondent: Mr Simon Dixon [11187]

Agent: N/A

Summary: One of the aims stated in the plan is for a "safer healthier more active community" surely depriving a community of undeveloped green spaces is totally at odds with this goal.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6283 - 11187 - Local Strategies and Initiatives - None

6516 Object**Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: SA Objectives - SA Objectives 10 and 11 relating to the Historic Environment is welcomed.

Not clear how unknown archaeology in respect of NPPF Para 139 has been considered as part of the assumptions for SA Objective 10: Cultural Heritage.

Recommended that further HIA work is required for the proposed allocations;SS6,SS7.

Historic England does not agree with the 'neutral' outcome identified for SS7 and recommends that further HIA work is undertaken for the site.

6.12.2 - The first sentence indicates an incorrect interpretation of heritage asset setting. It is recommended that the text be revised(see submission).

6.40.1 - Incorrect grammar that implies that Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and other heritage assets will not be acceptable, it is suggested that the text be reworded. appropriately reworded.

All references to 'historic assets' should be revised throughout the document to read 'heritage assets' in line with NPPF terminology

It's not clear how the outcome for SA Objective 10 in SDC6 indicates very positive effects. Suggestion that these sections are reconsidered and revised in the next iteration of the SA.

6.42.1- SM's relevant legislation should be included here for consistency if relevant legislation is being included for Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings.

6.44.1- It is recommended that further work be undertaken on this aspect for clarity in the next iteration of the SA.

SA FRAMEWORK- Recommendation that SA Objective 10 criteria wording 'preserve' be replaced with 'conserve' inline with NPPF-terminology and that used in the Draft LP. Recommendation that indicators in the SA framework tie in better with the indicators set out in the Draft LP Policies supporting text for consistency. Recommendation that in Q10d, the number of Conservation Areas at risk be included as an indicator.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6516 - 10819 - Sustainability Appraisal - None

5454 Comment**Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Sustainability Appraisal at this stage of the Local Plan has involved the appraisal of a selection of alternative development options. We acknowledge that the objectives within the SA framework generally cover our interests and we particular welcome the inclusion of objectives on climate change, pollution reduction, biodiversity & geodiversity and landscape character. However we suggest that you may want to consider including green infrastructure and green/open spaces within the objectives list to ensure that this topic is fully considered throughout the appraisal exercise.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5454 - 4469 - Sustainability Appraisal - None

6390 Comment**Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]****Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**

Summary: Within the SA there is no assessment of the approach to focus on the larger settlements and not to provide any site allocation for Level 3 settlements. There are also no discussions regarding the assessment carried out under the Green Belt Review and the conclusions drawn from this process. These issues should be considered within the SA.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6390 - 8171 - Sustainability Appraisal - None

6446 Comment**Respondent: Mr & Mrs N Beecroft [11244]****Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**

Summary: The SA acknowledges at Paragraph 6.4.3 that the SHMA is now somewhat out of date and is being updated which may affect the housing targets within the LP going forward.

Furthermore within the SA there is no assessment of the approach to focus on the larger settlements and not to provide any site allocation for Level 3 settlements. There are also no discussions regarding the assessment carried out under the Green Belt Review and the conclusions drawn from this process. These issues should be considered within the SA.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6446 - 11244 - Sustainability Appraisal - None

CHAPTER: 1: Introduction

Habitats Regulations Assessment

5453 Comment**Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Habitat Regulations Assessment

We note that the intention is for the HRA screening to be revisited at publication stage of the plan. We advise that the HRA is an iterative process and would need to be updated to inform the plan as it progresses. The HRA should be used to refine options as they are developed to ensure that the requirements of the Habitat Regulations are met. If the HRA is not revisited until the publication stage when the allocations are finalised it would not be informing the options.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5453 - 4469 - Habitats Regulations Assessment - None

4666 Object**Respondent: Mrs Linda Blatt [10322]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Questions raised over how wildlife would be protected if proposed housing allocations were to go ahead. Concerns raised over how the potential increase in traffic could impact on wildlife and existing residents.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4666 - 10322 - Your Views - None

4877 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Kathryn Clay [10487]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: More consideration should be given to the issues outlined above before housing plans are given the go ahead. It strikes me that the current proposals are putting the cart before the horse.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4877 - 10487 - Your Views - None

5004 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 6 weeks is the minimum period for a consultation yet this is the amount of time chosen to allow residents to try and understand this huge document and formulate a considered response.

In the one opportunity provided to meet planning officers at a meeting at Dronfield Civic Hall, this was very much presented as a done deal and when questioned why brown fields sites hadn't been looked at for development it was suggested that we (the residents) should go and find some suitable. I believe this to be the job of the council.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5004 - 10593 - Your Views - None

5024 Comment**Respondent: Lisa Pitchford [10594]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Concern raised over using the website. Statement made that it would seem that it has purposely been made so that people cannot write any comments on the proposed plans do you can drive them through.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5024 - 10594 - Your Views - None

5201 Comment**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The quality of the English and the arguments within the plan fall way below that which should be produced by competent and qualified professionals.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5201 - 9166 - Your Views - None

5299 Comment Respondent: **Kevin Fielding [10636]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: The following considerations need to be addressed prior to any development:

Our property will suffer from:

Loss of light due to it's south facing aspect.

Loss of privacy due to new properties overlooking us

Increased traffic on the already congested road where most properties do not have off street parking

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5299 - 10636 - Your Views - None

6313 Comment Respondent: **Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: Statement that the absence of a Policy Map covering the whole of the District leaves a policy vacuum in regard to some areas as certain areas do not fall within any of the maps. This is the case in regard to Spinkhill only part of which is covered on the Renishaw Policies Map.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6313 - 11116 - Your Views - None

6450 Comment Respondent: **Mr & Mrs N Beecroft [11244]** Agent: **Caroline McIntyre [8482]**

Summary: The assessment of site BRAM/2301 - Millstone, Wadshelf in the Housing Sites Assessment Report (Feb 2017) is considered incorrect for the following reasons. (see submission.)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6450 - 11244 - Your Views - None

6770 Comment Respondent: **Clay Cross Parish Council (Michelle Cowin) [11303]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: 'One Public Estate'. How will that affect the Local Plan?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6770 - 11303 - Your Views - None

CHAPTER: 1: Introduction Next Steps

5005 Comment Respondent: **Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: I had understood that a Brownfield review should take place prior to looking at green belt sites - and there may be funding available for the transformation of brownfield. There is no evidence of this happening.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5005 - 10593 - Next Steps - None

5994 Support**Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sub-division of the District into four sub-areas (North, South, East and West) is well justified and fully supported as the basis to plan for the future spatial growth needs of the District. It is clear that each of the four sub-areas have their own close physical and functional relationships, their own characteristics and development needs to be addressed in the LPCD.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5994 - 10098 - Description of the Area - None

5983 Comment**Respondent: Advance Land & Planning Limited (Mr Andy Williams) [9755]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Questions over whether the HMA should not include Sheffield and parts of other Districts in North Derbyshire and North Nottinghamshire, where the influences are likely to be stronger than from Bassetlaw District.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5983 - 9755 - Description of the Area - None

5043 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sandra Fraser [8828]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: At present Killamarsh, Eckington and its surrounding area are threatened by loss of green belt to build over 1000 houses at least, HS2 building, Fracking developers and Gullivers Kingdom developments. What a nightmare scenario for our health and well being with traffic from all of these blighting our lives for the next 10/15 years at the very least!

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5043 - 8828 - North Sub-Area - None

5006 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: In Dronfield in the last few years Santander bank closed, HSBC is set to close very soon and the NatWest is also looking to close. This is not regeneration and will not support or attract new businesses looking to open here.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5006 - 10593 - North Sub-Area - None

6147 Support**Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: National Trust welcomes the reference to the settings of Bolsover Castle and Hardwick Hall and the need to protect these designated heritage assets.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6147 - 4598 - East Sub-Area - None

6488 Support**Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: P.12/ Para 2.8

The reference to heritage assets is welcomed, as is the acknowledgement of cross boundary issues. It is recommended that 'and their setting' is added to the end of the last sentence to reinforce and clarify the previous sentence.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6488 - 10819 - East Sub-Area - None

4981 Support**Respondent: PDNPA (Mr Ian Fullilove) [10430]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: welcome the reference to the connection with the National Park

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 4981 - 10430 - West Sub-Area - None

4728 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: "There is a need for more housing" This is a vague statement. "Only a quarter of the population in NE Derbyshire cannot afford market housing". This means 75% can. Where then is the demand for this affordable housing you wish to build on Green Belt land in Dronfield?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4728 - 9167 - Key Issues - None

5205 Comment**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Statement that affordability in NED is better than national average.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5205 - 9166 - Key Issues - None

4726 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no mention of provision for bungalows to be built in Dronfield. Whilst the Plan mentions affordable housing need of 30-40% it does not stipulate the proportion of bungalows that should be built. Dronfield is losing its stock of bungalows as planning permission has been granted by this authority to convert bungalows into houses or they get demolished for the plot which then has a very large house built upon the site. No provision is being made for an ageing population. As well as affordable housing, this council should stipulate a percentage of bungalows in new developments.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4726 - 9167 - Population - None

5009 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Dronfield has an ageing population and if we're looking at housing for these residents it would be helpful if this was on the flat areas in walking distance to the local amenities. The currently identified areas of green belt are all on steep hills a good distance from local shops that become isolated in snow, a car would be essential in many of these areas.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5009 - 10593 - Population - None

4727 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: "set within attractive countryside and landscapes highly valued locally"

This statement should therefore guide the planners to maintain the highly valued landscapes and not remove land from the Green Belt which will have a significant impact upon them.

"There will inevitably have to be some loss of countryside"

Why is it inevitable? It is the easiest option. There are plenty of alternatives which this council has not fully explored.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4727 - 9167 - Settlements and Separation - None

5007 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are unoccupied dwellings and brownfield sites that could be considered and exploited prior to looking at the Green belt to deliver the housing need.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5007 - 10593 - Settlements and Separation - None

5008 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I understand the need for more affordable housing but it is naive to believe that this will be delivered on the green belt of Dronfield where housing prices are already way beyond the national average. Developers will be looking for maximum profit and will be adding to the already many executive homes in the area. Dronfield sets to merge into Unstone, Chesterfield and Sheffield if the fields that surround it are developed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5008 - 10593 - Settlements and Separation - None

6149 Support**Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: National Trust welcomes the recognition within the Economy and Employment section of the value of the Peak District and local heritage assets such as Chatsworth, Bolsover and Hardwick Hall as drivers of economic growth and tourism.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6149 - 4598 - Economy & Employment - None

4729 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: "there is need to provide local employment opportunities close to where people live in order to reduce out commuting"
This is unlikely to be achieved in Dronfield when housing is 860 for 6 hectares of employment land.
You identify that unemployment is high in Grassmoor and Clay Cross etc., therefore these are the areas that need the regeneration in terms of jobs and housing, not Dronfield. You identify the Birchall Estate as being a growth area for tourism and employment. There are plenty of brownfield sites nearby on which to build houses. Building houses in Dronfield will encourage more commuting and congestion on roads through Dronfield and Unstone.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4729 - 9167 - Economy & Employment - None

5206 Comment**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: plan contains no commitments on investment. A plan to build 860 additional dwellings in Dronfield without a commitment to invest in the infrastructure will negatively impact the quality of life of existing residents; driving up congestion, pollution and CO2 emissions. This is contrary to the council's stated objective D1 Sustainable Growth; D8 Addressing Climate Change

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5206 - 9166 - Town Centres - None

5010 Comment **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Many Dronfield residents use the train for commuting to local cities for employment. The car park is already always full and parking spills over into local streets, causing even more traffic issues. There is no space to extend the car park and charging for parking would only encourage people to use their cars to commute. The 7 miles into Sheffield already takes in excess of 1 hour in rush hour.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5010 - 10593 - Accessibility and Transport - None

5207 Comment **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The council notes that Dronfield is the only town with a railway station. However, there are no connecting public transport links from the outer reaches of the town making it inaccessible to other households. Statement that this is contrary to the council's stated objective D12 Sustainable Transport and in breach of policy SS1 clause C.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5207 - 9166 - Accessibility and Transport - None

5995 Comment **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The analysis in the Spatial Portrait provides a thorough and comprehensive assessment of the issues and challenges facing the District. However, the Accessibility and Transport Section should make reference to the emerging proposals for HS2 and the Government's recent consultation proposals for the HS2 route refinement through Derbyshire, including proposals for HS2 services to stop at Chesterfield railway station. Although not located within North East Derbyshire District, the HS2 proposals are likely to have an impact on the District's economy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5995 - 10098 - Accessibility and Transport - None

5011 Support **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: I fully support the need for improved infrastructure as Dronfield is already fit to burst. There is however no evidence of consideration of the impact on Schools, Doctors, roads should these additional 860 houses be built.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5011 - 10593 - Infrastructure - None

6150 Support**Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: National Trust supports the recognition of opportunities to increase the capacity of renewable energy generation in the district to help reduce emissions and climate change.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6150 - 4598 - Climate Change and Flooding - None

5012 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is highly unlikely that the additional people this development will bring to Dronfield will work on Callywhite Lane as has been suggested. It is more likely they will be skilled/professional workers commuting to Sheffield and other local cities, adding to the pollution already caused.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5012 - 10593 - Climate Change and Flooding - None

5013 Support**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The impact on the wildlife and the areas identity will be significant. On my road I regularly see bats, foxes and a huge number of diverse birds.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5013 - 10593 - Natural Environment - None

6152 Comment**Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: While we acknowledge the recognition of pressure on the natural environment as a result of growth, we suggest that it would be helpful to include a positive statement here about protecting and enhancing these assets.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6152 - 4598 - Natural Environment - None

6153 Comment

Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]

Agent: N/A

Summary: National Trust welcomes the reference to protecting heritage assets and we suggest that archaeological remains along with (built and natural) heritage need to be protected and where possible enhanced.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6153 - 4598 - Built Environment - None

6489 Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The reference to heritage assets, including non-designated archaeology is noted. This could be strengthened by setting out how the Council will take a positive approach to this element.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6489 - 10819 - Built Environment - None

5014 Support**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A more vibrant and sustainable NE Derbyshire would be wonderful. Plans to develop green belt in Dronfield will just bring more affluent, older people to town. Looking to do something exciting with the unused areas of Callywhite lane to provide modern and dynamic housing for young people (akin to Sheffield's shalesmoor developments) would have a more beneficial impact to the future of the town.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5014 - 10593 - Vision - None

5400 Support**Respondent: Ms Rhian Harding [10774]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I completely support this as an objective but the proposed housing and business plan of Dronfield and Coal Aston is in direct opposition to this. It would make local people less proud to live here as we value our rural area and access to green spaces, and make us feel less safe, less healthy and cause massive implications to health and wellbeing through increased noise and air pollution, destruction of green spaces which have been valued by generations of families, loss of community, increased traffic and road congestion/danger and the loss of our rural village life.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5400 - 10774 - Vision - None

5432 Support**Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Natural England generally supports the vision particularly the aspiration to provide accessible Green Infrastructure and biodiversity networks and to strengthen the District's role as a gateway to the Peak District.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5432 - 4469 - Vision - None

6154 Support**Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: National Trust broadly supports the Local Plan Vision.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6154 - 4598 - Vision - None

6569 Comment**Respondent: Messrs FS, FJ & WV Rodgers [11276]****Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**

Summary: Messrs Rodgers argue that the Council's modified approach represents a much more realistic approach towards the delivery of growth and takes into account the northern area's generally much higher level of sustainability, having much stronger physical and economic links to Sheffield as well as Chesterfield. In regards to the site between A61 and Jordanthorpe Parkway it would be clear that an exception for housing exists due to its direct and immediate functional relationship to Sheffield which would be in line with the altered approach.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6569 - 11276 - Vision - None

4730 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: "In the north of the district, growth and expansion of the towns of Dronfield will have met the development needs"

This is past tense and states that in fact the job has been done to achieve the desired outcomes. Any further growth of Dronfield will have major adverse effects. However Dronfield does need a regeneration of its town centre - the Civic which has empty units and charity shops and which lets the rest of the town down badly.
Local Plan Objectives

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4730 - 9167 - Local Plan Vision - None

5208 Comment**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Statement "much needed affordable homes". The data provided in paragraph 2.15 indicates affordability is not an issue in NE Derbyshire.

The plan contains no binding commitments or obligations that will ensure the delivery of this vision.

The council will be aware that a developer owns Green Belt land adjacent to Shakespeare Crescent that is beyond the proposed development boundaries. Any removal of land from the Green Belt will set a precedent.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5208 - 9166 - Local Plan Vision - None

5479 Comment**Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We note the vision for additional housing as part of the overall growth of NED (in particular the expansion of Dronfield, Killamarsh and Eckington of just over 2000 houses up to 2033, table 4.2). We welcome the acknowledged need for a co-ordinated approach to transport, recognising cross boundary issues. Whilst this growth may increase traffic flows between Sheffield and NED, it could also provide increased travel demand which would help to improve the viability of cross boundary public transport improvements (e.g. P&R in south Sheffield, outlined in 'The Sheffield Plan: Citywide Options for Growth to 2034' Nov 2015).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5479 - 7769 - Local Plan Vision - None

6284 Comment**Respondent: Mr Simon Dixon [11187]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan also suggests that allowing the proposed plan will give Dronfield "Defensible boundaries against further development", this is an extremely weak argument, as the plan is proposing to scrap current boundaries and build on supposedly protected greenbelt land, this will set a precedent and make it more likely that future developments can simply redraw boundaries at will.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6284 - 11187 - Local Plan Vision - None

- 5996 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The inclusion of a range of both district-wide and sub-area strategic objectives is fully supported and should ensure that the Local Plan provides for a sustainable pattern of development and meets the future growth needs of the District over the Plan period.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5996 - 10098 - District-wide Objectives - None
- 6156 Support** **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: National Trust support objectives D3 Tourism, D6 Green Belt, D8 Addressing Climate Change, D9 Design and Place Making, D10 Heritage Assets, D11 Natural Assets, D12 Sustainable Transport.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6156 - 4598 - District-wide Objectives - None
- 5209 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Statement "seeking to narrow the gap between the more deprived areas and the more affluent areas". Why is this an objective of the plan?
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5209 - 9166 - District-wide Objectives - None
- 6469 Comment** **Respondent: Mr David Wilson [10756]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The development needs of the district should be met in a sustainable way. The proposed development on greenbelt land can not be considered 'sustainable'. Developing greenbelt land should only be considered as a last resort, where there are no other suitable alternative options. Plans to develop greenbelt land should be scrapped and replaced by plans to develop areas that are more sustainable, particularly the South Sub-Area.
 The economic benefits of development should be aimed at regenerating the settlements within the district itself, as opposed to benefitting adjacent other local authority areas.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6469 - 10756 - District-wide Objectives - None
- 6481 Comment** **Respondent: Paul Wilson [11262]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The development needs of the district should be met in a sustainable way. The proposed development on greenbelt land can not be considered 'sustainable'. Developing greenbelt land should only be considered as a last resort, where there are no other suitable alternative options. Plans to develop greenbelt land should be scrapped and replaced by plans to develop areas that are more sustainable, particularly the South Sub-Area.
 The economic benefits of development should be aimed at regenerating the settlements within the district itself, as opposed to benefitting adjacent other local authority areas.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6481 - 11262 - District-wide Objectives - None

5997 Comment**Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: In the context of the comments above, Objective D1 could be expanded to indicate that the Local Plan will seek to maximise the economic benefits for the District that are likely to be generated by HS2.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5997 - 10098 - District-wide Objectives, The Economy, D1 Sustainable Economic Growth - None

5015 Support**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Agreed - but plans for using Green Belt that will see Dronfield sprawl into the Unstone, Chesterfield and Sheffield will reduce the appeal of the town to visitors. Not to mention Hallows Golf Club that is 150 years old - this heritage should be celebrated, not turned into luxury housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5015 - 10593 - District-wide Objectives, The Economy, D3 Tourism - None

6050 Support**Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: D3 Tourism
SUPPORT the inclusion of Chesterfield Canal as a district wide objective. This project is the subject of on-going co-operation between the districts and councils through the Chesterfield Canal Partnership.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6050 - 8156 - District-wide Objectives, The Economy, D3 Tourism - None

5535 Support**Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support inclusion of this objective.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5535 - 4563 - District-wide Objectives, The Community, D4 Sustainable Communities - None

5480 Support

Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are pleased to note that the Plan confirms the intention to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the District and will not require part of this need to be met within adjacent authorities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5480 - 7769 - District-wide Objectives, The Community, D5 Housing for All - None

5060 Comment

Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The areas identified in Dronfield are prime development plots that will be hugely profitable - these will not delivery affordable housing. These are sites where executive homes will be built, adding to the many expensive homes in the area. This will attract more people from local cities to come and benefit from our semi rural location, rather than addressing the needs of the people that live here.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5060 - 10593 - District-wide Objectives, The Community, D5 Housing for All - None

4731 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]

Agent: N/A

Summary: D7 "To protect the separation and identity of settlements by identifying key areas of countryside where development should be restricted"
If this is an objective, then achieving it by taking land out of the Green Belt is totally contrary to this statement.

D13 "To ensure that housing and employment growth takes place in a way that protects local amenity and does not undermine environmental quality"
Again another objective that cannot be achieved by taking Green Belt land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4731 - 9167 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment - None

- 5255 Object** **Respondent: Mr Andrew Goodwin [10686]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The green belt land is there for a reason. I ask you to stop this plan as you are creating urban sprawl and not promoting anything that green belt stands for.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5255 - 10686 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D6 Green Belt - None
- 5950 Support** **Respondent: Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: Panache Lingerie Ltd strongly supports Objective D6 (Green Belt) which seeks to protect the Green Belt and promote sustainable patterns of development across the District. The redevelopment of our client's site would meet with this objective as it offers the opportunity to minimise Green Belt losses, whilst ensuring an adequate supply of high quality employment land is retained.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5950 - 11096 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D6 Green Belt - None
- 5965 Support** **Respondent: Green Piling Ltd (Green Piling Ltd) [11104]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: Green Piling strongly supports Objective D6 (Green Belt). The redevelopment of the Land south of Smithybrook Road would meet with this objective as it offers the opportunity to minimise Green Belt losses.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5965 - 11104 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D6 Green Belt - None
- 5999 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objective D6 is fully supported, which seeks to ensure that the general area of the Green Belt is protected and that the purposes of including land within the Green Belt takes account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development across the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5999 - 10098 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D6 Green Belt - None
- 6033 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Strategic Objective D6 is fully supported which seeks to protect the general area of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it taking account of the need to meet the needs of all sectors of the District's communities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6033 - 10098 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D6 Green Belt - None

4701 Comment **Respondent: Dr Clare Freeman [10223]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Greenbelt should only be developed in exceptional circumstances when all other options have been exhausted. The land around Dronfield prevents the town from merging with Unstone and Chesterfield in the south and with Sheffield in the north. The land in the south is actively and sympathetically farmed, allowing local residents to enjoy the green spaces and providing a haven for wildlife- there are families of foxes, badgers and hares in the fields. The farm produces meat for local consumption. The green fields allow run off for water to prevent flooding.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4701 - 10223 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D6 Green Belt - None

CHAPTER: 3: Vision & Objectives District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D7 Settlement Identity

5058 Support **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: However, the plans set out here go against this for Dronfield - it brings us closer to the surrounding areas - merging into Unstone.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5058 - 10593 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D7 Settlement Identity - None

6051 Support **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: D7 Settlement Identity
SUPPORT objective

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6051 - 8156 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D7 Settlement Identity - None

5210 Comment **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objective D7 Settlement Identity
The proposal to remove land from the Green Belt adjacent to Shakespeare Crescent is contradictory to this objective.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5210 - 9166 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D7 Settlement Identity - None

5059 Comment

Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plans for Dronfield will cause a negative impact - more commuter traffic into sheffield and other local cities on already heavily congested roads.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5059 - 10593 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D8 Addressing Climate Change - None

5433 Comment

Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]

Agent: N/A

Summary: D8: Addressing Climate Change - we suggest this objective should also reference the provision of green infrastructure to assist with climate change adaptation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5433 - 4469 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D8 Addressing Climate Change - None

5061 Comment

Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no evidence of plans to do this in Dronfield. There is a lot of derelict land on Callywhite Lane that could be used for modern, well designed sustainable housing - both meeting the need for affordable housing in an easily accessible place AND delivering something innovative and of value to the area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5061 - 10593 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D9 Design and Place Making - None

5016 Support**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Hallowes Golf Club is one of these assets and looks set to be redeveloped as part of these proposals. This needs protecting for the future generations of the town and for attracting more visitors.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5016 - 10593 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D10 Heritage Assets - None

5164 Support**Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steve Baker) [7985]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I recognise and welcome the proposed commitment to protect and enhance the District's distinct historic environment and industrial heritage at Strategic Objectives D10.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5164 - 7985 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D10 Heritage Assets - None

6490 Comment**Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: P.22/ D10 Heritage Assets
It is recommended that 'and their setting' is included at the end of the sentence for completeness and the avoidance of doubt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6490 - 10819 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D10 Heritage Assets - None

5017 Support**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The very areas of greenbelt identified are important natural assets. The area around hallowes golf club and hilltop attracts many dog walkers, ramblers, mountain bikers and joggers.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5017 - 10593 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D11 Natural Assets - None

5434 Support**Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: D11: Environmental Protection - we are pleased to note that the wording within this objective has been clarified from the initial draft document by including "nature conservation sites".

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5434 - 4469 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D11 Natural Assets - None

5062 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Its this very point that made Dronfield the 9th best place to live in England in a recent survey. your plans are set to undermine this.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5062 - 10593 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D11 Natural Assets - None

5481 Support

Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We support increasing travel by sustainable forms of transport and maintaining and improving connectivity to the main urban areas within Sheffield City Region. We would welcome partnership working with neighbouring authorities as set out in paragraph 9.54.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5481 - 7769 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D12 Sustainable Transport - None

5584 Support

Respondent: NHS Hardwick Clinical Commissioning Group (Jean Richards) [1647]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We welcome the local plan objective around sustainable transport and a commitment to linking bus services and major housing developments; we would ask that the location of health premises is considered in any changes to current public transport provision.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5584 - 1647 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D12 Sustainable Transport - None

5063 Comment

Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The effects of historic coal mining are already in evidence in the Dronfield area. Many areas identified by this plan are on high risk coal sites.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5063 - 10593 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D13 Local Amenity - None

4732 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Where in this plan has the council demonstrated that they are in any way doing this? Why can't Chesterfield Borough Council accommodate North East Housing on the border between south Unstone and Chesterfield. Why is it necessary to put housing in Dronfield, why should the largest town in the District have more housing than the smaller settlements. It should be regenerated and that is it.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4732 - 9167 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D14 Strategic Co-operation - None

5931 Support**Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]****Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Sophie Taylor) [4539]**

Summary: Bolsover Land Ltd strongly supports Objective D14, Strategic Co-operation, specifically the co-ordinated approach which is suggested to achieving sustainable development and working across boundaries.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5931 - 4542 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D14 Strategic Co-operation - None

6052 Support**Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: D14 Strategic Co-operation

SUPPORT the inclusion of the objective. Mechanisms and pathways for Co-operation on cross boundary issues between Chesterfield Borough and North East Derbyshire District are already well established through the HMA wide Local Plan Liaison Group, Sheffield City Region Planning Policy Officers Group, and Derbyshire Planning Policy Officers group. This co-operation has resulted in a strong shared evidence base across the LPA including the SHMA (currently being updated), Retail Study, Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, and agreed methodologies for Land Availability Assessment and Green Belt Reviews.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6052 - 8156 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D14 Strategic Co-operation - None

5064 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no evidence in this plan that any strategic work has been done with neighbouring areas to find land to support the housing need. Using the Green Belt when other areas have large amounts of Brownfield sites can not be described as exceptional circumstances

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5064 - 10593 - District-wide Objectives, The Environment, D14 Strategic Co-operation - None

6157 Support **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: National Trust support objectives N2 Countryside Recreation, W2 Countryside Character, E3 Environmental Quality.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6157 - 4598 - Sub-area Objectives - None

5490 Comment **Respondent: Keith Myall [10812]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: It would appear that the report regarding pollution contradicts itself. Section 3.10.6 is contradicted by section 3.10.13 in this respect.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5490 - 10812 - Sub-area Objectives - None

5213 Comment **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Explain what the council will do to ensure these improvements are implemented. The plan contains no binding commitments or obligations that will ensure the delivery of this objective.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5213 - 9166 - Sub-area Objectives, The North, N1 Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh Town Centres - None

5020 Support **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: But these proposals look to remove areas of the golf course that are used regularly - not just by golfers but by runners, walkers, etc.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5020 - 10593 - Sub-area Objectives, The North, N2 Countryside Recreation - None

6053 Support **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: N2 Countryside Recreation
SUPPORT reinstatement of Chesterfield Canal

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6053 - 8156 - Sub-area Objectives, The North, N2 Countryside Recreation - None

- 5019 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Has some skills analysis been done. Is there really a need for more industry in Dronfield? What type of business do we really need and is it not more likely that the skilled and educated majority of the town will travel to large cities for work and enjoy their rural home?
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5019 - 10593 - Sub-area Objectives, The North, N3 Employment Land - None
- 4739 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Question raised over whether improving the quality of employment land in the north and addressing infrastructure deficiencies to allow for the expansion of existing sites. Comment made that Callywhite Lane will not attract business's that employ large numbers of people. Suggestion to redesignate vacant sites like Padley and Venable land to deal with housing shortage.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4739 - 9167 - Sub-area Objectives, The North, N3 Employment Land - None
- 5018 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: There are currently many vacant sites on Callywhite Lane. It is not attractive to businesses as access is not great and that is why they are leaving. If by some miracle it did become an attractive place for investment this would have a largely negative impact on the town as HGVs would be struggling with access right next to the school...
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5018 - 10593 - Sub-area Objectives, The North, N3 Employment Land - None
- 5065 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: What skills analysis has been done? What type of businesses are you looking to attract to Callywhite lane? It is not suitable for heavy industries due to access issues for HGVs. If developed for mixed housing, retail and business use this could be a vibrant area of the town and may indeed attract digital companies, coffee shops, etc that would all be well used and may make more use of skills here in the town.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5065 - 10593 - Sub-area Objectives, The North, N3 Employment Land - None
- 5214 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Explain what the council will do to ensure these deficiencies are addressed. The plan contains no binding commitments or obligations that will ensure the delivery of this objective. The deficiencies at Callywhite Lane are decades old; the council has demonstrably failed to address them to date.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5214 - 9166 - Sub-area Objectives, The North, N3 Employment Land - None

4982 Comment

Respondent: PDNPA (Mr Ian Fullilove) [10430]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The reference to the National park is welcome but the plan (and users of it) would benefit from a clear reference to the duty of regard within Section 62(2) of the Environment Act. This ensures the park is a real consideration in planning decisions that potentially impact on the setting of the Park.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4982 - 10430 - Sub-area Objectives, The West, W2 Countryside Character - None

4995 Comment

Respondent: Chesterfield Gospel Hall Trust (Mr Adrian Rowles) [7578]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sub-Regional Target:

Add: S3 - Recognise the economic and social importance of the A61/A617 link road and the importance that this project has to the sub-region and place all importance on any opportunities to lead and ultimately facilitate the provision of this vital piece of infrastructure within as short a time frame as possible.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4995 - 7578 - Sub-area Objectives, The South - None

6054 Support

Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]

Agent: N/A

Summary: S2 Regeneration
SUPPORT recognition of the role of Chesterfield as a key employment area

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6054 - 8156 - Sub-area Objectives, The South, S2 Regeneration - None

5932 Support

Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]

Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Sophie Taylor) [4539]

Summary: Bolsover Land Ltd also supports Objectives E1, Regeneration and E2 Land Remediation and notes that these objectives are fully consistent with the NPPF and principles of sustainable development. Bolsover Land Ltd do consider there could be scope to identify the former Coalite site within the supporting text, particularly as the policy refers to remediation, regeneration and working with neighbouring partners and authorities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5932 - 4542 - Sub-area Objectives, The East - None

5951 Support

Respondent: Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096]

Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]

Summary: Panache Lingerie Ltd also supports Objective E2 (Land Remediation), and the promotion of previously developed land in order to support sustainable growth, as this will facilitate the redevelopment of underused sites such as our client's, for other more viable uses.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5951 - 11096 - Sub-area Objectives, The East, E2 Land Remediation - None

5966 Support

Respondent: Green Piling Ltd (Green Piling Ltd) [11104]

Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]

Summary: Green Piling also strongly supports Objective E2 (Land Remediation). This will facilitate the redevelopment of underused sites such as our own one.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5966 - 11104 - Sub-area Objectives, The East, E2 Land Remediation - None

5998 Support

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is welcomed that Objective E3 appropriately seeks to ensure that any environmental impacts arising from the development of HS2 are effectively mitigated.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5998 - 10098 - Sub-area Objectives, The East, E3 Environmental Quality - None

4685 Object **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas**  **[10351]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to building on the green belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4685 - 10351 - Introduction - None

4733 Object **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton** **[9167]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: meet the future needs of the District in locations where it is most needed" You have identified where these areas are and yet this plan seeks to build houses where they are not needed - in Dronfield and where there is no likelihood of employment on a large scale - Callywhite Lane.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4733 - 9167 - Introduction - None

5021 Object **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton** **[10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Callywhite Lane is in decline, its inaccessibility is already deterring businesses and many of the sites have laid empty for a long time. A renewed approach to this area needs considering. This could be space for affordable housing - modern starter homes and apartments for the town's young people - becoming a vibrant and dynamic part of the town. Look at the example of Sheffield - Kelham Island.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5021 - 10593 - Introduction - None

5933 Support **Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam)** **[4542]****Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Sophie Taylor)** **[4539]**

Summary: Bolsover Land Ltd supports the growth strategy proposals in Chapter 4, in particular developing the M1 strategic growth corridor proposals as a principle economic growth location and bringing forward investment and site development in principal employment growth locations, including the former Coalite site. The proposed growth strategy appears to be justified and again, consistent with the principles of the NPPF.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5933 - 4542 - Introduction - None

6000 Support **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery)** **[10098]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The broad spatial strategy set out in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 is fully supported. DCC has worked in partnership with, and has been fully supportive of, the District Council's aims to bring their major strategic sites forward for development, not least for their major economic, job creation and regeneration benefits that they are likely to deliver to the residents of the District.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6000 - 10098 - Introduction - None

5461 Comment **Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
Summary: We support the general aims of the Local Plan Strategy but in its present form it does not deliver a sustainable form of development. Please see attached Statement for further details

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5461 - 10799 - Introduction - None

5527 Comment **Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
Summary: We support the general aims of the Local Plan Strategy but in its present form it does not deliver a sustainable form of development.

Please attached statement for further details

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5527 - 10799 - Introduction - None

5593 Comment **Respondent: Gleeson Regeneration Ltd [10846]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
Summary: We support the general aims of the Local Plan Strategy but in its present form it does not deliver a sustainable form of development.

Please see attached statement for further details

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5593 - 10846 - Introduction - None

- 4686 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas** 🗨️ [10351] **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I object to building on the green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4686 - 10351 - Sustainable Development - None
- 5415 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin)** [10724] **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin)** [10724]
 Summary: Policy SS1 should include support for the maintenance of the Green Belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5415 - 10724 - Sustainable Development - None
- 4839 Support** **Respondent: Mr A Petrie** [6413] **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Am of the view that the current draft policies appear (in the main) to have been prepared in a manner which will give much clearer guidance to decision makers in respect of those environmental aims.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4839 - 6413 - Sustainable Development - None
- 6542 Support** **Respondent: Ashover Parish Council (Mrs S Atkinson)** [7554] **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Spatial Strategy has at its heart ensuring that all new development makes a positive contribution towards the achievement of sustainable development. This is to be welcomed.
 We strongly support the principle of directing growth to the most sustainable locations.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6542 - 7554 - Sustainable Development - None
- 5066 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton** [10593] **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: There is nothing to suggest the level of growth in Dronfield is sustainable. Land identified will be provide expensive houses, bringing in more older people to the area and professionals with families - creating additional pressure on the already full schools, doctors and streets.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5066 - 10593 - Sustainable Development - None
- 5215 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton** [9166] **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The planned addition of 860 dwellings in Dronfield without major investment in infrastructure will blight Unstone which is centred around the major routes from the south into Dronfield. This is contrary to the stated vision and objectives.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5215 - 9166 - Sustainable Development - None

4687 Object **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas**  **[10351]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to building on the green belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4687 - 10351 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None

5407 Object **Respondent: PMW Property [10783]****Agent: Cerda Planning Limited (Michael Robson) [10782]**Summary: Objections are lodged in respect of the principle and detail of Policy SS1. The approach taken is inconsistent with the NPPF and creates conflict as to whether the approach to sustainable development as set out within the NPPF should be applied to development proposals, or whether the approach to sustainable development as set out within the Emerging Plan should be applied to development proposals.
See attached.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5407 - 10783 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None

6660 Object **Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]****Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**

Summary: Policy SS1 Sustainable Development: disagree with the requirement at the end of the policy which states that all major applications should be accompanied by a Sustainability Statement. This is onerous and unnecessary in a policy. Such requirements should be included on a local validation list.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6660 - 692 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None

5022 Support **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: However, I had understood national policy was to develop possible brownfield sites first and look to unoccupied dwellings...it appears that this has not yet been done prior to declaring exceptional reasons for developing the Green Belt

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5022 - 10593 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None

5435 Support **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Natural England considers that this policy provides a clear framework for the achievement of sustainable development and particularly welcomes the provisions for the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure and local landscapes (h) and protection of the best quality agricultural land (i).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5435 - 4469 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None

- 5678 Support** **Respondent: The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support - The Coal Authority is pleased to note that criterion i. identifies that proposals should avoid sterilisation of mineral resources.
 Reason - The Policy supports the principles set out in National Planning Policy in the NPPF
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5678 - 9528 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 5934 Support** **Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Sophie Taylor) [4539]**
 Summary: In respect of Policy SS1, Sustainable Development, we support these principles as per the NPPF para. 14, and highlight particular support for point 'B' 'promote the efficient use of land the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations.'
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5934 - 4542 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 5952 Support** **Respondent: Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: Panache Lingerie Ltd generally supports the principles of this policy as they broadly align with paragraph 14 of the NPPF. The respondent particularly supports part B of this policy which promotes the efficient use of land and the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, such as our client's site.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5952 - 11096 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 5967 Support** **Respondent: Green Piling Ltd (Green Piling Ltd) [11104]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: The respondent generally supports the policy's principles and particularly supports part B which promotes the efficient use of land and re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5967 - 11104 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 6573 Support** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs F Elliot [11277]** **Agent: Copesticks Ltd. (Mr Tim Farley) [9829]**
 Summary: Emphasis on sustainable economic growth is supported. Without economic growth, safeguarding and increasing employment opportunities, few other visions or objectives for the District will realistically be achievable.
 Policy SS1 strikes a good balance between economic, social and environmental sustainability; recognising the benefits and encouraging the re-use of previously developed land and reducing the need to travel, but not at the expense of support for business expansion. Realistically achievable policy-led employment growth is the essential driver for improving the social and economic wellbeing of NED's communities. Draft Policy SS1 is considered to be sound.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6573 - 11277 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None

- 4703 Comment** **Respondent: Dr Clare Freeman [10223]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The local plan has not considered re-use of brownfield sites as per point b. Developing the Greenbelt will not enhance the character and setting of Dronfield as specified in point g, nor would it protect the quality of the District's green infrastructures and local landscapes(point h)or protect the productive potential of the agricultural land(point l).
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4703 - 10223 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 5067 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: On point c. The areas identified for Dronfield are not within easy walking distance of the town centre or train station - they are on the periphery of the town and in most cases up very steep hills. Most people that will buy in these areas will commute to local cities rather than work in the town.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5067 - 10593 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 5068 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: There is nothing in the plan to suggest this will enhance Dronfield's character (f) or (h) its green space - it will just add more housing along the lines of what is already available.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5068 - 10593 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 5211 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Questions raised over why the housing need in Dronfield has changed since the last plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5211 - 9166 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 5216 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy SS1, Sustainable Development, clause a: "key business sectors" is meaningless; define "key".
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5216 - 9166 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 5536 Comment** **Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Reference should also be made to the need for development proposals to protect, enhance and provide sports facilities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5536 - 4563 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None

- 6007 Comment** **Respondent: Mr W Smith [11115]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
Summary: Mr W Smith argues that this policy would outline a presumption in favour of sustainable development and reflects paragraph 14 of the Framework and as such would be superfluous. In regards to point I the respondent points out that an assessment of coal mining should be covered through a coal mining risk assessment instead of a sustainability document. It is therefore suggested to delete policy SS1.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6007 - 11115 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 6216 Comment** **Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Recommendation that the opening policy of the Plan, SS1, should be much more than the generalized wish-list it currently is. It should offer a sequential guide to the way the rest of the plan works in the pursuit of sustainable placemaking. Example given in full submission.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6216 - 7581 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 6319 Comment** **Respondent: Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
Summary: Strata Homes comments on Policy SS1 and argues that it reflects paragraph 14 of the NPPF and as such it is superfluous. The policy also outlines a number of paragraphs which are covered through various paragraphs of the NPPF. Therefore the respondent suggests deletion of this policy. Point I refers to Coal Mining which would be addressed through a coal mining risk assessment and NOT through a Sustainability statement as the policy suggests.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6319 - 10158 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None
- 6348 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Martin Speed [11212]** **Agent: WYG (Harrogate office) (Mr John Dickinson) [11213]**
Summary: Policy SS1
The general principles of sustainable development in the current draft of Policy SS1 are supported. However, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out explicitly in paragraph 55 that the vitality of rural communities can mean that development in one village may support services in another village nearby. Policy SS1 should reflect this key principle, to ensure that there is a sufficiently broad recognition of what sustainability means in practice for a rural authority, and ensure that criterion f of the draft policy is not interpreted in an overly-restrictive manner.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6348 - 11212 - Policy SS1: Sustainable Development - None

4688 Object **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas** 🗨️ [10351]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to building on the green belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4688 - 10351 - Housing Employment and Retail Provision - None

4780 Support **Respondent: Rotherham MBC (Mr Ryan Shepherd)** [9526]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: Rotherham Council welcomes the opportunity the comment on the Consultation Draft Local Plan.

The Council supports the overall spatial strategy and locations for growth as set out in the document.

It considers that the proposed allocations and development management policies will promote sustainable development in compliance with national planning policy guidance, meeting the needs of the district and contributing to those of the wider Sheffield City Region.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 4780 - 9526 - Housing Employment and Retail Provision - None

6002 Support **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery)** [10098]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is noted that the Local Plan's proposed housing provision requirement of 300 dwellings pa is at the higher end of the OAHN figure set out in the SHMA and exceeds the higher end of the OAHN range following sensitivity testing. However, the Local Plan's requirement of 300 dwellings is considered to be fully justified as this higher figure would be more likely to positively support the economic growth and regeneration needs of the District and would be more likely to deliver higher levels of much needed affordable housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6002 - 10098 - Housing Employment and Retail Provision - None

4689 Object Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas [10351]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to building on the green belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4689 - 10351 - Housing Provision - None

4738 Object Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: Questions raised over why the housing requirement for Dronfield is now 860 instead of 285 like in the 2011 draft local plan. Questions whether the Council have considered their own Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4738 - 9167 - Housing Provision - None

5403 Object Respondent: Ms Rhian Harding [10774]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: The draft proposal for almost 1000 additional homes in Dronfield and Coal Aston shows no understanding of the needs of the local community. We have very little green space within our town, our primary schools are oversubscribed and class sizes above average and the senior school has no green space for children to play at break times and is already too big. We are losing local businesses, banks are closing and there is very little provision for safe cycling or teenage activity parks. The infrastructure and heritage needs investment in an already over-populated town.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5403 - 10774 - Housing Provision - None

5462 Object Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]**Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**

Summary: We have concerns regarding the SHMA (2013) and Sensitivity Update. The housing requirement is not based on the full OAN. Additional provision should be made to take account of unmet need from Sheffield, the economic needs of the area, the need for significant affordable housing and the latest population and household projections. A figure of between 390-420 dwellings per annum or 8,580 - 9,240 over the plan period should be provided for. Please see attached statement for further details.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5462 - 10799 - Housing Provision - None

5594 Object Respondent: Gleeson Regeneration Ltd [10846]**Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**

Summary: We have concerns regarding the SHMA 2013 and Sensitivity Update. The housing requirement is not based on the full OAN. Additional provision should be made to take account of unmet need from Sheffield, the economic needs of the area, the need for significant affordable housing and the latest population and household projections. A figure of between 390-420 dwellings per annum or 8,580 - 9,240 dwellings over the plan period should be provided.

Please see attached statement for further details

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5594 - 10846 - Housing Provision - None

6700 Object **Respondent: Hallam Land Management [7114]** **Agent: Pegasus Group (East Midlands Office) (Ian Deverell) [11291]**

Summary: In its approach to housing provision, the Local Plan should provides sufficient flexibility to deal with changing circumstances to ensure that the housing requirements over the plan period are delivered.

NPPF advises that local plans should meet objectively assessed needs with sufficient flexibility to deal with rapid change.

The Consultation Draft Plan does not address the issue of flexibility to deal with changing circumstances to ensure that the plan delivers the required housing provision over the plan period and maintains a five year supply of housing land.

The Council should look to include a policy in the submission draft plan setting out the approach to dealing with changed circumstances to provide the plan with sufficient flexibility.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6700 - 7114 - Housing Provision - None

6001 Support **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The housing provision requirement for the District of 6,600 new homes (300 per annum) over the Plan period set out in Policy SS2: Scale of Development, is fully supported, as it would meet the full objectively assessed housing needs of the District based on extensive evidence in the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw SHMA. DCC's Officers are familiar with the SHMA, particularly its methodology and conclusions and consider it to be a comprehensive and robust piece of evidence. The proposed housing requirement of 300 dwellings pa would meet the OAHN of the District in full, consistent with the requirements of paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6001 - 10098 - Housing Provision - None

6055 Support **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: SUPPORT the overall approach to meeting the District's Housing Need within the district across the plan period, as previously discussed and agreed through the Local Plan Liaison group.

The relationship between the Local Plan housing target of 300 dwellings per year and the SHMA 268-285 projection, and the approach to resolving the backlog of delivery up to 2016 could be more clearly set out.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6055 - 8156 - Housing Provision - None

5023 Comment **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: It appears from looking at the plan and talking to planning officers that the number of houses allocated to Dronfield has come from the amount of land that they have found landowners willing to sell, rather than a particular requirement for Dronfield. This seems very simplistic and is not driven by the need to provide affordable housing in the wider region. The areas identified will be highly profitable for developers creating estates with low density executive homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5023 - 10593 - Housing Provision - None

- 5225 Comment** **Respondent: Mr David Munn [8193]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I note that the Plan, as currently proposed, is to be reviewed in the light of recently released 2014-based population figures. Presumably the current proposals are based on data which is sufficiently robust that any update will not result in significant changes to the Plan. Equally, presumably the same will be true for any future variations within the life of the current Plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5225 - 8193 - Housing Provision - None
- 5278 Comment** **Respondent: Heath Village Development Committee (Mr David Oliver) [8202]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: It is noted that the Plan, as currently proposed, is to be reviewed in the light of recently released 2014-based population figures. It is assumed that the current proposals are based on data which is sufficiently robust that any update will not result in significant changes to the Plan. It is similarly assumed that the same will be true for any future variations within the life of the current Plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5278 - 8202 - Housing Provision - None
- 5482 Comment** **Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The evidence base presented explains how the housing requirement has been arrived at and this appears sensible. The minimum requirement of 300 new homes per year to support economic growth as well as deliver affordable housing will contribute towards the overall economic aspirations of the Sheffield City Region.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5482 - 7769 - Housing Provision - None
- 5984 Comment** **Respondent: Advance Land & Planning Limited (Mr Andy Williams) [9755]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The SHMA needs to be updated to take into account the 2014 based population figures and household projections as well as other factors (unmet need etc). We are however, compelled to question a strategy that seeks to set an annual housing requirement at 300 dwellings, which is around 20% lower than the previously adopted target of 380 dwellings set out in the East Midlands RSS, which appears to fly in the face of the NPPF's objective to significantly boost the supply of housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5984 - 9755 - Housing Provision - None
- 6004 Comment** **Respondent: Mr W Smith [11115]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
 Summary: Mr W Smith points out that the evidence base for the draft plan is significantly out of date, especially the SHMA 2013, the Growth Strategy 2014 and the 2011 Housing Needs Market and Affordability Study. These documents needs to be updated and need to provide a more robust evidence base:
 - Updated OAN requirements
 - Shortfall in affordable housing
 - Needs to release land from the Green Belt
 - Needs to deliver ambitious growth levels
 - Needs to deliver housing
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6004 - 11115 - Housing Provision - None

6056 Comment **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The plan allocates sufficient sites to meet the allocated housing need, taking account delivery up to 2016 and the backlog (as set out in appendix C), but it is not clear if this is to be resolved in the first five years of the plan and, if so, what happens to the target after this.
Impacts of the revised HS2 phase 2b proposals may need to be incorporated into future iterations of the plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6056 - 8156 - Housing Provision - None

6057 Comment **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Para 4.10
Acknowledge the need to update the SHMA following the publication of new 2014 population projections and that this is already being done co-operatively across the HMA through the Local Plan Liaison Group. The SHMA methodology remains sound and the update will provide a robust assessment for the next iteration of plans across the HMA.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6057 - 8156 - Housing Provision - None

6440 Comment **Respondent: Mr & Mrs N Beecroft [11244]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**
Summary: Statement that the Plan has been prepared on the basis of the 2013 SHMA and the sensitivity testing in 2014 and not on an updated assessment. Statement that an updated Assessment should be completed as soon as possible to determine the more localised need for new housing. This will be an important consideration in the review of the boundaries to the Level 3 Settlements.

Assumption that previous need for Wadshelf will be reassessed in the light of the revised Local Plan SHMA and updated housing targets process.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6440 - 11244 - Housing Provision - None

6559 Comment **Respondent: Harworth Estates (Mr T Love) [4431]** **Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**
Summary: Harworth Estates points out that there remain serious concerns of how the housing provision would fully respond to the anticipated employment market change which the northern part of the district will undergo. The respondent argues that greater consideration needs to be given to the impact of the SCR on the northern settlements due to the planned 70,000 new jobs until 2025. Housing provision would have to meet job growth and in that sense there would be a very large impact especially on Killamarsh due to its close proximity to Sheffield. Killamarsh should therefore accommodate a greater level of housing growth.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6559 - 4431 - Housing Provision - None

6572 Comment **Respondent: Messrs FS, FJ & WV Rodgers [11276]** **Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**
Summary: Messrs Rodgers point out that there remain serious concerns over how the housing provision would fully respond to the anticipated employment market change which the northern part of the district will undergo. The respondents argue that greater consideration needs to be given to the impact of the SCR on the northern sub-area due to the planned 70,000 new jobs until 2025. Housing provision would have to meet job growth. In that sense there would be a large impact on the northern settlements and especially on the subject site which would be able to accommodate a portion of NEDDC's housing provision.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6572 - 11276 - Housing Provision - None

6626 Comment**Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: As part of the Draft LP consultation the Council has not provided a 5 YHLS calculation. The HBF preferences for the calculation of 5 YHLS include 20% buffer applied to both annualised housing requirement and any shortfalls which should be recouped as quickly as possible using the Sedgefield approach(NPPGID 3-035-20140306).

If there is not reasonable certainty that the Council has a 5 YHLS the LP cannot be considered sound as it would be neither effective nor consistent with national policy as set out in the NPPF(para47).

If the NED LP is not to be out of date on adoption it is critical that the land supply requirement is achieved

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6626 - 4414 - Housing Provision - None

6707 Comment**Respondent: Harron Homes Ltd. (Mr Mark Beevers) [11293]****Agent: ID Planning (Mr Jonathan Dunbavin) [11292]**

Summary: Harron Homes notes that the SHMA needs to be updated to take into account the 2014 based population figures and household projections as well as other factors (unmet need etc) and questions the housing requirement of 300 dwellings per annum.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6707 - 11293 - Housing Provision - None

4734 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: "The local plan aims to provide new jobs along with new housing" Where are the new jobs in Dronfield for the 860 new households planned? Callywhite Lane is not one of your Strategic Sites and employment you have said is in storage and distribution which does not employ many.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4734 - 9167 - Employment Land Provision - None

5217 Comment**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The statement "The Local Plan aims to provide new jobs" is both false and misleading. The most this plan can potentially achieve is to ensure the development of an environment sufficiently appealing to attract additional employment. The additional congestion in the Dronfield area is likely to do the Statement "[The Local Plan] acknowledges the 61% of people who commute out of the District to work". Consequently, the Local Plan also acknowledges that providing an additional 860 dwellings in Dronfield without a commensurate increase in local employment will increase commuting, congestion and CO2 emissions.pposite.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5217 - 9166 - Employment Land Provision - None

5936 Comment**Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]****Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Sophie Taylor) [4539]**

Summary: Bolsover Land Ltd suggests that the Policy SS2: Scale of Development should be revisited once the Employment Land Update is reviewed and that a 50ha employment land provision may be too high. It is questioned if this takes into account the planning permission for the Coalite site; whilst this employment land will fall within Bolsover, it will however serve the M1 corridor. Bolsover Land Ltd feels that there is a credible argument that this provision could contribute to the overall NEDDC employment land provision due to its strategic nature and location.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5936 - 4542 - Employment Land Provision - None

5960 Comment**Respondent: Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096]****Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**

Summary: The respondent suggests that the policy on new employment land (50ha) is revisited once the most up to date Employment Land Update (ELU) is issued later. There is clearly the opportunity to release this site from the employment land designation without having a detrimental impact on high quality employment land supply within the district and this would potentially reduce pressure on other Greenfield or Green Belt sites within the locality.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5960 - 11096 - Employment Land Provision - None

5973 Comment**Respondent: Green Piling Ltd (Green Piling Ltd) [11104]****Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**

Summary: Green Piling suggests that once the most up-to-date Employment Land Update (ELU) is issued later this year the policy of employment land provision (50ha) should be revisited. There is clearly the opportunity to release this site from the allocation without having a detrimental impact on high quality employment land supply within the district. Such an approach would be consistent with the proposed spatial strategy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5973 - 11104 - Employment Land Provision - None

6058 Comment**Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Paras 4.16 & 4.18

Further explanation would be useful as to why the mid-range figure of 50ha has been selected from the 2013 ELU. The link between the minimum target of 50 ha of employment land and the target of target of 64.8ha in policy S3 could be more clearly set out (assuming it is to provide flexibility in sites and to meet LEP growth aspirations).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6058 - 8156 - Employment Land Provision - None

- 5463 Object** **Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: Please see previous summary in relation to 'Housing Provision' and attached statement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5463 - 10799 - Balancing Housing and Economic Growth - None
- 5595 Object** **Respondent: Gleeson Regeneration Ltd [10846]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: Please see previous summary in relation to 'Housing Provision' and attached statement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5595 - 10846 - Balancing Housing and Economic Growth - None
- 5416 Support** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
 Summary: Support the aim of seeking to balance housing with employment growth and the aim of reducing out commuting
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5416 - 10724 - Balancing Housing and Economic Growth - None
- 5218 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Statement "The Council's Growth Strategy has the intention of raising job densities (jobs/worker) within the District"
 The plan to build 860 homes in Dronfield will significantly reduce the job density within the settlement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5218 - 9166 - Balancing Housing and Economic Growth - None
- 6377 Comment** **Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**
 Summary: The Plan will need to remain flexible in order to respond to any increased housing need and our clients' site is well located to meet any housing growth to serve the needs of SCC should this be an issue which arises as the Plan progresses. At present it is not possible to see how the Plan will be sufficiently flexible to respond to these issues.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6377 - 8171 - Balancing Housing and Economic Growth - None
- 6710 Comment** **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
 Summary: Paragraph 4.23 refers to the evidence underpinning the employment target which is under review, the outcome of this work may amend the current targets and commentary set out in the plan. St Modwen has previously shared with the Council's Policy Team an Employment Land Need: North East Derbyshire (November 2016) report produced on its behalf by Regeneris Consulting. RPS reserve the right to make further comments once the updated evidence is available.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6710 - 8407 - Balancing Housing and Economic Growth - None

5070 Comment

Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Dronfield is a thriving town with some wonderful local businesses. If people want big shops they only need to travel a short distance to Chesterfield or Sheffield. A new retail park is being developed at Meadowhead only 5 mins away from Dronfield. Dronfield's independent shops and character should be protected and the right type of commerce attracted.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5070 - 10593 - Retail Provision - None

- 5408 Object** **Respondent: PMW Property [10783]** **Agent: Cerda Planning Limited (Michael Robson) [10782]**
 Summary: See attached
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5408 - 10783 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5464 Object** **Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: We propose the following new wording for Policy SS2 Scale of Development:

 5.016 Policy SS2 Scale of Development should be amended to:
 'For the period 2011-2033 the Local Plan will make sufficient housing and employment land to accommodate a minimum of:
 * 8,580 dwellings; and
 * 50ha of new employment land

 Please see attached statement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5464 - 10799 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5596 Object** **Respondent: Gleeson Regeneration Ltd [10846]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: we propose the following new wording for Policy SS2 Scale of Development

 5.016 Policy SS2 Scale of Development should be amended to:
 'For the period 2011-2033 the Local Plan will make sufficient housing and employment land to accommodate a minimum of:
 * 8,580 dwellings; and
 * 50ha of new employment land

 Please see attached statement
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5596 - 10846 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5622 Object** **Respondent: Mr John Prestwich [10858]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Michael Edgar) [4355]**
 Summary: Please refer to the attached SPRU Report on Objectively Assessed Housing Need.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5622 - 10858 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5625 Object** **Respondent: W Redmile & Sons Ltd [10859]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Michael Edgar) [4355]**
 Summary: Please refer to the attached SPRU report on the objectively assessed need for housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5625 - 10859 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

- 5659 Object** **Respondent: Cartledge Farms Ltd [10876]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Michael Edgar) [4355]**
 Summary: Please refer to the attached SPRU report which outlines additional requirement for housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5659 - 10876 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 6139 Object** **Respondent: Sheffield FC (Mr Richard Timms) [8364]** **Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) East Midlands (Mr Doug Moulton) [8357]**
 Summary: Mr Richard Timms objects to Policy SS2. This is supported by the attached research report on Objectively Assessed Housing Need which concludes that
 - much of the Council's supporting evidence is now out of date
 - the proposed level of housing provision is unlikely to be able to support either the current level of jobs in the future or any employment growth
 - the identified level of affordable housing need would be unmet
 - a housing requirement of between 338 and 395 dpa would be required
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6139 - 8364 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 6396 Object** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]** **Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**
 Summary: Hallam Land Management Ltd objects to Policy SS2 because it would fail to account for full objectively assessed housing need, would be unduly pessimistic in respect of economic growth and would fail to meet anticipated housing need arising from the Sheffield City Region. The respondent refers to the SHMA projection PROJ B which indicates high commuting rates and total jobs which would more than double. It is therefore suggested that the housing requirement figure is re-evaluated. Eventually, Sheffield is likely to have a shortfall which should be accommodated over the plan period by NED.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6396 - 11228 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 6422 Object** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]** **Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**
 Summary: Hallam Land Management Ltd objects to Policy SS2 because it would fail to account for full objectively assessed housing need, would be unduly pessimistic in respect of economic growth and would fail to meet anticipated housing need arising from the Sheffield City Region. The respondent refers to the SHMA projection PROJ B which indicates high commuting rates and total jobs which would more than double. It is therefore suggested that the housing requirement figure is re-evaluated. Eventually, Sheffield is likely to have a shortfall which should be accommodated over the plan period by NED.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6422 - 11228 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 6461 Object** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]** **Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**
 Summary: Hallam Land Management Ltd objects to Policy SS2 because it would fail to account for a full objectively assessed housing need, would be unduly pessimistic in respect of economic growth and would fail to meet anticipated housing need arising from the Sheffield City Region. The respondent refers to the SHMA projection PROJ B which indicates high commuting rates and total jobs which would more than double. It is therefore suggested that the housing requirement figure is re-evaluated. Eventually, Sheffield is likely to have a shortfall which should be accommodated over the plan period by NED.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6461 - 11228 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6612 Object**Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: SHMA reports are now somewhat dated. The Council should give further consideration to its OAHN and the housing requirement as set out in Policy SS2.

When the SHMA is updated it is suggested that :-

- any meaningful change from the 2014 SNHP is taken into account (NPPG ID 2a-016-20140306);
- economic growth aspired to by the LEPs is supported by the alignment of economic and housing strategies; □
- account is taken of any unmet needs from elsewhere in particular Sheffield.

Housing White expects the Council to prepare an up-to-date sufficiently ambitious Plan which recognises and plans for the homes that are needed. Housing White Paper proposes standard methodology for the assessment of housing needs/requirements.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6612 - 4414 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6678 Object**Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]****Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: Policy SS2 proposes a housing provision target to accommodate "a minimum of 6,600 dwellings" over the plan period, which equates to 300 dwellings per annum. This is significantly lower than the previous 380 dwellings per annum target of the adopted East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. The evidence base which supports the Council's stated Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) is dated. Paragraph 158 of the NPPF requires the Local Plan to be based upon up-to-date evidence. RPS recommends that further evidence work is undertaken by the Council to determine the District's OAHN based upon an up to date evidence base.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6678 - 11287 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6692 Object**Respondent: Hallam Land Management [7114]****Agent: Pegasus Group (East Midlands Office) (Ian Deverell) [11291]**

Summary: The recognition of the need to update the SHMA to reflect more up-to-date evidence is welcomed. This reflects guidance set out in the (NPPG) which requires the most up-to-date evidence of household growth to be used.

300 dwellings per year target identified in the Consultation Draft Plan.

It is considered that the housing target underestimates the full objectively assessed housing need for the district and is based on out-of-date evidence. Concern that proposed OAN does not meet demographic requirements, when considering trends over a longer term period.

Recommended that the SHMA is updated to use the 2014 based household projections.

Critical for the soundness of the plan that the Council updates its evidence to reflect the most recent data for determining the full OAHN.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6692 - 7114 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6711 Object**Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]****Agent: Spawforths (Mr Gavin Winter) [8147]**

Summary: Statement that the Plan is unsound in respect of Policy SS3. Council have not satisfied the 'Duty to Cooperate' requirements, unresolved strategic matters need to be addressed very soon by the respective Council's. No up-to-date Duty to Co-operate Statement published for consultation as part of this Draft Local Plan stage. Duty to Co-operate Statement will need to be prepared for pre-submission draft plan.

Evidence base used to determine the OAHN is out-of-date. Statement that the plan is unsound and is not positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development. It is not justified and based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6711 - 8171 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

- 6059 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: SS2 Scale of development
 SUPPORT the intention to meet housing need within the district, although it could be clearer if the figure of 6,600 dwellings across the plan period represents the OAN or is a target taking account of other factors. For clarity, it appears this policy could be combined with policy SS3 to avoid confusion over the employment target in particular.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6059 - 8156 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 6250 Support** **Respondent: Messrs S & K Whittam & Grayson [8368]** **Agent: IBA Planning Limited (Mr Nick Baseley) [4560]**
 Summary: S Whittham and K Grayson support the scale of development (minimum of 6,600 dwellings until 2033) set out under Policy SS2.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6250 - 8368 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 6574 Support** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs F Elliot [11277]** **Agent: Copesticks Ltd. (Mr Tim Farley) [9829]**
 Summary: LP approach, setting a minimum objective for employment land, is supported. The delivery of employment development is very much driven by market requirements and there is a need for flexibility to ensure that that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation (NPPF p.7).
 Different employment uses give rise to different developed densities and employment densities. To be reactive to changing market conditions successfully, there must be flexibility in the guiding policies. Draft Policy SS2 is considered to be sound.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6574 - 11277 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5071 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I have nothing against Dronfield building new homes in a manageable number - on sites that need developing and regenerating. Not on this scale and not on green belt. Dronfield has grown 5x in size over the last 100 years while the population has doubled. It has already grown to its capacity and has already contributed to the housing need. It appears that because some landowners are keen to sell their land (due to the huge profit that could be made in the Dronfield area) Dronfield has been hit with a disproportionate allocation.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5071 - 10593 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5551 Comment** **Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Our response to the consultation in March 2015 highlighted that Sheffield might not be able to accommodate all its own objectively assessed housing need. We will set out the options for meeting our growth later this year, including significant Green Belt release. However, some options may not be deliverable in the short-medium term. It is therefore necessary to approach neighbouring authorities about meeting some of Sheffield's housing needs, particularly in the short to medium term up to 2028. After that, we would expect strategic sites within Sheffield to boost supply up to 2034 and beyond.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5551 - 7769 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

- 5640 Comment** **Respondent: Define (Mr Mark Rose) [7847]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy SS2 should be revised to include a clear acknowledgement for the District's role of complying with the Duty to Cooperate and the need to review the Green Belt to release appropriate sites for development in the northern part of the District to contribute meeting housing needs.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5640 - 7847 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5648 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Robert Gilmore [10344]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Review the level of housing proposed in order to provide a more realistic assessment and target of housing need.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5648 - 10344 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5937 Comment** **Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Sophie Taylor) [4539]**
 Summary: Bolsover Land Ltd therefore queries whether the proposed 50ha of new employment land within Policy SS2, Scale of Development, is justified; it may need to change subject to the most up to date evidence base being issued.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5937 - 4542 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5953 Comment** **Respondent: Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: Panache Lingerie Ltd generally supports the proposed level for residential development of up to 1,950 dwellings within Level 2 Settlements, including Renishaw. However, the respondent has serious concerns about the calculation of the housing need. The Council states that 1,016 units of the 6,600 dwellings have already been built. This would directly contravene paragraph 47 of the NPPF, as these houses are delivered, as opposed to deliverable. Therefore, there would be scope to develop more than 1,950 units within Level 2 Settlements.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5953 - 11096 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5970 Comment** **Respondent: Green Piling Ltd (Green Piling Ltd) [11104]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: Green Piling generally supports the proposed level of new employment land of 50ha. However, the respondent has serious concerns about the way in which the Council calculated their housing need which includes 1,016 houses which have already been built/delivered. This would directly contravene paragraph 47 of the NPPF, as these houses are delivered, as opposed to deliverable.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5970 - 11104 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None
- 5985 Comment** **Respondent: Advance Land & Planning Limited (Mr Andy Williams) [9755]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: In the light of the forgoing, we suggest that the scale of development will have to be increased above the current proposal of 6,600 dwellings for the plan period.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5985 - 9755 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6020 Comment**Respondent: Mr W Smith [11115]****Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**

Summary: W Smith mentions that Policy SS2 is vague and sets only a minimum target and does not account for substantial uplifts in employment from investment to the two LEPs. The plan should also provide sufficient adaptability and flexibility to ensure it can meet the needs of housing growth within the two LEPs. It is suggested that the policy should include:

- Increased housing requirement to account for economic growth, or reduce growth to account for lower requirement.
- Greater flexibility by releasing more sites to increase housing supply which do not serve an out of settlement purpose

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6020 - 11115 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6225 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Gray [11155]****Agent: Fisher German LLP (Liberty Stones) [10150]**

Summary: Mrs Margaret Gray points out that the SHMA Final Report 2013 and the SHMA Sensitivity Testing Analysis 2014 are now out of date. The updating of those reports may affect the housing requirement figure. Also, unmet needs from Sheffield will need to be accommodated by NED. It would be highly likely that the housing requirement would therefore need to increase which could be fulfilled by the Land immediately north of Tupton and Land south East of site aq at Wingerworth.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6225 - 11155 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6238 Comment**Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]****Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]**

Summary: It's noted that Shirland and Stonebroom have been identified as potential sustainable locations for proposed provision of 230 dwellings in Shirland, and 85 dwellings in Stonebroom during the plan period.

EPC-UK wishes to support the Council in meeting their strategic objectives and development aims and targets.

However, this must be balanced with a fair and reasonable review of the scale and location of development being proposed. Concerns over potential impact of development within Rough Close Works(RCWs) consultation zones.

Assurances sought from Council that the RCWs consultation zone will be rigidly protected and none of the additional development proposed within the Plan will be located in close proximity to RCWs.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6238 - 540 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6289 Comment **Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Questions raised over predicted employment growth in NED, saying that by the time the Plan is adopted, job growth will have expired and, if the Derbyshire Employment Forecast is correct, the economy of the area will have largely flattened out.

Suggestion that NED take a more ambitious position than this, and make policy interventions on that basis.

CPRE would strongly support the emphasis on reducing out-commuting.

Statement that the www.gov.uk Live Table 253 indicated that completions over 2011-16 period averaged only 142 per year, of which only 3% (20 homes) were affordable. The reason for this statistical discrepancy is unclear. Statement that housing completions would need to be increased.

Questions raised over the OAN, statement that the translation of OAN into the proposed housing requirement is deeply ineffective, and therefore unsound. (See full submission for more).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6289 - 7581 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6305 Comment **Respondent: Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy SS2 states that the draft plan will make sufficient land available to accommodate a minimum of 6,600 dwellings during the Plan period (2011-2033). This figure equates to 300 dwellings per annum over the plan period and we understand that this is informed by the draft plan's 2013 Strategic Housing Market Area (SHMA) Assessment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6305 - 11116 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6322 Comment **Respondent: Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**

Summary: Strata Homes mentions that Policy SS2 is vague and sets only a minimum target and does not account for substantial uplifts in employment from investment to the two LEPs. The plan should also provide sufficient adaptability and flexibility to ensure it can meet the needs of housing growth within the region. It is suggested that the policy should include:

- Increased housing requirement to account for economic growth, or reduce growth to account for lower requirement.
- Greater flexibility by releasing more sites to increase housing supply

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6322 - 10158 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6349 Comment Respondent: Mr Martin Speed [11212] Agent: WYG (Harrogate office) (Mr John Dickinson) [11213]

Summary: Policy SS2

The principle of Policy SS2 identifying a level of housing provision which is seen as a minimum is supported, but the local plan as a whole must ensure that a policy context is created which actively supports sustainable development where these figures are likely to be exceeded.

it is unclear at present how the Council intend to address the record of persistent under delivery of housing in the District and in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF should include provision for a buffer of 20% above the identified annual requirement for housing during the first five years of the Plan period.

the Publication Version of the Local Plan prior to the Examination will need to take full account of any updated evidence base in respect of housing need, as well as the potential

Table 4.1 Policy SS3 Policies SS12 and SS14 Policy LC1 standardised methodology on assessing needs as discussed in the Government's Housing White Paper

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6349 - 11212 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6406 Comment Respondent: Mr Paul Stock [8388] Agent: N/A

Summary: We believe that the decision taken by the Council not to review the housing requirement has been made without sufficient regard to the requirements and guidance provided by national policy and practice guidance as cited above. The Council must also consider wider issues such as market signals, affordable and economic needs. The balancing of housing and employment strategies is critical in securing economic development and sustainable growth.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6406 - 8388 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6539 Comment Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071] Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council's proposed housing requirement is based on evidence prepared in 2013/14, statement that an update is needed so LP is identifying sufficient land to meet development needs.

Noted that the proposed annual housing requirement of 300 dwellings per annum over the plan period does not represent the upper end of the OAN range identified within the Council's own evidence base.

Gladman welcomes update to housing target based on updated evidence and further work with strategic partners. Would welcome opportunity to be involved in any consultation exercises relating to preparation of new evidence base document.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6539 - 10071 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6709 Comment Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407] Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]

Summary: The proposed housing provision target "minimum of 6,600 dwellings" over the period equalling 300 dwellings per annum, is significantly lower than previous 380 dwellings per annum target of the adopted East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. The evidence base supporting the Council's stated Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) of 300 dwellings per annum is significantly dated. RPS would request that the updated evidence base should be made available when it is complete and this should be issued for consultation alongside other Local Plan Evidence Base documents.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6709 - 8407 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

6715 Comment Respondent: **Harron Homes Ltd. (Mr Mark Beevers) [11293]**

Agent: **ID Planning (Mr Jonathan Dunbavin) [11292]**

Summary: Harron Homes suggests that the scale of development will have to be increased above the current proposal of 6,600 dwellings for the plan period.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6715 - 11293 - Policy SS2: Scale of Development - None

5323 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Dean [10732]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4. Spatial Strategy Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy. Ref 4.27 - Morton has been categorised as level 2 as a "Settlement with a good level of sustainability". This ranking is obtained from findings in the settlement and hierarchy study (December 2016). We believe this categorisation is incorrect and should be reviewed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5323 - 10732 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

5465 Object**Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]****Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**

Summary: The Settlement Hierarchy is broadly in line with the fundamental principles of sustainability set out in the Framework. As already set out in Section 5, it is considered that the housing requirement for the plan period of 300 dwellings per annum or 6,600 for the plan period is insufficient to meet the full OAN. There are opportunities for some of the Level 2 Settlements to support higher levels of housing provision. See attached statement

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5465 - 10799 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

5597 Object**Respondent: Gleeson Regeneration Ltd [10846]****Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**

Summary: The Settlement Hierarchy is broadly in line with the fundamental principles of sustainability set out in the Framework. As already set out in Section 5, it is considered that the housing requirement for the plan period of 300 dwellings per annum or 6,600 for the plan period is insufficient to meet the full OAN. There are opportunities for some of the Level 2 Settlements to support higher levels of housing provision. See Attached Statement

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5597 - 10846 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

6521 Object**Respondent: Mr Simon Carr [8173]****Agent: Planning and Design Practice Ltd (Mr Richard Pigott) [4588]**

Summary: Questions over how different the settlement hierarchy is to the previous iteration contained in the 2015 draft LP. Statement that proposed pattern of growth is spatially very uneven with no growth allowed for in the west sub-area. Argument given for Ashover to be included as a Level 2 settlement. Questions over why Ashover is not suitable for any at all with the exception of windfall sites.

Statement that to preclude all but infill development in so many settlements appears at odds with the NPPF which recognises the social and economic benefits of a limited amount of new housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6521 - 8173 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

- 4856 Support Respondent: Dr Derek Cullen [8110] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I am writing to support the local plan which sensibly is limiting development to sustainable places. As a resident of Heath Village we already have problems with parking and traffic in the village which would be increased by further development
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4856 - 8110 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5115 Support Respondent: Mr C Pratt [6423] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I support the re-categorisation of Ashover and Kelstedge as level 3 settlements and Alton ,Fallgate and Littlemoor as level 4 settlements which now realistically reflect these communities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5115 - 6423 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5120 Support Respondent: Mrs Muriel Pratt [8331] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I support the recategorisation of settlements within the Ashover parish as level 3 and 4 settlements and this realistically reflects these communities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5120 - 8331 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5226 Support Respondent: Mr David Munn [8193] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I welcome the Council's change in policy which now allocates housing growth to reflect sustainability levels within differing parts of infrastructure in the district. This appears to give a more logical and equitable distribution of new housing development. The previous proportional distribution resulted in new homes being proposed in locations which could not accommodate them.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5226 - 8193 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5309 Support Respondent: Mrs Christine Brocksopp [10716] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Comment: Uppertown Hamlet in Ashover Parish. Should it be specified in Level 4?
 Comment: I support the re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover parish as level 3 & 4 settlements
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5309 - 10716 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5552 Support Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The strategy to direct growth to the most sustainable settlements is welcomed, and is in line with the aims of the NPPF. Three of the four level one settlements are in the north and therefore have a stronger relationship with Sheffield than Clay Cross in the south. With the majority of housing growth proposed across the four towns and four strategic sites, this is likely to result in a reasonable amount of new homes being developed in settlements where there are commuting links to Sheffield and where there is an overlap in the housing market with Sheffield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5552 - 7769 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

- 5883 Support** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs David & Margaret Wombwell [11062]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the change of Ashover to Level 3 Settlements with limited sustainability. Support for removing housing growth targets for Ashover.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5883 - 11062 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5885 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Isobel Clark [8068]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for Ashover being categorised at Level 3 & 4 in the settlement hierarchy. Support for removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the district.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5885 - 8068 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 6226 Support** **Respondent: Patricia Scott [8283]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for Ashover being categorised as Level 3 & 4 in the Settlement Hierarchy.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6226 - 8283 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 6328 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Ellen Hardwick [8198]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for categorising Ashover as a Settlement 3 & 4 in the Settlement Hierarchy.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6328 - 8198 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 6609 Support** **Respondent: Mr J White [11282]** **Agent: JVH Town Planning Consultants (Janet Hodson) [1990]**
 Summary: We support Killamarsh as a development location and the proposed release of sites from the green belt to support development in this sustainable location and noted as a Level 1 Settlement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6609 - 11282 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 4735 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Why does an already large centre mean it has the greatest needs for new housing? I disagree. Dronfield should not become larger to eventually become a mini city or because of their urban sprawl join with Sheffield or Unstone.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4735 - 9167 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

4736 Comment Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167] Agent: N/A

Summary: Four Strategic Sites have been identified etc, along with 43ha of employment land and XXm26 of retail floorspace. Callywhite Lane is not listed as amongst the four Strategic Sites where most of the housing will be along with a large proportion of employment land so why build houses in Dronfield? This plan makes statements that Callywhite Lane is not attractive to investment - another reason not to build houses in Dronfield. It will only drive up commuting, unemployment and congestion.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4736 - 9167 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

4740 Comment Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167] Agent: N/A

Summary: Distribution of Growth and Settlement Hierarchy
Why does this council consider it necessary to make the largest centres of population even bigger whilst making no effort whatsoever to plan for the proposals? With an additional 860 houses in Dronfield that would mean a 10% increase in population, of 2064 people, with 680 children with 37.8 more children in every school year group, with 1760 more cars on Dronfield's already congested streets.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4740 - 9167 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

5171 Comment Respondent: Morton Parish Council (Ms Tina Frost Morris) [7882] Agent: N/A

Summary: Ref 4.27 - Morton has been categorised as level 2 as a "Settlement with a good level of sustainability". This ranking is obtained from findings in the settlement and hierarchy study (December 2016). We believe this categorisation is incorrect and should be reviewed.

Statement that due to the geography of Morton, busus that only go through the outskirts should not be included in the scoring. This should be taken into account within the scoring mechanism The current scoring is 24 which should be revised to 8 excluding the 55,55x and SP1. North East Derbyshire should downgrade the Level 2 categorization for Morton to level 3.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5171 - 7882 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

5219 Comment Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166] Agent: N/A

Summary: The statement in paragraph 4.26: "the Local Plan aims to direct new growth to the district's most sustainable settlements based on the Settlement Hierarchy" and repeated in paragraph 7.4 conflates settlement size with 'sustainability'. This plan offers no evidence to demonstrate that enlarging an already large settlement by building on land currently designated as Green Belt is more 'sustainable' than other options.

Para 4.28 is misleading: the size of a community does not necessarily correlate to job volume creation. The plan does not provide evidence that Dronfield will generate the number of jobs commensurate with 860 additional dwellings.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5219 - 9166 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

5980 Comment Respondent: Green Piling Ltd (Green Piling Ltd) [11104] Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]

Summary: Sustainability: Green Piling argues that their site occupies a highly sustainable location within the defined settlement boundary of Renishaw. The release of their land, particularly if in addition to the adjacent vacant land to the east (Panache Lingerie site) would also enable an adequate standard of amenity to be achieved for future occupants.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5980 - 11104 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

6097 Comment **Respondent:** Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096] **Agent:** Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]
Summary: Sustainability: Panache Lingerie considers their own site as a wholly sustainable location for residential development within the defined settlement boundary of Renishaw with excellent transportation links and accessibility to local services.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6097 - 11096 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

6189 Comment **Respondent:** John Church Planning Consultancy Limited (Mr John Church) [4417] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: No objection is raised in principle to the identification of Brackenfield under level 4 in the Settlement Hierarchy (Table 4.1), policy SS13 is considered to be unnecessarily restrictive

Statement that the words "and rounding-off" should be inserted between the words "infill" and "development".

It is requested that the policy be modified, slightly, in accordance with these representations.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6189 - 4417 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

6571 Comment **Respondent:** Messrs FS, FJ & WV Rodgers [11276] **Agent:** Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]
Summary: Messrs Rodgers point out that the distribution of housing growth purports to be in part directed in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy Study and argue that the subject site would be capable of accommodation significant growth. Therefore, the site should be enabled to deliver a proportion of housing provision via a proposed allocation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6571 - 11276 - Distribution of Growth & the Settlement Hierarchy - None

6458	Object	Respondent: Mr Paul Johnson [6884]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: Statement that the reliance on the existing scale of a settlement and the increasingly transient levels of local services in the Settlement Hierarchy Study, will always suggest that new development should be focused towards locations such as Killamarsh. Objection to the four main towns not being properly assessed in the Settlement Hierarchy Study.		
	Change To Plan:		
	Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
	Full Reference: O - 6458 - 6884 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None		
4840	Support	Respondent: Mr A Petrie [6413]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: The re-categorisation of Ashover and Kelstedge as level 3 settlements with only limited sustainability, and Alton, Fallgate and Littlemoor as level 4 settlements with very little sustainability, also reflects realistically now the circumstances of these communities.		
	Change To Plan:		
	Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
	Full Reference: S - 4840 - 6413 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None		
5136	Support	Respondent: Mr A Hardwick [8085]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: I particularly agree with Ashover now being considered a level 3 settlement.		
	Change To Plan:		
	Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
	Full Reference: S - 5136 - 8085 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None		
5179	Support	Respondent: Clare and Ian Blaskey [10654]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: We support the re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover Parish as level 3&4.		
	Change To Plan:		
	Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
	Full Reference: S - 5179 - 10654 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None		
5189	Support	Respondent: Helen Boffy [10661]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: Support the re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover Parish as level 3 and 4 settlements and,		
	Change To Plan:		
	Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
	Full Reference: S - 5189 - 10661 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None		
5192	Support	Respondent: Mr David Boffy [10662]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: Support the re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover Parish as level 3 and 4 settlements and,		
	Change To Plan:		
	Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
	Full Reference: S - 5192 - 10662 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None		

- 5261 Support Respondent: Johanne Boulding [8047] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover Parish as level 3 and 4 settlements;
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5261 - 8047 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5269 Support Respondent: Mrs Sally Skinner [8285] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover Parish as level 3 and 4 settlements and
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5269 - 8285 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5313 Support Respondent: JK Marsden [8305] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover Parish as level 3 and 4 settlements.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5313 - 8305 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5343 Support Respondent: Paul Eastwood [8278] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for re-categorisation of Ashover and Kelstedge as level 3 settlements with only limited sustainability, and Alton, Fallgate and Littlemoor as level 4 settlements with very little sustainability.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5343 - 8278 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5351 Support Respondent: Mrs Thelma Childs [8335] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover Parish as level 3 and 4 settlements.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5351 - 8335 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5355 Support Respondent: Gemma Childs [10750] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover Parish as level 3 and 4 settlements.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5355 - 10750 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5379 Support Respondent: Jill Broadhead [10766] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover Parish as level 3 and 4 settlements.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5379 - 10766 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None

- 5580 Support** **Respondent: Peter Maskrey [10842]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Fully supports the re-categorisation of the settlements within Ashover Parish as level 3 and 4 settlements.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5580 - 10842 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5696 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Hardwick [8097]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the re-categorisation of Ashover and Kelstage as level 3 settlements and Alton, Fallgate and Littlemoor as level 4 settlements which realistically reflect these communities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5696 - 8097 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 5986 Support** **Respondent: Advance Land & Planning Limited (Mr Andy Williams) [9755]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We note and support the identification of Holmewood as a Level 2 Settlement and we agree that such settlements should accommodate a significant proportion of the District's housing requirement, especially those settlements that are strategically well-placed and not surrounded by Green Belt, such as Holmewood.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5986 - 9755 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 6005 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The definition of a Settlement Hierarchy for the District in Table 4.1 as the basis for the spatial distribution of the Local Plan's proposed housing growth set out in Policy SS3 and table 4.2, appears to be well conceived and justified and based on extensive evidence in the North Derbyshire Settlement Hierarchy Study(SHS).
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6005 - 10098 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 6013 Support** **Respondent: Janet E Bradley [8342]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I support the change of category of settlements with the parish of Ashover, to level 3 and level 4. (Village)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6013 - 8342 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None
- 6201 Support** **Respondent: Chris Scott [11161]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for Ashover settlement hierarchy change from Level 2 to Level 3 & 4.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6201 - 11161 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None

6350 Support **Respondent: Mr Martin Speed [11212]** **Agent: WYG (Harrogate office) (Mr John Dickinson) [11213]**

Summary: Table 4.1

The identification of Shirland as a Level 2 settlement is supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6350 - 11212 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None

6466 Support **Respondent: Mrs Anne Eastwood [8059]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support for the re-categorisation of Ashover and Kelstedge as level 3 settlements with only limited sustainability, and Alton, Fallgate and Littlemoor as level 4 settlements with very little sustainability; the limiting effect of this approach in restricting housing growth within the Parish to infill within the settlement development limits along with isolated 'windfall' development on brown-field sites in the open countryside is both welcome and appropriate.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6466 - 8059 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None

6638 Support **Respondent: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd [11285]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Bob Woollard) [10128]**

Summary: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd supports the identification of Shirland as a Level 2 Settlement with good levels of sustainability.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6638 - 11285 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None

6661 Support **Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**

Summary: Table 4.1 Settlement Hierarchy: support for the identification of Heath as a Level 3 Settlement

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6661 - 692 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None

6713 Support **Respondent: Harron Homes Ltd. (Mr Mark Beevers) [11293]** **Agent: ID Planning (Mr Jonathan Dunbavin) [11292]**

Summary: Harron Homes broadly supports the proposed settlement hierarchy which identifies the settlements of Morton and North Wingfield as Level 2 settlements.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6713 - 11293 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None

6547 Comment **Respondent: Harworth Estates (Mr T Love) [4431]** **Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**

Summary: Harworth Estates challenges the 'ranking' of Killamarsh as a Level 1b 'Secondary Town' within the Settlement Hierarchy because no justification is offered as to why the four primary settlements are split into 'principal' and 'secondary' sub-level brackets. Instead, Killamarsh should be considered as 'Principal Town' for the purposes of the direction of growth and housing provision.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6547 - 4431 - Table 4.1: Settlement Hierarchy - None

- 5072 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: All areas of Green Belt should be retained until all opportunities presented by redeveloping Brownfield sites and delivering innovative, affordable housing has been exhausted.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5072 - 10593 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 5212 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy SS3 states that employment growth will be on four strategic sites to the South and East of Chesterfield. It therefore follows that the plan for 860 additional dwellings in Dronfield is environmentally unsustainable. This is inconsistent with objectives 3.9 D8 and D13, and in breach of policy SS1 clauses c and g.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5212 - 9166 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 5220 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The evidence base referenced in policy SS3 does not fulfil the requirement for "exceptional circumstances" that are necessary to take land out of the Green Belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5220 - 9166 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 5409 Object** **Respondent: PMW Property [10783]** **Agent: Cerda Planning Limited (Michael Robson) [10782]**
 Summary: Object to approach.
 The Emerging Plan seeks to deliver economic growth in only four location across what is an extensive rural district.
 This has a number of flaws:
 1. limited locations causes the plan to be inherently inflexible and sensitive to market change, viability issues.
 2.the rate of delivery is limited. Spreading economic growth across a wider portfolio of sites, enables a larger economic market to be captured by the plan, with less infrastructure requirements and reduced lead-in times. 3.Focusing on four sites will increase commuting distances as not directed to locations where houses are proposed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5409 - 10783 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 5417 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
 Summary: Object to the focus for housing growth in Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh other than that which can be accommodated within the existing urban areas and those areas not designated as green belt. Object to the release of greenbelt land for development or safeguarding.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5417 - 10724 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6141 Object **Respondent: Sheffield FC (Mr Richard Timms) [8364]** **Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) East Midlands (Mr Doug Moulton) [8357]**

Summary: R Timms objects to Policy SS3 and demands that the housing requirement should be increased to reflect the latest evidence. Policy SS3 should be amended that
- The Local Plan will make provision for the delivery of a minimum of 7,436 dwellings over the period 2011-2033.
Paragraph 5.3 should be amended that
- The Local Plan will make provision for the delivery of a minimum of 7,436 dwellings over the plan period 2011 -2033 (338 dpa). When deducting the dwellings that have already been built since 2011, 7,020 dwellings will need to be found through allocations up to 2033.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6141 - 8364 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6291 Object **Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The planned spatial distribution of development is broadly similar to past trends. The exception to this is the increased focus on strategic development sites; and to the extent that these are predominantly brownfield sites in areas requiring regeneration, we support that emphasis.

We welcome that the Council has responded to past concerns in relation to inappropriate development in smaller settlements. However, within that context we do not accept that the strategic case for changing Green Belt boundaries at Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh is soundly based. (Reasons given in full submission). Main concern over: out-commuting, road traffic, pollution and carbon emissions.

Recommendation that GB release is not needed and that the housing requirement be adjusted downwards by 1,200 homes to 5,400.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6291 - 7581 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6378 Object **Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**

Summary: Objection to Ridgeway being defined as a Level 3 Settlement. Statement that the Settlement Hierarchy Study (2016) places no weight on the location of Ridgeway on the edge of Sheffield and its proximity to a range of public transport links and facilities in Sheffield.

The approach in Policy SS3 and the Settlement Hierarchy Study (2016) is questioned in that there is little regard to the sustainability of settlements such as Ridgeway which are located closer to Sheffield and the potential for good accessibility to services, jobs and transport outside of the District.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6378 - 8171 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6560 Object **Respondent: Plexus Consultants Ltd (Mr K Pearson) [11275]** **Agent: Emery Planning (Mr John Coxon) [8001]**

Summary: The proposed housing requirement is not supported by an up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The Council's decision to reduce the requirement in Grassmoor from that put forward in the initial draft of the plan has not been justified and would result in the development needs for Grassmoor not being met. Would be social, economic and regeneration benefits from promoting growth in Grassmoor. There is significant potential for increased inward investment from new residents in Grassmoor. Grassmoor is capable of accommodating significant growth, with few constraints.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6560 - 11275 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

- 6685 Object** **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
 Summary: RPS is concerned that the level of housing per settlement/strategic site does not appear to be justified by sufficient supporting evidence. There is no evidence provided as to why there are substantial differences in the number of dwellings allocated to each of the Level 2 Settlements. This proposed distribution of housing growth across the settlements must be justified by evidence. There is no evidence to justify why sustainable settlements without the constraint of Green Belt could not provide a greater number of dwellings than proposed within Table 4.2.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6685 - 11287 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6716 Object** **Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]** **Agent: Spawforths (Mr Gavin Winter) [8147]**
 Summary: The landowners consider that the Plan is unsound in respect of Policy SS3. The Council's housing requirement should be increased because of an under-estimation of OAHN then a corresponding increase in site allocations will be necessary. On this basis, statement that there should be an allowance for further housing growth in some sustainable Level 3 settlements. Should also reflect the potential requirement to meet Sheffield's unmet housing needs.
 Suggestion that there is a need to identify further housing allocations in Ridgeway and release further land from the Green Belt in this settlement to meet the housing need.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6716 - 8171 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 5955 Support** **Respondent: Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: Panache Lingerie Ltd supports the Settlement Hierarchy outlined and the intention to locate 240 new dwellings within the Level 2 Settlement of Renishaw, albeit we consider this figure should be higher. However, we consider that the allocation of Green Belt land to meet this demand is unnecessary.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5955 - 11096 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6006 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: In the context of the above, Policy SS3 is fully supported which seeks to focus the majority of the District's housing growth in the Level 1 Principal, Secondary towns and level 2 settlements and strategic sites. The broad distribution of growth, therefore, with 2,508 dwellings proposed in the four main towns; 1,270 dwellings on the strategic sites; and 1,962 dwellings in the Level 2 settlements, appears to be well conceived and should provide for a sustainable distribution of the District's housing growth.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6006 - 10098 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6060 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: SS3 Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development
 SUPPORT the approach to the spatial strategy and the distribution of development.
 The discrepancy in the employment target between policies SS2 (50ha) and SS3 (64.8ha) needs clarifying. SS2 and SS3 could be combined for clarity.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6060 - 8156 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

- 6251 Support** **Respondent: Messrs S & K Whittam & Grayson [8368]** **Agent: IBA Planning Limited (Mr Nick Baseley) [4560]**
 Summary: S Whittam and K Grayson support the identification of Dronfield as Principal Town and Level 1 Settlement within the Settlement Hierarchy (Policy SS3).
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6251 - 8368 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6410 Support** **Respondent: Mr Paul Stock [8388]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We fully support the proposal set out in the Table 4.2 accompanying Policy SS3 (Housing Provision 2011-2033) to allocate 270 dwellings at Renishaw which is classified as a Level 2 Settlement (Large Village).
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6410 - 8388 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6575 Support** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs F Elliot [11277]** **Agent: Copesticks Ltd. (Mr Tim Farley) [9829]**
 Summary: Inclusion of Markham Vale Extension as a Strategic Employment Site is considered to be a sound approach to ensuring successful delivery of Policies SS1 and SS2.
 Markham Vale has proved to be an extremely successful location for economic growth, particularly in the B2 and B8 sectors, due principally to the proximity to the M1 motorway and supported by its Enterprise Zone status.
 Markham Vale is well served by public transport and employment growth within the District will reduce the number of residents commuting out for work.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6575 - 11277 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6718 Support** **Respondent: Harron Homes Ltd. (Mr Mark Beevers) [11293]** **Agent: ID Planning (Mr Jonathan Dunbavin) [11292]**
 Summary: Harron Homes broadly supports the proposed housing target and points out that if the target be amended they would review their position regarding the housing requirements for the district.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6718 - 11293 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 5642 Comment** **Respondent: Define (Mr Mark Rose) [7847]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support Policy, although some clarity is required in relation to the criteria set out under Green Belt in the policy.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5642 - 7847 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 5650 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Robert Gilmore [10344]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I support the overall strategy in the Plan to direct housing towards the larger towns and villages in the District. However, I do not consider that the level of Green Belt release around the 3 main towns in the north is required. In particular, in Dronfield, a further assessment is required which considers alternative sites within the existing settlement boundary BEFORE Green Belt land is released. This approach would be consistent with the NPPF.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5650 - 10344 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

- 5938 Comment** **Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Sophie Taylor) [4539]**
 Summary: Bolsover Land Ltd refers to this policy, especially to the provision for 64.8ha of employment land within the plan period and its focus of employment growth on primary employment areas as identified in Policy WC2 and on strategic sites. Bolsover Land Ltd suggests that the former Coalite site could contribute to this and thus reduce pressure for additional land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5938 - 4542 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6021 Comment** **Respondent: Mr W Smith [11115]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
 Summary: W Smith points out that this policy is more of a statement and objective of the plan rather than offering any specific guidance. It is proposed to change the policy as follows:
 The Local Plan will make provision for the delivery of a minimum of 7,436 houses (instead of 6,600 dwellings) within the plan period. Together with that paragraph 5.3 should be amended that when deducting the dwellings which have already been built since 2011, 7,020 new houses will need to be built.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6021 - 11115 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6159 Comment** **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The purpose of Green Belts is to keep land permanently open. In order to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt the Council will need to demonstrate that there are exceptional circumstances (NPPF paragraph 83) taking account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development (NPPF 84).
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6159 - 4598 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6231 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Margaret Gray [11155]** **Agent: Fisher German LLP (Liberty Stones) [10150]**
 Summary: M Gray raises concerns over the release of Green Belt land in the district, when there is sufficient land available around sustainable settlements outside the Green Belt. Tupton as a sustainable settlement could deliver more houses.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6231 - 11155 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6239 Comment** **Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]** **Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]**
 Summary: It's noted that Shirland and Stonebroom have been identified as potential sustainable locations for proposed provision of 230 dwellings in Shirland, and 85 dwellings in Stonebroom during the plan period.
 EPC-UK wishes to support the Council in meeting their strategic objectives and development aims and targets.
 However, this must be balanced with a fair and reasonable review of the scale and location of development being proposed. Concerns over potential impact of development within Rough Close Works(RCWs) consultation zones.
 Assurances sought from Council that the RCWs consultation zone will be rigidly protected and none of the additional development proposed within the Plan will be located in close proximity to RCWs.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6239 - 540 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6306 Comment Respondent: **Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: Smaller settlements classified as "level 3" settlements in Table 4.1 can and should make a significant contribution to housing provision and this can help sustain community facilities. Limiting development in such villages to "limited infilling of one or two dwellings" is too restrictive.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6306 - 11116 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6323 Comment Respondent: **Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158]** Agent: **DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**

Summary: Strata Homes points out that this policy is more of a statement and objective of the plan rather than offering any specific guidance. It is proposed to change the policy as follows:

The Local Plan will make provision for the delivery of a minimum of 7,436 houses (instead of 6,600 dwellings) within the plan period. Together with that paragraph 5.3 should be amended that when deducting the dwellings which have already been built since 2011, 7,020 new houses will need to be built.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6323 - 10158 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6351 Comment Respondent: **Mr Martin Speed [11212]** Agent: **WYG (Harrogate office) (Mr John Dickinson) [11213]**

Summary: Policy SS3

The general objectives of policy SS3 are supported, but it must be made clear that the levels of housing proposed, both District-wide in the policy text and per settlement in Table 4.2, are confirmed as being minimum levels of delivery.

Though the figures provided in Table 4.2 are very likely to be interpreted by local communities as being the maximum quota for each individual settlement, and used for resisting planning applications once this level of delivery has been achieved.

Therefore, in order for the District-wide figure of 6,600 to actually function as a minimum target, the title of Table 4.2 should be amended to read "Minimum Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement".

Alternatively, it may be better to express the distribution in Table 4.2 as an approximate percentage of growth, and perhaps as the percentage of growth within each of the four sub-areas rather than the District as a whole.

To ensure that the Plan's strategy can be delivered, consideration should be given to the allocation of additional land above that required to meet minimum requirements, or perhaps through the identification of reserve sites which are to be delivered in the event of a demonstrable shortfall from allocated sites.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6351 - 11212 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6412 Comment Respondent: **Mr Paul Stock [8388]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: We consider Plan still places an over reliance on the Avenue site to deliver 710 new dwellings during the Plan period. It is known the site has major issues in terms of ground contamination. This is extremely likely to prevent it from being able to deliver any meaningful number of new dwellings particularly in the first 5-years of the Plan period. Given the legacy of extensive contamination and uncertainty over the trajectory of delivery the proposed housing allocation on the Avenue site should be deleted from the consultation draft Local Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6412 - 8388 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6413 Comment Respondent: Mr Paul Stock [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We consider the consultation draft Local Plan places an over reliance on the Biwater site to deliver 560 new dwellings during the Plan period. The site is unlikely to deliver any meaningful number of new dwellings particularly in the first 5-years of the Plan period. Due to serious concerns over the trajectory of housing delivery for the Biwater site the proposed figure should be drastically reduced.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6413 - 8388 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6457 Comment Respondent: Mr Paul Johnson [6884]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Statement that there is little reference to the justification for this strategy within the Plan apart from a common approach of focusing development proportionately to the scale of the existing settlement hierarchy. Consequently the plan seeks to allocate 618 new dwellings around Killamarsh over the plan period.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6457 - 6884 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6543 Comment Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Noted that policy makes reference to the minimum requirement that is set out in Policy SS2. Evidence required to demonstrate that allocations have the ability to meet full, objectively assessed housing needs over the plan period.

Suggestion that an appropriate buffer is added to the 6,600 target as contingency, in order to ensure that the LP is sufficiently flexible and can respond to the rapid changes in circumstance

Suggestion that Council recalculate its proposed 'broad distribution' to ensure that a 20% contingency is built into its local plan.

SS3 includes a proposed settlement hierarchy. Request that all sustainable settlements, such as Grassmoor, are apportioned an additional level of growth.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6543 - 10071 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6580 Comment Respondent: Mr & Mrs Brailsford [11278]

Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]

Summary: Mr & Mrs Brailsford points out that smaller settlements classified as "level 3" settlements in Table 4.1 can, have and should continue to make a significant contribution to housing provision and this can help sustain community facilities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6580 - 11278 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6586 Comment Respondent: Mr Neil Mowatt [11279]

Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]

Summary: Mr Mowatt points out that smaller settlements classified as "level 3" settlements in Table 4.1 can, have and should continue to make a significant contribution to housing provision and this can help sustain community facilities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6586 - 11279 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

- 6593 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Grey [11280]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
- Summary: Mr Grey points out that smaller settlements classified as "level 3" settlements in Table 4.1 can, have and should continue to make a significant contribution to housing provision and this can help sustain community facilities.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6593 - 11280 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6615 Comment** **Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: The Council proposes that housing growth is distributed according to a defined four tiered settlement hierarchy. Distributed housing growth the level 1 and 2 settlements and strategic sites. No housing requirements set out for Level 3 and 4 settlements and no housing site allocations.
- The Council's policy approach to development for these settlements is set out in Policy SS12 and Policy SS13
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6615 - 4414 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6663 Comment** **Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**
- Summary: Policy SS3 Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development: concern regarding the lack of clarity regarding the level of growth at Heath
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6663 - 692 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6679 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Perez [11288]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
- Summary: Mr Perez points out that smaller settlements classified as "level 3" settlements in Table 4.1 can, have and should continue to make a significant contribution to housing provision and this helps sustain community facilities.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6679 - 11288 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None
- 6683 Comment** **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
- Summary: RPS is concerned by the levels of new housing set out in Table 4.2. The overall growth level in Table 4.2 is 5,740 yet the overall housing requirement is set as a minimum of 6,600 dwellings. Paragraph 4.37 states combined with the 1016 dwellings already built there is more than enough to meet 6,600 dwellings. This only allows for a slippage of 156 dwellings not to be delivered. We recommend the Local Plan ensures the minimum housing requirement be met through the flexibility of an increased housing growth.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6683 - 11287 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6714 Comment**Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]****Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: RPS is concerned that the level of housing per settlement/strategic site is not justified by sufficient supporting evidence. The Biwaters Strategic Site is allocated for 560 dwellings, but as set out later within these representations the site is capable of delivering a higher number of dwellings during the plan period. There is no evidence provided as to why there are differences in the number of dwellings allocated to each of the Level 2 Settlements. This proposed distribution of housing growth across the settlements must be justified by evidence.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6714 - 8407 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

6736 Comment**Respondent: Harron Homes Ltd. (Mr Mark Beevers) [11293]****Agent: ID Planning (Mr Jonathan Dunbavin) [11292]**

Summary: Harron Homes comments on this policy that the Council has not identified the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the release of Green Belt land adjoining Renishaw.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6736 - 11293 - Policy SS3 : Spatial Strategy and the Distribution of Development - None

- 5533 Object** **Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: Please see our comments/objections in relation to the overall requirement for housing.
 See attached statement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5533 - 10799 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5599 Object** **Respondent: Gleeson Regeneration Ltd [10846]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: Please see our comments/objections in relation to overall requirement for housing.
 See attached statement
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5599 - 10846 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 6460 Object** **Respondent: Mr Paul Johnson [6884]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Focus on Killamarsh for high levels of growth are not well justified or sustainable and do not present the exceptional circumstances in which re-alignment of the Green Belt can be justified.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6460 - 6884 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 6522 Object** **Respondent: Mr Simon Carr [8173]** **Agent: Planning and Design Practice Ltd (Mr Richard Pigott) [4588]**
 Summary: Statement that the plan only proposes development in a very limited number of settlements. This brings into question the overall viability and deliverability of the plan. A key part of deliverability is that there must be sufficient demand for the levels of housing proposed in those locations. Statement the council's evidence base on this is thin to say the least
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6522 - 8173 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 6618 Object** **Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The Council has calculated its overall HLS as 6,756 dwellings comprising of site allocations for 5,740 dwellings and 1,016 existing completions.
 The Council contends that a surplus of 156 dwellings (2%) plus existing planning consents not aligned with the Local Plan's proposed spatial strategy and residential development on sites of less than 10 dwellings provides further flexibility to the HLS sufficient to deal with any unforeseen circumstances.
 HBF would recommend a larger contingency given that the housing requirement is a minimum not a maximum figure. Suggests a 20% contingency in order to respond rapidly to changing circumstances.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6618 - 4414 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

- 6760 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Nigel & Marie Hamilton [8163]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern that no allocations have been made in Walton. Despite the Nathaniel Lichfield and partners report showing that even on its lowest growth strategy Walton had a housing need of 13 dwellings. Lack of housing allocations in Walton and Holymoorside seen as unsustainable during the plan period.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6760 - 8163 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5116 Support** **Respondent: Mr C Pratt [6423]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I support the removal of housing growth for the rural west of the district.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5116 - 6423 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5121 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Muriel Pratt [8331]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I support the removal of housing growth for the rural west of the district. This again makes more sense.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5121 - 8331 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5135 Support** **Respondent: Mr A Hardwick [8085]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I agree that the emphasis on development around the main towns (and level 1 and 2 settlements) is of paramount importance.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5135 - 8085 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5190 Support** **Respondent: Helen Boffy [10661]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District and,
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5190 - 10661 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5193 Support** **Respondent: Mr David Boffy [10662]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District and,
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5193 - 10662 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5262 Support** **Respondent: Johanne Boulding [8047]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5262 - 8047 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

- 5270 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Sally Skinner [8285]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5270 - 8285 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5314 Support** **Respondent: JK Marsden [8305]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5314 - 8305 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5344 Support** **Respondent: Paul Eastwood [8278]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the proposed removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District, which will assist in preventing further inappropriate development on greenfield sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5344 - 8278 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5353 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Thelma Childs [8335]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5353 - 8335 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5356 Support** **Respondent: Gemma Childs [10750]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5356 - 10750 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5381 Support** **Respondent: Jill Broadhead [10766]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5381 - 10766 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5581 Support** **Respondent: Peter Maskrey [10842]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Supports the removal of housing growth targets for the rural West of the district.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5581 - 10842 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

- 6014 Support** **Respondent: Janet E Bradley [8342]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I support the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west, (which includes Ashover)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6014 - 8342 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 6261 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Hardwick [8097]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support that there is "no specific housing requirements" for level 3 & 4 settlements. Support for the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6261 - 8097 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 6329 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Ellen Hardwick [8198]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for Ashovers housing growth targets in the Local Plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6329 - 8198 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 6467 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Anne Eastwood [8059]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the proposed removal of housing growth targets for the rural west of the District, which will assist in preventing further inappropriate development on greenfield sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6467 - 8059 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 5301 Comment** **Respondent: Mr and Mrs Dring [10712]** **Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**
 Summary: Planning for only 156 units above the minimum housing requirement does not give sufficient certainty regarding delivery and does not achieve growth, particularly in light of persistent under-delivery.

 Given the previous under-delivery of housing on the strategic sites, the anticipated delivery rates for these is unrealistic. The disproportionate reliance on them makes the housing provision strategy weak.

 The reliance on many Green Belt dwellings is also a significant weakness. There are numerous non-Green Belt sites which have been discounted for reasons which should not outweigh Green Belt designation. Not all other reasonable options have been considered, making the plan unsound.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5301 - 10712 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

5328 Comment **Respondent: 654 Group Ltd (Mr Nigel Egginton) [10738]** **Agent: John Church Planning Consultancy Limited (Ms Charlotte Stainton) [10737]**

Summary: Planning for only 156 units above the minimum housing requirement does not give sufficient certainty regarding delivery and does not achieve growth, particularly in light of persistent under-delivery.

Given the previous under-delivery of housing on the strategic sites, the anticipated delivery rates for these is unrealistic. The disproportionate reliance on them makes the housing provision strategy weak.

The reliance on many Green Belt dwellings is also a significant weakness. There are numerous non-Green Belt sites which have been discounted for reasons which should not outweigh Green Belt designation. Not all other reasonable options have been considered, making the plan unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5328 - 10738 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

5332 Comment **Respondent: Mrs K Goodwin [10739]** **Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**

Summary: Planning for only 156 units above the minimum housing requirement does not give sufficient certainty regarding delivery and does not achieve growth, particularly in light of persistent under-delivery.

Given the previous under-delivery of housing on the strategic sites, the anticipated delivery rates for these is unrealistic. The disproportionate reliance on them makes the housing provision strategy weak.

The reliance on many Green Belt dwellings is also a significant weakness. There are numerous non-Green Belt sites which have been discounted for reasons which should not outweigh Green Belt designation. Not all other reasonable options have been considered, making the plan unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5332 - 10739 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

5380 Comment **Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Planning Advisor) [4266]** **Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**

Summary: Planning for only 156 units above the minimum housing requirement does not give sufficient certainty regarding delivery and does not achieve growth, particularly in light of persistent under-delivery.

Given the previous under-delivery of housing on the strategic sites, the anticipated delivery rates for these is unrealistic. The disproportionate reliance on them makes the housing provision strategy weak.

The reliance on many Green Belt dwellings is also a significant weakness. There are numerous non-Green Belt sites which have been discounted for reasons which should not outweigh Green Belt designation. Not all other reasonable options have been considered, making the plan unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5380 - 4266 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

5426 Comment **Respondent: Andrew Jones [8105]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Questions raised over the SHMA and how the housing requirement was worked out. Questions over how the total has been broken down to be allocated to individual areas but the result does not seem to follow the principle of sustainability, which requires new homes to be close to the expected growth of employment which they are to serve.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5426 - 8105 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

- 5468 Comment** **Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: Please see our comments/objections in relation to the overall requirement for housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5468 - 10799 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 6193 Comment** **Respondent: John Church Planning Consultancy Limited (Mr John Church) [4417]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Statement that whilst the identification of Shirland as a "Level 2 Settlement" is supported, and its intended housing provision will assist in meeting the requirement for a minimum 6600 new dwellings in the District, none of the new sites are included within the Settlement Development Limits of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (2005). It is considered that a more comprehensive approach to residential and associated developments in the Parish is required.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6193 - 4417 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 6381 Comment** **Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**
 Summary: The Housing Figures within the Plan appear to be based upon the 2013 Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment ("SHMA") and the sensitivity testing in 2014 and not on an updated assessment. This document is now four years out of date, and an updated Assessment should be completed as soon as possible to determine the more localised need for new housing. This will be an important consideration in the review of the boundaries to the Level 3 Settlements.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6381 - 8171 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 6712 Comment** **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
 Summary: RPS is concerned by the levels of new housing set out in Table 4.2. The overall growth level in Table 4.2 is 5,740 yet the overall housing requirement is set as a minimum of 6,600 dwellings. Paragraph 4.37 states combined with the 1016 dwellings already built there is enough to meet the minimum provision of 6,600 dwellings. However this only allows for a slippage of 156 dwellings not to be delivered. It is recommended that the Local Plan ensure that the minimum housing requirement be met through the flexibility of an increased housing growth.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6712 - 8407 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None
- 6762 Comment** **Respondent: Clay Cross Parish Council (Michelle Cowin) [11303]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The Pegasus Development proposed for land off Coupe Lane. When outline come through, what will be the Parish Councils observations? If the development is passed, will there be 106 monies available and will the housing total go towards the target for Clay Cross?
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6762 - 11303 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

6774 Comment**Respondent: Mr David Burton [11309]****Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**

Summary: Planning for only 156 units above the minimum housing requirement does not give sufficient certainty regarding delivery and does not achieve growth, particularly in light of persistent under-delivery.

Given the previous under-delivery of housing on the strategic sites, the anticipated delivery rates for these is unrealistic. The disproportionate reliance on them makes the housing provision strategy weak.

The reliance on many Green Belt dwellings is also a significant weakness. There are numerous non-Green Belt sites which have been discounted for reasons which should not outweigh Green Belt designation. Not all other reasonable options have been considered, making the plan unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6774 - 11309 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

6775 Comment**Respondent: S&G Dore [11308]****Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**

Summary: Planning for only 156 units above the minimum housing requirement does not give sufficient certainty regarding delivery and does not achieve growth, particularly in light of persistent under-delivery.

Given the previous under-delivery of housing on the strategic sites, the anticipated delivery rates for these is unrealistic. The disproportionate reliance on them makes the housing provision strategy weak.

The reliance on many Green Belt dwellings is also a significant weakness. There are numerous non-Green Belt sites which have been discounted for reasons which should not outweigh Green Belt designation. Not all other reasonable options have been considered, making the plan unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6775 - 11308 - Housing Provision by Settlement - None

CHAPTER: 4: Spatial Strategy

Level 1 and 2 Settlements

5470 Object**Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]****Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**

Summary: There is capacity to increase the overall housing provision in Level 1 and Level 2 Settlements through increased capacity on identified sites and identification of additional sites.

Please see attached statement

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5470 - 10799 - Level 1 and 2 Settlements - None

5553 Support**Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We support the flexibility in housing supply provided by excluding from the housing requirement both small sites and commitments incompatible with the strategy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5553 - 7769 - Level 1 and 2 Settlements - None

4705 Object	Respondent: Dr Clare Freeman [10223]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The proposed housing provision for Dronfield is an additional 860 dwellings, roughly a 9% increase. There has been no assessment of the capacity of the existing infrastructure to absorb these levels of development, nor has there been any thought as to the social and environmental ability of the existing community to accommodate this number of new houses.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
Full Reference: O - 4705 - 10223 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None		
5073 Object	Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Dronfield has already grown to its capacity. Any additional development should be in the spirit of regeneration and bring something new to the town. Callywhite lane is underused and not attractive to industry due to its access. The infrastructure and roads where these areas have been identified can not support this level of additional housing.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
Full Reference: O - 5073 - 10593 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None		
5075 Object	Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The number for Dronfield appears to have been arrived at by looking at the space which landowners are keen to profit from but the removal of its green belt status and THEN working out how many houses they can fit on this land.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
Full Reference: O - 5075 - 10593 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None		
5404 Object	Respondent: Mrs Helen F Lawton [10775]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Objection to category allocated to Morton on grounds of oversubscribed school that cannot meet any increase in homes in the village and the lack of a bus service to the area where development is proposed.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
Full Reference: O - 5404 - 10775 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None		
5412 Object	Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]	Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]
Summary: Object to the housing allocations through Green Belt release at Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh. More limited allocations should be made which can be accommodated within existing urban areas or form part of proposals for redevelopment or intensification.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified		
Full Reference: O - 5412 - 10724 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None		

- 5471 Object** **Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: There is capacity to increase the overall housing provision in Level 1 and Level 2 Settlements through increased capacity on identified sites and identification of additional sites.
 The amount of housing provision identified for each settlement is insufficient to provide for the full OAN for NEDDC for the plan period.
 Please see attached statement for further details.
 Please see attached statement
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5471 - 10799 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None
- 5600 Object** **Respondent: Gleeson Regeneration Ltd [10846]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: Please see attached statement
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5600 - 10846 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None
- 5636 Object** **Respondent: W Redmile & Sons Ltd [10859]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Michael Edgar) [4355]**
 Summary: To be amended in accordance with increased housing requirement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5636 - 10859 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None
- 5651 Object** **Respondent: Mr Robert Gilmore [10344]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The level of housing proposed in Dronfield is a concern due to the lack of evidence provided to support the Town's ability to accommodate this level of growth. These further assessments should relate to local highways, schools & medical/health facilities. In order for the Plan to be sustainable & be found sound by an Inspector, the Council should provide this level of detail upfront. At present, it is not available.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5651 - 10344 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None
- 6610 Object** **Respondent: Mr J White [11282]** **Agent: JVH Town Planning Consultants (Janet Hodson) [1990]**
 Summary: We object to table 4.2 as the table fails to recognise that site r in Killamarsh should be extended and therefore the total dwellings allocated for Killamarsh should be increased by an addition 70 dwellings. The Plan is over reliant on strategic allocation sites, which are previously developed and which do not deliver homes speedily to the market.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6610 - 11282 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None

- 6641 Object** **Respondent: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd [11285]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Bob Woollard) [10128]**
 Summary: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd objects to the specific housing requirement being proposed for Level 2 Settlements and considers that in the context of housing growth needs these should be minimum figures reflecting the acknowledged sustainability of these locations. The settlement boundary around Shirland is already tight. The approach advocated by Policies LC1 and SS12 would allow only restricted development opportunities to be realised. Proposed revisions to settlement boundaries have not yet been published as part of the Local Plan preparation process.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6641 - 11285 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None
- 6662 Object** **Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**
 Summary: Table 4.2 Housing Provision by Level 1 & 2 Settlement & para 4.38: object to lack of specific housing requirements for Level 3 Settlements (and therefore lack of proposed allocations)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6662 - 692 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None
- 6725 Object** **Respondent: Harron Homes Ltd. (Mr Mark Beevers) [11293]** **Agent: ID Planning (Mr Jonathan Dunbavin) [11292]**
 Summary: Harron Homes objects to the housing provision set out in table 4.2, in particular to the level of distribution for Morton and North Wingfield which are at the lower end of scale compared to other Level 2 settlements. It is argued that the Council's evidence base would demonstrate that both settlements could support a higher level of growth. According to the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Study North Wingfield would achieve the highest score and Morton would achieve the same score than Shirland. Also, Harron Homes criticises the Council's approach for the proposed housing provision.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6725 - 11293 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None
- 6734 Object** **Respondent: Harron Homes Ltd. (Mr Mark Beevers) [11293]** **Agent: ID Planning (Mr Jonathan Dunbavin) [11292]**
 Summary: Harron Homes also objects to the proposed housing provision for Renishaw because the Council would have to show that there are exceptional circumstances for release from the Green Belt but this was not provided. The Green Belt review would conclude that for Renishaw more houses are provided than the housing requirement identified in several growth scenarios. Also, the Schedule of Potential Housing Sites identified less homes. In short, the proposed housing provision for Renishaw would be too high and there would be alternative options with the non-Green Belt sites proposed by Harron Homes in North Wingfield and Morton.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6734 - 11293 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None
- 5554 Support** **Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We support the 5,740 new homes identified within level 1 and 2 settlements, including 553 at Eckington and 860 at Dronfield. To some extent, delivery of new homes in these locations supports Sheffield's growth, as there is a relationship with Sheffield's urban area, as well as a strong commuting link.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5554 - 7769 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None

6556 Comment **Respondent: Harworth Estates (Mr T Love) [4431]** **Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**
Summary: Harworth Estates comments that further concentration of housing growth in the more sustainable northern settlements can and should be targeted in the evolving document. If the Biwaters site would be included within Clay Cross then this settlement would accommodate a total of 1,037 dwellings over the plan period which is far beyond of Killamarsh's housing figure despite the fact that Killamarsh is comparable in size. The draft Local Plan would not reflect the northern settlements' innate qualities for accommodating growth which represents a thread to the document's soundness. The distribution of housing growth must therefore be further developed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6556 - 4431 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None

6561 Comment **Respondent: Plexus Consultants Ltd (Mr K Pearson) [11275]** **Agent: Emery Planning (Mr John Coxon) [8001]**
Summary: We consider that Grassmoor should accommodate a greater proportion of the proposed housing requirement. The settlement is a sustainable location for growth, offering good access to jobs, services and amenities. This is accepted through the identification of Grassmoor as a Level 2 Settlement (large village).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6561 - 11275 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None

6570 Comment **Respondent: Messrs FS, FJ & WV Rodgers [11276]** **Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**
Summary: Messrs Rodgers comment that further concentration of housing growth in the more sustainable northern sub-area can and should be targeted in the evolving document. If the Biwaters site would be included within Clay Cross then this settlement would accommodate a total of 1,037 dwellings over the plan period which is beyond of Dronfield's housing figure despite the fact that Dronfield is a more sustainable settlement than Clay Cross. Although there are constraints for the northern sub-area present the draft Local Plan would not reflect the northern sub-areas' innate qualities for accommodating growth which represents a thread to its soundness.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6570 - 11276 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None

6628 Comment **Respondent: Mr T Gaskill [11284]** **Agent: JVH Town Planning Consultants (Janet Hodson) [1990]**
Summary: Calow is a Level 2 settlement which is a sustainable location for additional new development Table 4.2 should be amended to include for a modest increase in development to allow for the redevelopment of the Duckmanton Lodge site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6628 - 11284 - Table 4.2: Housing Provision by Level 1 and Level 2 Settlement - None

5180 Support**Respondent: Clare and Ian Blaskey [10654]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We support the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west district.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5180 - 10654 - Level 3 and 4 Settlements (Smaller villages and hamlets) - None

5277 Support**Respondent: Heath Village Development Committee (Mr David Oliver) [8202]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We welcome the Council's change in policy which now allocates housing growth to reflect the level of sustainability of differing parts of the infrastructure within the district. This appears to give a more logical and equitable distribution of new housing development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5277 - 8202 - Level 3 and 4 Settlements (Smaller villages and hamlets) - None

5310 Support**Respondent: Mrs Christine Brocksopp [10716]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4.38 No specific housing requirements are proposed for these settlements and therefore no allocations are proposed. The policy approach to dealing with proposals for new housing on unallocated land in these settlements is set out in Policies SS12 & SS13.

Comment; I support the removal of housing growth targets for the rural west

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5310 - 10716 - Level 3 and 4 Settlements (Smaller villages and hamlets) - None

6544 Comment**Respondent: Ashover Parish Council (Mrs S Atkinson) [7554]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Parish Council is generally comfortable with the very modest scale of development suggested for the identified settlements, and the Parish as a whole. It recognised that development can sometimes bring benefits.

We support that Ashover Parish and settlements within it are neither a suitable or sustainable location for development other than small scale. It lacks the range of the social infrastructure required to sustain a larger community.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6544 - 7554 - Level 3 and 4 Settlements (Smaller villages and hamlets) - None

- 5555 Support** **Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The four strategic sites will be an important source of new homes over the plan period. We support the pragmatic approach of identifying the Coalite site as a priority regeneration area rather than a strategic site because of concerns over deliverability. However, if any homes are able to come forward there towards the end of the plan period, that would be positive and give additional flexibility to the housing supply.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5555 - 7769 - Strategic Site Allocations - None
- 6010 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The identification of four key strategic housing and employment site allocations at The Avenue, Wingerworth; Former Biwaters site; and Markham Vale is fully supported, particularly the provision in the Plan for specific policies (SS4, SS5 and SS6) to guide the future development of these sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6010 - 10098 - Strategic Site Allocations - None
- 6336 Support** **Respondent: Elaine Bullers [11206]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I support the regeneration of former industrial sites in the district, such as Clay cross, Coalite and Markham Vale.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6336 - 11206 - Strategic Site Allocations - None
- 5336 Comment** **Respondent: Highways England (Mr Steve Pearce) [10741]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The strategic sites have the capacity to accommodate a large number of dwellings and are in relative proximity to the SRN, including the former Biwater Strategic Site, Clay Cross for 560 dwellings, Clay Cross South for 400 dwellings, The Avenue Strategic Site, Wingerworth for 710 dwellings and the Eckington South site for 400 dwellings. It is considered that, due to the scale of these sites, there could be some impacts on the operation of the SRN. Highways England considers that these impacts need to be understood as part of the plan making process through an appropriate Transport Assessment.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5336 - 10741 - Strategic Site Allocations - None
- 5587 Comment** **Respondent: NHS Hardwick Clinical Commissioning Group (Jean Richards) [1647]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The CCGs would like to further develop our relationship with NEDDC planning, particularly in relation to the housing developments identified in the local plan consultation draft; Further conversations are needed on the relationship between our strategic objective of keeping people in their own homes and the ability of existing and future local housing stock to support that.
 We believe that any new applications for housing at the following developments will require a contribution to health; we would like to see this reflected in planning policy, and would like an opportunity to discuss these developments with planners at an early stage;
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5587 - 1647 - Strategic Site Allocations - None

5939 Comment **Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Sophie Taylor) [4539]**
Summary: Bolsover Land Ltd refers to paragraph 4.39 which indicates that the Coalite Site is not included as a Strategic Site due to concerns over its ability to deliver within the plan period. Bolsover Land Ltd queries this approach, on the grounds that the site is identified as a Strategic Site in the Bolsover Plan, and they reiterate the Inspectors advice on the strategic nature of the site. The respondent is keen to ensure the Local Plan is sound in its approach.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5939 - 4542 - Strategic Site Allocations - None

6326 Comment **Respondent: Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
Summary: Strata Homes comments on Policies SS4, SS5, SS6, SS7 and SS8 and argues that with regards to the high level of jobs creation within the 2 LEPs the draft plan should focus on meeting the additional housing demand that growth in these two regions would create. It is therefore proposed to change the policies in order to reflect economic growth in housing requirement or reduce growth to compensate.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6326 - 10158 - Strategic Site Allocations - None

CHAPTER: 4: Spatial Strategy The Avenue, Wingerworth

4996 Comment **Respondent: Chesterfield Gospel Hall Trust (Mr Adrian Rowles) [7578]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Amend as follows

4.43 The Local Transport Plan sets out future proposals for new infrastructure and includes an A61-A617 Avenue link road as a longer term County Council project. However, this plan recognises the strategic potential of the infrastructure investment to the economic and social wellbeing of the area and the Council will take every opportunity to lead and facilitate its delivery.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4996 - 7578 - The Avenue, Wingerworth - None

6473 Comment **Respondent: Mr David Wilson [10756]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The capacity of the road network, notably the A61 between Wingerworth and Chesterfield, is without doubt inadequate and would be unable to cope with the increased traffic flow caused by up to 1,100 new homes on the Avenue site, 172 to the rear of 1-59 Adlington Avenue, and the significant number planned for the site at Wingerworth opposite the end of Mill Lane that is currently shown as a settlement gap in the February 2017 version of the Draft Local Plan. Also concerned about toxicity of the land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6473 - 10756 - The Avenue, Wingerworth - None

6483 Comment **Respondent: Paul Wilson [11262]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The capacity of the road network, notably the A61 between Wingerworth and Chesterfield, is without doubt inadequate and would be unable to cope with the increased traffic flow caused by up to 1,100 new homes on the Avenue site, 172 to the rear of 1-59 Adlington Avenue, and the significant number planned for the site at Wingerworth opposite the end of Mill Lane that is currently shown as a settlement gap in the February 2017 version of the Draft Local Plan. Also concerned about toxicity of the land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6483 - 11262 - The Avenue, Wingerworth - None

4539 Support**Respondent: J.S. Reaney [6377]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Because of existing traffic congestion on the A61 between Chesterfield and Clay Cross, the A61/A617 Avenue Link project needs to be brought forward urgently since it is not a sustainable policy for the County Council to view it as "long term". The number of extra vehicles needing to use the A61 from the housing development at Avenue will be significant. All three authorities, Chesterfield, North East and DCC need to improve their liaison and more importantly their co-ordination of policy. Building additional homes is all very well but you need the infrastructure to match it.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 4539 - 6377 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None

5436 Support**Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We welcome bullet point (g) which provides pedestrian and cycle routes through green infrastructure where there would be no impact on biodiversity. We also support point (j) which aims to maintain and improve existing areas of habitat and species and promotes measures for habitat creation. This site has great potential to make positive green infrastructure and biodiversity gains for the benefit of both wildlife and local residents therefore these opportunities should be maximised during the earliest stages of the development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5436 - 4469 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None

5538 Support**Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support protection, enhancement and provision of new sports facilities. This should be informed by further evidence base work which is under preparation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5538 - 4563 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None

5565 Support**Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy SS4 - The Avenue

We are supportive of the plan to accommodate significant development at this site, subject to the site being fully remediated prior to any development taking place. We strongly support this policy at a strategic level as its successful implementation will assist in delivering significant environmental benefits, in accordance with The Avenue Area Strategic Framework (AASF). The provision of adequate sewerage infrastructure is a key factor in delivering sustainable development, continued co-operation with Yorkshire Water is therefore required to deliver this site in a sustainable manner.

We therefore strongly recommend that a bullet point should be added which requires development proposals to identify, and submit details of, adequate foul drainage solutions as part of any future planning applications.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5565 - 10840 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None

6011 Support**Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is particularly welcomed that Policy SS4 identifies the need for a new primary school to be provided as part of the development of The Avenue site and the need to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the construction of a link road from the A61 to A617, which is identified in the Derbyshire Local Transport Plan 3 as a longer term strategic highway project.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6011 - 10098 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None

- 6654 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: With respect to the policy we support item (j) relating to maintaining existing wildlife habitats and the creation of habitat. This will help to maintain and potentially enhance the wildlife corridor running north - south along the sites eastern boundary.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6654 - 2607 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None
- 4997 Comment** **Respondent: Chesterfield Gospel Hall Trust (Mr Adrian Rowles) [7578]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy SS4:
 Amend as follows

 h) Do not prejudice the construction of a link road from the A61 to A617 and take every opportunity to lead and facilitate its delivery.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4997 - 7578 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None
- 5362 Comment** **Respondent: Coverland UK Ltd (Ms Sarah Foster) [8583]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Whilst we do not object to the strategic allocation of The Avenue site, the fact that it has been allocated since 2001, without any development being brought forward, suggests that the Council should explore other contingency sites in the vicinity of Wingerworth to ensure an adequate supply of housing to 2033. SHLAA site WW/1606 would represent an opportunity for additional housing land close to existing residential development, subject to its partial release from the green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5362 - 8583 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None
- 6022 Comment** **Respondent: Mr W Smith [11115]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
 Summary: W Smith states that the Housing and Economic Development Strategy outlined that under a third of the Districts work population work within the district with the remainder commuting outside. The draft plan should therefore focus on meeting the additional housing demand given the district is an ideal commuter area. It should be clearly demonstrated how to the Council co-operates with neighbouring authorities and the LEP's for housing and employment land. It is suggest to include in the draft chapters as follows:
 - Reflect economic growth in housing requirement or reduce growth to compensate
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6022 - 11115 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None
- 6562 Comment** **Respondent: Plexus Consultants Ltd (Mr K Pearson) [11275]** **Agent: Emery Planning (Mr John Coxon) [8001]**
 Summary: We consider that the site is unlikely to deliver the quantum of development currently proposed during the plan period. The site is subject to a number of constraints which are likely to affect its delivery, and requires the provision of significant new infrastructure. The annual delivery rates required to deliver 1,100 dwellings from one site (700 within the period upto 2033) are optimistic. We consider that the Council should be more realistic in its assumptions over delivery from the site, and should seek to allocate a range of deliverable sites in order to meet the housing requirement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6562 - 11275 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None

6738 Comment **Respondent: Harron Homes Ltd. (Mr Mark Beevers) [11293]** **Agent: ID Planning (Mr Jonathan Dunbavin) [11292]**

Summary: Harron Homes mentions that the Avenue site in Wingerworth was allocated in the previous Local Plan but did not come forward. The site is subject to a remediation programme which has been delayed and is in multiple ownership. It is maintained the delivery of 710 dwellings from this site is overly optimistic and a lower quantum of dwellings should be identified and alternative sites allocated to ensure the plan is deliverable, in particular their won sites in Morton and North Wingfield.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6738 - 11293 - Policy SS4: The Avenue - None

CHAPTER: 4: Spatial Strategy Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross

6471 Comment **Respondent: Mr David Wilson [10756]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: This site has previously suffered from high levels of toxicity and despite attempts to clean it up, there will always be a stigma, particularly by people who live locally, who will make up the majority of the people buying the new houses on the site. Accordingly, it is maintained that too much significance has been put on this site as far as housing development is concerned. Switching the focus of the housing development back to other adjacent, sustainable settlements in the South Sub-Area, as envisaged in the February 2015 Draft Plan, would certainly alleviate these concerns about toxicity.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6471 - 10756 - Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - None

6482 Comment **Respondent: Paul Wilson [11262]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: This site has previously suffered from high levels of toxicity and despite attempts to clean it up, there will always be a stigma, particularly by people who live locally, who will make up the majority of the people buying the new houses on the site. Accordingly, it is maintained that too much significance has been put on this site as far as housing development is concerned. Switching the focus of the housing development back to other adjacent, sustainable settlements in the South Sub-Area, as envisaged in the February 2015 Draft Plan, would certainly alleviate these concerns about toxicity.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6482 - 11262 - Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - None

6729 Comment **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: St Modwen's have a comprehensive strategy for bringing forward redevelopment of the Biwaters Site and are working closely with the Council, the policy wording for the site should be amended to reflect this and their proposals and aspirations for the site's redevelopment. A number of amendments and rewordings have been recommended for the supporting paragraphs 4.44-4.48 in the full submission.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6729 - 8407 - Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - None

6735 Comment **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: The site allocation boundary illustrated on Figure 4.2 does not reflect the development proposals for the site. Figure 4.2 should be amended to reflect the new outline planning application being prepared for the site and to ensure the Local Plan is fully consistent with the developer's proposals. The site area has been expanded to include additional land to the north of the Derby Road parcel.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6735 - 8407 - Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - None

4540 Support**Respondent: J.S. Reaney [6377]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This development will be significant for the future prosperity of Clay Cross but vehicle access from the site to the already congested A61 will simply add to the problems which I have already highlighted in my response to the Avenue Site proposals.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 4540 - 6377 - Policy SS5: Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - None

5437 Support**Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We welcome the provision in this policy at bullet point (j) for a wildlife corridor and buffer zone beside the River Rother and we suggest that this should link to the wider green infrastructure network.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5437 - 4469 - Policy SS5: Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - None

6491 Support**Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy SS5
Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - the inclusion of Bullet Point (BP) i) in line with our previous comments is welcomed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6491 - 10819 - Policy SS5: Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - None

6728 Support**Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]****Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: RPS fully support the principle of the inclusion under Policy SS5 of the Former Biwaters Site as a Strategic Development Site for mixed use development, but have objections to specific detailed elements in terms of the wording of the Policy and its supporting paragraphs.
Given landowners St Modwen have a comprehensive strategy for bringing forward redevelopment of the site and are working closely with the Council, the policy wording for the site should be amended to reflect this and their proposals and aspirations for the site's redevelopment.

Suggested proposed changes to the wording of Policy SS5 are shown in the full submission for this rep. This includes, the second paragraph, bullet(b-h & k-l).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6728 - 8407 - Policy SS5: Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - None

5539 Comment**Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Reference should be made to provision/enhancement of sports facilities to meet additional need generated by the development (informed by further evidence based work currently being carried out).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5539 - 4563 - Policy SS5: Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - None

6564 Comment **Respondent: Plexus Consultants Ltd (Mr K Pearson) [11275]** **Agent: Emery Planning (Mr John Coxon) [8001]**
Summary: The site is unlikely to deliver the quantum of development proposed during the plan period. The site is subject to a number of constraints which are likely to affect its delivery, and requires the provision of significant new infrastructure. The annual delivery rates required to deliver 1000 dwellings (560 within the period upto 2033), from one site are optimistic. The Council should be more realistic in its assumptions over delivery from the site, and should seek to allocate a range of deliverable sites in order to meet the housing requirement.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6564 - 11275 - Policy SS5: Former Biwaters Site, Clay Cross - None
CHAPTER: 4: Spatial Strategy Markham Vale, Long Duckmanton

6218 Comment **Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Statement that link-road and motorway-based development corridor models do not deliver significant economic benefits, but have many shortcomings in terms of poor place-making, wide-scale landscape impact, traffic generation and associated air and noise pollution and carbon emissions.
Comment that Markham Vale could be seen as an exceptional case, due to the large regeneration opportunity there.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6218 - 7581 - Markham Vale, Long Duckmanton - None
CHAPTER: 4: Spatial Strategy Policy SS6: Markham Vale

6061 Support **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: SS6 Markham Vale
SUPPORT the policy intention to bring forward development in line with the approved Design Framework.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6061 - 8156 - Policy SS6: Markham Vale - None

6492 Support **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policy SS6
Markham Vale - the inclusion of BP's a) and e) in line with our previous comments is welcomed.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6492 - 10819 - Policy SS6: Markham Vale - None

5438 Comment **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: We acknowledge the provision for structural landscaping and green infrastructure as set out at point (c) and suggest that this should link to the wider green infrastructure network.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5438 - 4469 - Policy SS6: Markham Vale - None

5165 Comment

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steve Baker) [7985]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Strategic site allocation: Land to south of Markham Vale.

This located within the setting of Bolsover Castle and is largely visible in nationally important designed views from the Castle, including those from its western terrace. The Castle is an internationally important heritage asset. Historic England opposes certain types of development on the Coalite site due to harm to Bolsover Castle through its setting, and has indicated that housing on the southern part of the Coalite site is harmful to the setting of the Castle (though in this case 'less than substantial harm').

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5165 - 7985 - Land to South of Markham Vale Extension, Long Duckmanton - None

5943 Object**Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]****Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Sophie Taylor) [4539]**

Summary: Bolsover Land Ltd objects to the strategic site allocation of Land to the south of Markham Vale on the grounds that it could undermine the delivery of the former Coalite site. If this greenfield site would become available in the short/medium term it could prove a more viable and attractive interest to parties considering relocating to the former Coalite site which received financial support from D2N2 and DCC and should therefore be protected as a priority.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5943 - 4542 - Policy SS7: Land to South of Markham Vale - None

6493 Object**Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is not clear from the Draft Plan or the evidence base documents how the historic environment, heritage assets or their setting have been considered. Grade I Listed Bolsover Castle is included in BP f) but it is not clear how the development of the site can be achieved in respect of any impact on the significance of the heritage asset or its setting. Possible impact on the Bolsover Conservation Area and its Listed Buildings. There's concern that this allocation is not sound in respect of relevant legislation and the NPPF.

Recommendation that further historic impact assessment is undertaken.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6493 - 10819 - Policy SS7: Land to South of Markham Vale - None

6647 Object**Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The strategic site allocation extends into part of the Peter Fidler Nature Reserve and LWS and if this area were to be developed there could be significant impacts on this site. It is unclear why the allocation needs to extend into the Reserve and raises concerns about new access roads, as well as direct impacts. We would support pedestrian and cycle access through the reserve into the strategic area, but not vehicular access.

Allocation seen as a concern, hope that the allocation would have been able to exclude all of the designated Local Wildlife Site.

Request Council to review the boundary of the strategic allocation to see if that part of the Peter Fidler LWS that is included could be excluded.

Concern that the strategic allocation as it stands could limit any flexibility for the proposed HS2 route to be moved slightly further west to avoid significant harm to the Peter Fidler Reserve and the Doe Lea valley corridor more generally.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6647 - 2607 - Policy SS7: Land to South of Markham Vale - None

6577 Support**Respondent: Mr & Mrs F Elliot [11277]****Agent: Copesticks Ltd. (Mr Tim Farley) [9829]**

Summary: Masterplan approach required by the policy is broadly reasonable and pragmatic, to ensure that development can be appropriately phased, integrated with the wider Markham Vale area and any necessary mitigation can be achieved consistently across the site. Policy approach considered to be appropriate and should be carried forward through future planning permissions to ensure that supply can meet demand.

It is important that the adopted policy and future permission enables sufficient flexibility to ensure that demand can be met in a timely manner. Support for wider growth around Markham Vale to significantly bolster the location's sustainability and potential for growth. Policy SS7 is seen as sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6577 - 11277 - Policy SS7: Land to South of Markham Vale - None

5166 Comment **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steve Baker) [7985]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policy SS7 f: It is not clear that wholesale development of this site for employment uses could be achieved without meaningful harm to the significance of the Castle through its setting, particularly if the site is seen as the 'next phase' of the Markham development, with similar types of building. If such harms do arise then the allocation of the site could be seen as 'unsound' because of material harm to heritage assets at the highest levels of designation. I therefore recommend that the local planning authority should not consider allocating this site without a visual sensitivity study assessing the impacts of development on the significance of Bolsover Castle.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5166 - 7985 - Policy SS7: Land to South of Markham Vale - None

5439 Comment **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: We acknowledge the provision for structural landscaping and green infrastructure as set out at point (d) and the protection of the adjacent Local Wildlife Site and biodiversity interest of the Doe Lea corridor.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5439 - 4469 - Policy SS7: Land to South of Markham Vale - None

6012 Comment **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: It is noted that Policy SS7: South of Markham Vale, proposes the allocation of a new strategic employment site to the south of the existing Markham Vale employment site. The need to ensure that the proposed allocation of the site does not undermine the delivery of the adjacent Coalite site, which is welcomed and supported.

DCC's Officers consider that the proposed new allocation is unlikely to impact on the delivery of the remaining part of the existing Markham Vale site. Concern however over potential impact on heritage assets, HIA and Visual Appraisal will therefore be needed, further consideration and detail required for this site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6012 - 10098 - Policy SS7: Land to South of Markham Vale - None

6062 Comment **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: NO OBJECTION in principle and we recognise that, as a result of its location, it will also deliver additional employment opportunities to residents of CBC. The development of this site will need to be the subject of ongoing co-operation on cross boundary impacts, in particular the impact of additional traffic on the highways network and specifically on the capacity of J29a of the M1 and the Chesterfield Road/Rectory Road junction, taking into account the cumulative impacts of this proposal, Coalite, Staveley Works and Eastern Villages proposals in the adopted CBC Strategy and emerging draft LP.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6062 - 8156 - Policy SS7: Land to South of Markham Vale - None

6063 Support**Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Para 4.57 (Coalite Priority Regeneration Area)

SUPPORT the objective of regenerating this vacant and derelict former employment site. The supporting text could be clearer about why the site is not counted towards the housing requirement (presumably due to delivery being beyond the plan period) and updated to reflect the planning permission that has now been granted for the development (although we appreciate this is likely to require further revision to take account of the impact of the proposed route of HS2 phase 2b).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6063 - 8156 - Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None

5564 Comment**Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site specific comments for SS8:

It is our opinion that housing must not be sited in areas of Flood Zone 2 or 3, until such a time as adequate sequential test evidence has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority (LPA).

Furthermore, the supporting SA recognises that the development' may have adverse impacts' on important features. We therefore strongly recommend that a 10m buffer zone should be implemented either side of the watercourse on this site, to prevent development in these areas. We look forward to developing our partnership working with you.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5564 - 10840 - Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None

6111 Comment**Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The LPCD identifies a further site at the former Coalite works, as a Priority Regeneration Area. It is noted that this is considered by the LPCD to be of a strategic scale and has planning permission for some 980 dwellings. This site is not, however, included in the LPCD as Strategic Site Allocation, on account of concerns over its ability to deliver housing within the plan period. This site has planning permission with an agreed highways mitigation strategy in place.

Other sites are now under consideration for housing allocations that have no transportation analysis underpinning them let alone any basis for providing a strategy to mitigate their effects upon the transportation network.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6111 - 10098 - Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None

5167 Support**Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steve Baker) [7985]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area

Welcomes recognition of the importance of the setting of Bolsover Castle in Policy SS8 d). Statement that this is a critical factor in redevelopment of the Coalite site. Historic England are clear in their consultation response to the latest detailed proposals for the Coalite site, that the development of the housing element is harmful to setting and is only justifiable in terms of securing the benefits of remediation of the wider site. I therefore recommend that the proposed Supplementary Planning Document agreed by the joint authorities takes forward this critical linkage in guiding redevelopment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5167 - 7985 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None

5567 Support**Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We continue to welcome a collaborative approach for this site and we therefore request that we are included in any future discussions relating to either remediation and/or water quality implications of the River Doe Lea.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5567 - 10840 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None

5944 Support**Respondent: Bolsover Land Ltd (Sir / Madam) [4542]****Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Sophie Taylor) [4539]**

Summary: Bolsover Land Ltd is generally supportive of the "Priority Regeneration Area" status of the site and considers with regards to the uncertainty of HS2 the Council's approach in terms of not relying on this site for housing land supply to be appropriate. The respondent also supports the notion of a comprehensive masterplan for re-development on the whole site and welcomes maximum flexibility. However, an SPD could potentially generate further policy and potential burdens to deliverability and viability.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5944 - 4542 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None

6016 Support**Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is noted that the former Coalite site has not been identified in the LPCD as a strategic site allocation but instead has been identified a Priority Regeneration Area under Policy SS8. This is considered to be an appropriate and justified approach given that there can be no degree of certainty that the Coalite site will contribute to meeting the Local Plan's housing target, which would otherwise be likely to be required by an Inspector, if the land was identified as a Strategic Allocation Site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6016 - 10098 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None

6494 Support**Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - the inclusion of BP i) in line with our previous comments is welcomed. We are aware that the site benefits from planning approval, and also that the proposed HS2 Phase 2b route is likely to impact the site. We would welcome the opportunity to continue dialogue with the Council about the site should the Masterplan need to be revised.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6494 - 10819 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None

- 5440 Comment** **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Whilst we welcome the protection of the biodiversity value of Doe Lea corridor at point (d), this site has great potential to make positive green infrastructure and biodiversity gains and therefore opportunities to incorporate green infrastructure during the development of the masterplan should be maximised.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5440 - 4469 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None
- 6064 Comment** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: SS8 Coalite Priority Regeneration Area
 NO OBJECTION in principle. The development of this site will need to be the subject of ongoing co-operation on cross boundary impacts, in particular the impact of additional traffic on the highways network and specifically on the capacity of J29a of the M1 and the Chesterfield Road/Rectory Road junction, taking into account the cumulative impacts of this proposal, land south of Markham Vale (policy SS7), the associated development of the Coalite site in Bolsover District, Staveley Works and Eastern Villages proposals in the adopted CB Core Strategy and emerging draft LP.
 Would be useful to set out the amount of employment land and housing expected to be delivered by the allocation in the policy for clarity.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6064 - 8156 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None
- 6120 Comment** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy SS8 identifies the former Coalite site as a Strategic Priority Area. The proposed collaborative working between NEDDC and BDC to address the comprehensive restoration of the former Coalite site is fully supported but DCC's Officers still have concerns about the potential scale of development as currently proposed with respect to its potential impact on landscape character and the setting/sense of arrival at Bolsover Castle (see comments above).
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6120 - 10098 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None
- 6578 Comment** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs F Elliot [11277]** **Agent: Copesticks Ltd. (Mr Tim Farley) [9829]**
 Summary: Doubt over the deliverability of employment land as a part of the Coalite regeneration scheme (within the Plan period) is well founded.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6578 - 11277 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None
- 6616 Comment** **Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Coalite Priority Regeneration Areas includes development proposals for this regeneration site which is not part of the District's housing requirement. The Council should provide further clarification about this site.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6616 - 4414 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None

6652 Comment

Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We believe that the policy should be strengthened in relation to Biodiversity by stating that the development should 'Protect and enhance the biodiversity value of the Doe Lea corridor'.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6652 - 2607 - Policy SS8: Coalite Priority Regeneration Area - None

4699 Object **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas** 🗨️ **[10351]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The green belt should remain as green belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4699 - 10351 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

4836 Object **Respondent: Mrs Maralyn Dommert** **[10326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green Belt land around Dronfield is a valuable asset in preventing urban sprawl. Historically Sheffield has been eager to spread its boundaries. Any relaxation of the Green Belt will encourage a fresh attempt at this. Development towards Chesterfield will do the same in the light of Chesterfield's attempts to become part of the Sheffield City Region. Preservation of our Green Belt/Farm Land is paramount as such areas attract wildlife and provide havens for conservation. Healthy lifestyles are encouraged by these areas. Recent national research found that such areas show decreased mental health problems, (Bioscience Journal cite Dr Cox/Prof Gaston).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4836 - 10326 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

5040 Object **Respondent: Mrs Sandra Fraser** **[8828]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brownfield sites should be used before ANY green belt is developed.

Also certain areas are earmarked in the area but many villages have been spared any development-why? Surely it would be fairer if all places had a share of the loss of Green belt rather than centres of population already reeling under huge transport problems.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5040 - 8828 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

5162 Object **Respondent: Mr Jonathan Webster** **[9459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Re proposed housing in green belt, Coal Aston, Moss Valley (north of Eckington Road). I object to proposals for housing or other development in this area as it will detract from the amenity value of the green belt and from the conservation area it is in. It will irreversibly damage green belt and the conservation area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5162 - 9459 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

5250 Object **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Anthony Stephen Jackson** **[6606]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council is riding roughshod over Green Belt regulations. The council has failed to justify any special circumstances. The Council has failed to utilise other options. There appears to be a hidden motive in the Councils agenda.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5250 - 6606 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

- 5418 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
- Summary: Para 4.61. There is no evidence of increased pressure affordability and house prices in Killamarsh and Eckington. Average house prices in Killamarsh for example are £156,145 up 11.5% in 10 years (ref: Zoopla April 2017) and up less than 1% in 12 months. House prices are higher in Dronfield but house price growth is below the national average. Housing completions 2011 -2016 (appendix A) in Dronfield (70), Eckington(87) and Killamarsh (29) are significant and show capacity within the existing urban areas for continued growth.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5418 - 10724 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5421 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
- Summary: Object to the assertion that in para.4.61 that there are problems of unmet housing need or demand which could not be met within existing green belt boundaries through redevelopment or intensification. There is no evidence from house prices in Killamarsh Eckington or Dronfield.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5421 - 10724 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5074 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Lisa Bell [10308]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: We welcome the key aims of this section/policy in terms of ensuring that the key strategic function of the Sheffield/Derbyshire Green Belt remains intact and also support the direction of growth for Dronfield to other areas of the town.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 5074 - 10308 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5420 Support** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
- Summary: Support the acknowledgement in para 4.59 that the greenbelt can assist in urban regeneration and the recycling of land. Support para.4.61 in its assertion that the green belt has been an effective tool in assisting the focus of development on brownfield and undeveloped land within settlement boundaries.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 5420 - 10724 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 6252 Support** **Respondent: Messrs S & K Whittam & Grayson [8368]** **Agent: IBA Planning Limited (Mr Nick Baseley) [4560]**
- Summary: S Whittam and K Grayson support the release of land from the Green Belt. If the Land at Stubley Drive, Stubley Hollow (site k) would be removed the site would not constitute unrestricted urban sprawl, would still retain separation towards Sheffield and would not encroach into the countryside.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 6252 - 8368 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5076 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Affordability will still be an issue. The green belt land identified in Dronfield is prime development land and will command very high prices.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 5076 - 10593 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

- 5401 Comment** **Respondent: Ms Rhian Harding [10774]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I agree with 4.59 and 4.60 but not 4.61 The Green Belt surrounding Dronfield and Coal Aston is for many of us living here why we choose to live here and we value this green land and the community within it more than anything else. There is very limited green space within the mass housing sprawl of Dronfield and Dronfield Woodhouse and gardens are being paved over or built on so the surrounding but we are compensated by appalling planning decisions by the countryside and farms where we spend a lot of family recreation time.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5401 - 10774 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5988 Comment** **Respondent: Advance Land & Planning Limited (Mr Andy Williams) [9755]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: As a matter of principle, we take the view that a well-placed settlement not in the Green Belt should be sequentially preferred as a location for new development ahead of land in the Green Belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5988 - 9755 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 6314 Comment** **Respondent: Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Area shown as Allotment area (on the attached plan) should be within the settlement limits and removed from the Green Belt. This would allow for development of the land for housing and provide funding for improvement to the facilities at Mount St Mary's College.
 The area at Spinkhill identified as "GS3" in the existing Local Plan, comprising the building complex at Mount St Mary's College, should be within the settlement limits and removed from the Green Belt. It is clearly part of the settlement. This was previously shown as "major development in the Green Belt" which is illogical
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6314 - 11116 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 6380 Comment** **Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**
 Summary: Consideration should be given to the removal of land from the Green Belt as part of the review of smaller settlement boundaries, which is still to be undertaken. Alternatively, the scope of Policy SS10 'Safeguarded Land' should be extended to allow for greater flexibility for the Plan to respond to any future changes to without the need for a full Green Belt Review to be undertaken.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6380 - 8171 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 6546 Comment** **Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Gladman consider that locations outside of green belt in suitable, available, viable and sustainable locations should be allocated for development within the Plan.
 Gladman do not object to the release of Green Belt that no longer meets the purposes set out in the Framework. However, all reasonable non Green Belt options should first have been carefully explored.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6546 - 10071 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

6686 Comment **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
Summary: It is not clear from the evidence base exactly how the Council has assessed and ruled out as reasonable alternatives non-Green Belt sites (including Rippon Homes land interests at Wingerworth) at the sustainable settlements in the District before proposing significant Green Belt releases.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6686 - 11287 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

6717 Comment **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
Summary: It is not clear from the evidence base exactly how the Council has assessed and ruled out as reasonable alternatives non-Green Belt sites at the sustainable settlements in the District before proposing significant Green Belt releases.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6717 - 8407 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

6756 Comment **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Nigel & Marie Hamilton [8163]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern that the sheer scale of the review has led to some opportunities being missed to alter the green belt boundaries to more appropriate ones. There should be an insurance of consistency with the Local Plan's strategy, not include land which it is unnecessary to keep open. In Walton the criteria has not been met. Plan makes no allocation of dwelling locations in Walton and Holymoorside. Both are constrained by the Green Belt and would make allocation or construction of housing difficult.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6756 - 8163 - North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

- 4606 Object** **Respondent: Mr Edward Throp [10272]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Proposed regions of green belt provide an important barrier too excessive growth of the urban environment. In particular the hollowes golf course and the paths around it provide important green areas where existing residents exercise, walk dogs etc. Current infrastructure (road network) is not adequate to support such significant developments.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4606 - 10272 - Green Belt Review - None
- 4698 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas [10351]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The green belt should remain as green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4698 - 10351 - Green Belt Review - None
- 4741 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the release of parcels of green belt land around Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4741 - 9167 - Green Belt Review - None
- 4858 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Elizabeth Ann Boardman [10473]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of land from the green belt. Concerns over the impact the release might have on people's health and wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4858 - 10473 - Green Belt Review - None
- 4957 Object** **Respondent: Mr Mark Wilkinson [10553]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Greenbelt land is supposed to stay green and not be built on. Greenbelt land is important to be kept as it is in order to separate the towns and villages. It also is important for wildlife. Studies have also shown that green areas are good for the health and wellbeing of people. By taking that away you will create more pressure on the NHS.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4957 - 10553 - Green Belt Review - None
- 5042 Object** **Respondent: David McCall [10602]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of greenbelt land in the north of the District. Concern raised over potential urban sprawl that this proposed release could lead to.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5042 - 10602 - Green Belt Review - None

5078 Object **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Exceptional circumstances have not been evidenced in this plan. There are brownfield sites available for redevelopment in Dronfield and across the region. The areas identified in Dronfield DO provide a valid Green Belt function - for recreation, wildlife and inhibiting urban sprawl.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5078 - 10593 - Green Belt Review - None

5222 Object **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: 4.64 is nonsense. A review does not "provide exceptional circumstances". Exceptional circumstances either exist or they do not. This statement is overt evidence of the council's flawed logic in proposing land be removed from the Green Belt. This plan does not make the case that there are exceptional circumstances. Comment that the planned 860 dwellings in Dronfield is unsustainable. Statement that land at Shakespeare crescent does perform a green belt function.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5222 - 9166 - Green Belt Review - None

5252 Object **Respondent: Mr Andrew Goodwin [10686]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: My objection centres around the removal of the Green Belt land surrounding Dronfield.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5252 - 10686 - Green Belt Review - None

5258 Object **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Anthony Stephen Jackson [6606]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: 1. The review of the Green Belt was unnecessary.
2. The Council failed to adopt other alternatives
3. The Council failed to identify any Special Circumstances to alter the status of any Green Belt land.
4. The Council, contrary to Government requirements, fails to take account of Dronfield's residents' wishes preferring to support the lobbying of development companies.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5258 - 6606 - Green Belt Review - None

5292 Object **Respondent: Mr and Mrs Andrew and Angela Spencer [10709]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The full representation makes detailed comparisons between sites, and points out errors, inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the Green Belt Review, relating to the drawing of the Green Belt boundary and the scoring of parcels as having a weak or strong boundary.

The representation sets out that the following two areas of land would be suitable for future residential development - one area of parcel WAL/GB/013, and all of WAL/GB/014, stating it would have little or no impact on Urban sprawl, has strong defensible boundaries, with well-contained residential properties and not reducing the width of the gap between built up areas.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5292 - 10709 - Green Belt Review - None

- 5393 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The council has selected Green Belt land for development without a rigorous assessment of all options and other sources of land ((5.6) including: windfall sites (5.6, 7.4) sites below 10 dwellings (5.8) issues of deliverability have been addressed to justify Green Belt release (5.7) This is contrary to the Housing White Paper 2017.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5393 - 9166 - Green Belt Review - None
- 5402 Object** **Respondent: Ms Rhian Harding [10774]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I totally reject the evidence led review of the Green Belt boundaries. To suggest that building 180 houses on farm land in Coal Aston meets any needs of local residents is absurd. The detriment to health & wellbeing and environmental impact will be enormous to residents who have lived in this village for a lifetime. Coal Aston is small, friendly and rural and steeped in tradition. The village has grown organically and the Green Belt land must be protected to retain the character and protect the land which is integral to the local landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5402 - 10774 - Green Belt Review - None
- 5474 Object** **Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: Please see attached statement
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5474 - 10799 - Green Belt Review - None
- 5517 Object** **Respondent: Mr Steven mitchell [10772]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to review of green belt because of negative impact on the community and countryside. Green belt was introduced to stop urban spread and sprawl which is what will happen if green belt status is changed to allow development and building.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5517 - 10772 - Green Belt Review - None
- 5603 Object** **Respondent: Gleeson Regeneration Ltd [10846]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: Please see attached statement
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5603 - 10846 - Green Belt Review - None
- 5702 Object** **Respondent: Mr Peter MacKay [10902]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Statement that section 4.65 claims that in order to achieve a "sustainable pattern of development... we must accept that this will have an impact on the Green Belt", but the Council's approach to removing land from the Green Belt in Dronfield is does not fit a "sustainable pattern of development". Statement that the land proposed for removal from the Green Belt at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield (Section 5.20) and Hilltop Dronfield (Section 5.21) come with a list of factors that have not been investigated
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5702 - 10902 - Green Belt Review - None

- 6034 Object** **Respondent: Roy Phillips [10496]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to release of greenbelt land surrounding Dronfield. Reasons for objection: limited green space in Dronfield, pressure on narrow roads.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6034 - 10496 - Green Belt Review - None
- 6128 Object** **Respondent: Gareth Barber [11129]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed removal of greenbelt land around Dronfield. Reasons for objections: does not believe that the proposals are in line with central government approach and does not fit with a case for exceptional circumstances, believe the loss of greenbelt will reduce quality of life not increase it, states that empty homes should be targeted first as well as brownfield sites, removal of the greenbelt area will impact on the character of the town.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6128 - 11129 - Green Belt Review - None
- 6273 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Catherine Dixon [10830]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed changes to greenbelt surrounding Dronfield. Reasons given for objections: urban sprawl, loss of countryside, no acceptable show of exceptional circumstances to remove greenbelt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6273 - 10830 - Green Belt Review - None
- 6281 Object** **Respondent: Mr Simon Dixon [11187]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I strongly object to the building of new houses on greenbelt land around Dronfield. This land was deliberately set aside to ensure that Dronfield remains a town in its own right and is not swallowed up into the suburbs of either Sheffield or Chesterfield, eventually resulting in the merging of the two larger conurbations. Residents of Dronfield do not want to live in Shefferfield!
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6281 - 11187 - Green Belt Review - None
- 6334 Object** **Respondent: Elaine Bullers [11206]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to developments on Green Belt land in Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh. Concerns are for exceptional circumstances, merging of towns, loss of green space for recreation, impact on wildlife, strain on services, increase in traffic, unsafe road conditions for cycling, pedestrian safety, plans for the future of public transport, medical services, use of brownfield sites first.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6334 - 11206 - Green Belt Review - None
- 6366 Object** **Respondent: Mr John Reedman [11222]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I refer to that part of the area shaded as and identified as a Parcel partially meets Green Belt purposes as I object to the rezoning of existing and green belt recreation facilities, in respect of the historic recreation facilities behind Coal Aston Village Hall which were originally provided by private and charitable means.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6366 - 11222 - Green Belt Review - None

6379 Object **Respondent:** Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171] **Agent:** Caroline McIntyre [8482]
Summary: The decision not to allocate any sites or remove land from the Green Belt within the Level 3 Settlements at this stage of the Plan preparation, particularly where these are well located to the adjacent Authorities, does not provide the flexibility to respond to accommodate changes required through the Duty to Cooperate or the Sheffield City Region work (see Paragraphs 1.16 and 4.22 of the Local Plan).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6379 - 8171 - Green Belt Review - None

6449 Object **Respondent:** Mr & Mrs N Beecroft [11244] **Agent:** Caroline McIntyre [8482]
Summary: Clients' site is included within the parcel of land assessed under WAD/GB/006. Conclusion on Parcel WAD/GB/006 is that this scores 'Red' in an assessment against the Purposes 1 and 3 of the Green Belt by checking unrestricted sprawl and assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Statement that smaller elements within each parcel which may score different in terms of the purposes of the Green Belt is not considered. Review process therefore seems to be at odds with the detail of Stage 2 of the 'Common Approach to the Green Belt Review' document.

Statement that there is a lack of consistency in the approach to selecting parcels for assessment.

Requested that the GB Review of Site BRAM/2301, be reconsidered on the same grounds as the approach taken to Parcel HOLY/GB/024.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6449 - 11244 - Green Belt Review - None

6719 Object **Respondent:** Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171] **Agent:** Spawforths (Mr Gavin Winter) [8147]
Summary: Concerns over GB review methodology, results and conclusions. Do not consider this has been applied consistently, when assessing individual parcels against the purposes of the GB.

Statement that it's not appropriate to release a site from the Green Belt solely for the reasons it performs fewer Green Belt functions than other areas, or because it performs certain Green Belt functions less well than other areas.

Statement that "Land opp High Lane set back from B6388", should be considered for GB release.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6719 - 8171 - Green Belt Review - None

6035 Support **Respondent:** Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: Support for the release of green belt land in the north of the District. NEDDC has undertaken a Green Belt Review, which provides an objective assessment of the role of individual parcels of Green Belt land in fulfilling the five main Green Belt purposes set out in the NPPF.

DCC's Officers concluded that the overall methodology was robust and consistent with the agreed methodology for undertaking Green Belt Reviews that was developed by Officers of the SCR local authorities, including DCC.

It is considered that the LPCD has set out an appropriate and well-reasoned justification in sections 4.62 to 4.65 for there to be exceptional circumstances within the District for undertaking a review of Green Belt boundaries.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6035 - 10098 - Green Belt Review - None

6065 Support**Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Para 4.64

SUPPORT the methodology used in undertaking a Green Belt review. We can confirm that CBC was consulted on the methodology.

Para 4.66

We note that that some areas of release are close to the CBC boundary (and immediately adjacent in the case of releases south of Eckington) but have no objections in principle to the proposed releases.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6065 - 8156 - Green Belt Review - None

4737 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: These points would seem to be the justification for removing land from the Green Belt. However housing need cannot be cited as the exceptional circumstances necessary to remove land from the Green Belt. Suggestions made that housing should go on brownfield sites. Little opportunity identified for potential creation of local employment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4737 - 9167 - Green Belt Review - None

5562 Comment**Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Green Belt methodology outlined is different to, but not inconsistent with, Sheffield's approach to Green Belt review. Identification of Safeguarded Land is consistent with the aims of the NPPF to ensure enduring Green Belt boundaries. We note there is recognition within the Green Belt review that some land parcels adjacent to Sheffield's urban area, which scored red, have locational benefits that could potentially weigh in favour of release, although more detailed consideration would be needed. This may be an issue to be picked up through a future review of the North Derbyshire and South Yorkshire Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5562 - 7769 - Green Belt Review - None

6392 Comment**Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]****Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**

Summary: It is considered that the site ECK/2201, which lies within parcel RID/GB/002 remains available, suitable and achievable and should be released from the Green Belt to meet the district's housing needs over the plan period.

We would therefore urge the Council to review the draft Local Plan and Evidence Base documents in the light of the above submission and consider the removal of all or part of our clients' site from the Green Belt as part of the review of Level 3 Settlement Boundaries which is still to be undertaken at the next stage of the Local Plan process.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6392 - 8171 - Green Belt Review - None

6704 Comment Respondent: Hallam Land Management [7114] Agent: Pegasus Group (East Midlands Office) (Ian Deverell) [11291]

Summary: Plan needs to be clear that the proposed GB releases are justified and that full use has been made of suitable land for development outside the GB to meet future requirements. For NED, some GB release in the northern part of the district is justified to meet the needs of the three Towns and to address needs arising from the SCR to the north.

Identified GB sites District will take time to come forward. A number of sites need to be identified in good market areas to ensure a good supply of housing. Land at Coupe Lane Tupton suggested.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6704 - 7114 - Green Belt Review - None

6758 Comment Respondent: Mr & Mrs Nigel & Marie Hamilton [8163] Agent: N/A

Summary: The boundary around Walton is currently weak. In either 1999 or 2005 the green belt was changed and drawn even tighter around Walton. Meaning that new housing is impossible without encroaching on the green belt. Given the unmet demand for housing and the weakness of that boundary, the current boundary will need to be changed at the end of the plan period.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6758 - 8163 - Green Belt Review - None

6759 Comment Respondent: Mr & Mrs Nigel & Marie Hamilton [8163] Agent: N/A

Summary: The NPPF requires green belt boundaries to be capable of persisting beyond the plan period. We believe a new site should be assessed (WAL/GB/018) which is a combination of WAL/GB/016 and WAL/GB/017. It scored 'green' when assessed against the methodology in the Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners report. The Council should re-assess this themselves. The location is the 'right' side of the A632 and surrounded by development, it could be released for housing.

Overall scores:

Purpose 1 Green

Purpose 2 Green

Purpose 3 Green

Purpose 4 Green

Purpose 5 Amber

See attachment for detailed scores of location by independent review.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6759 - 8163 - Green Belt Review - None

- 4582 Object** **Respondent: Mr Oliver Hewitt [10177]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I do not think you have justified the 'very special circumstances' required to allow release of greenbelt in the Dronfield area. Taking the "Land off Shakespeare Crescent & Sheffield Road" as an example you are suggesting the removal of agricultural land which is so important that the policy makes special provision for agricultural buildings to be erected if it aids their business, this action will surely have a detrimental effect on local agriculture.
 This is not poor-quality unproductive land as it is used for grazing and crops and I do not feel you have fully examined all other reasonable options.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4582 - 10177 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 4697 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas ☺ [10351]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I object to changes of use for the green belt. It should remain as green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4697 - 10351 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5080 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The evidence that there are some people that want to release the Green Belt for development is only reflecting those that are set to profit from its development.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5080 - 10593 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5161 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jenny Towers [10649]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Dronfield does not have the infrastructure to cope with the additional housing proposed. This increase in people will adversely impact upon the existing residents in Dronfield by putting additional pressure on the existing schools and doctors surgeries. In addition, the additional traffic through the town will cause the roads to be more dangerous than they already are. The plans also reduce the green belt area, I strongly object to this and the plans would appear to conflict with the councils statements around the desire to protect and preserve our green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5161 - 10649 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5247 Object** **Respondent: JVN Architecture [8121]** **Agent: Mrs Linda Trollope [8119]**
 Summary: The general aims of this policy including the allowance for agricultural and forestry buildings are in line with national Green Belt guidance. I do however object to the restriction that such buildings should only be allowed where the majority of the income is derived from the business. In general the quality of agricultural land in the district is classified as "poor" or "good to moderate". There are many small agricultural units that are operated in association with a more profitable occupation. To ban the construction of new agricultural buildings in these circumstances would severely limit agricultural operations.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5247 - 8121 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

- 5321 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Hannah Knowles [10725]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to removal of green belt land in north east derbyshire
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5321 - 10725 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5410 Object** **Respondent: PMW Property [10783]** **Agent: Cerda Planning Limited (Michael Robson) [10782]**
 Summary: See attached
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5410 - 10783 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5608 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Amanda Hockey [10851]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: No exceptional circumstances to justify removing land from greenbelt.
 Dronfield infrastructure not adequate for this level of development
 Character of town changed detrimentally and irrevocably.
 Would merge Dronfield with surrounding towns/ vilages/ city
 No attempt made to liaise and cooperate with neighbouring authorities
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5608 - 10851 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5958 Object** **Respondent: Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: Although the respondent support's the Council protection of the Green Belt Panache Lingerie Ltd strongly objects against the assertion that the level of planned growth for NED cannot be accommodated sustainably within sites which are spatially distributed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. It is considered that suitable Brownfield sites exist elsewhere within the district.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5958 - 11096 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5972 Object** **Respondent: Green Piling Ltd (Green Piling Ltd) [11104]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: Green Piling supports the Council's protection of Green Belt. However, the respondent strongly objects against the assertion that the planned housing growth in NED cannot be accommodated sustainably within sites which are spatially distributed in accordance with settlement hierarchy. It is considered that suitable Brownfield sites exist elsewhere within the district which are being unnecessarily protected for employment use.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5972 - 11104 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 6143 Object** **Respondent: Sheffield FC (Mr Richard Timms) [8364]** **Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) East Midlands (Mr Doug Moulton) [8357]**
 Summary: R Timms objects to Policy SS9 and wishes that for the Sheffield FC site at Sheffield Road, Dronfield a further category should be added to the policy which states
 g) The redevelopment of Sheffield Football Club ground at Sheffield Road, Dronfield where the redevelopment delivers a new provision for the club in their historic home of Sheffield
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6143 - 8364 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

- 6299 Object** **Respondent: Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
 Summary: Strata Homes Ltd objects to Policy SS9 and the designation of land off Harehill Road to the west of Walton Hospital as Green Belt. The respondent points out that this would be a very sustainable location and would not fulfil any of the functions of the Green Belt. If the site would not be allocated under Policy LC1 then the site should be allocated as safeguarded land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6299 - 10158 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 6304 Object** **Respondent: Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the draft Local Plan's Green Belt Policy (Policy SS9) and the plan more widely as it fails, in our opinion, to identify the developed parts of the College as previously developed or Brownfield land in the Green Belt. Neither does it enable positive planning promoted by para.81 of the NPPF.
 Statement that Local Plan identifies the College as a major developed site within the Green Belt and we feel that such major developed sites are dealt with by Policy GS3.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6304 - 11116 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 6597 Object** **Respondent: Mr Grey [11280]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
 Summary: Mr Grey points out that Policy SS9 refers to the Green Belt "as shown on the Policies Maps" but there are no such maps covering much of the District. This is a major deficiency and calls into question the validity of the consultation. The review of the Green Belt cannot be assessed in the absence of a policy map showing its extent. However, it seems clear that, the review has not been sufficiently robust or comprehensive.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6597 - 11280 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 6687 Object** **Respondent: Mr Perez [11288]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
 Summary: Mr Perez objects to Policy SS9 and wishes that the Land adjacent to Spring House should be removed from the Green Belt. The policy would refer to the Green Belt "as shown on the Policies Maps" but there would be no such maps covering much of the District. This would be a major deficiency and calls into question the validity of the consultation. The review of the Green Belt cannot be assessed in the absence of a policy map showing its extent. However, it seems clear that, the review has not been sufficiently robust or comprehensive.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6687 - 11288 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 4558 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Sarah Bayliss [10224]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Dronfield desperately needs new housing especially affordable homes for our young people, currently priced out of the very small market here. We wholeheartedly support the use of these small areas of green belt which will not detract from Dronfield as a whole.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4558 - 10224 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

- 5679 Support** **Respondent: The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support - The Coal Authority supports this policy which identifies that mineral extraction is an acceptable form of development in the Green Belt.
 Reason - The Policy supports the principles set out in National Planning Policy in the NPPF.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5679 - 9528 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 6160 Support** **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: National Trust supports the long term protection of North East Derbyshire's Green Belt through Policy SS9.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6160 - 4598 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 6407 Support** **Respondent: Mr Paul Stock [8388]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: In response to and for the reasons set out in our previous representations to the Draft Local Plan (Part 1) we welcome and fully support the fact that the Council has now undertaken a review of the Green Belt in the District since the last iteration of the Local Plan. In this regard we endorse the Council's thinking on this matter as set out in paragraphs 4.63 to 4.66 in the consultation draft Local Plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6407 - 8388 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 4983 Comment** **Respondent: PDNPA (Mr Ian Fullilove) [10430]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: It would be useful to include a reference to the need not only to protect the green belt but the National park area adjacent to the green belt since the methods for protecting green belt could otherwise inadvertently lead to release of land whose development might harm the setting of the National Park. A text reference might be better than a policy ref
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4983 - 10430 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None
- 5221 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy SS9 does not implement Local Plan Objective D6 as claimed in regards to Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5221 - 9166 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

6183 Comment **Respondent:** John Church Planning Consultancy Limited (Mr John Church) [4417] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Questions raised over why the Council's green belt review is related mainly to around the fringe of Sheffield. Statement that opportunity for the minor reviews of the boundary was not taken.

Two sites identified: Land at Belmont Cottage, Holymoore Road, Chesterfield and; Land at Hillside, Barrack Road, Apperknowle.

Requests that these sites are released from the green belt and that the Settlement Development Limits be altered accordingly.

See submission or more.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6183 - 4417 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

6222 Comment **Respondent:** CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: In terms of the rationale for that delineation, CPRE is broadly supportive of the policy. However, there is a very high risk that it will be ineffective, and must therefore be considered unsound. (see submission for more.)

Green Belt policy SS9 should provide for enhancement action plans to allow for the implementation of NPPF para 81.

In addition this commitment to enhancement should be extended to land designated as non-Green Belt countryside, settlement gaps and urban greenspaces, in order to assist in implementing policies SDC1 to SDC14 and ID1 to ID5; and to enable their sustainability functions to carry greater weight in decision-making.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6222 - 7581 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

6308 Comment **Respondent:** Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: This policy only refers to dwellings for agriculture and forestry It should allow for "other occupational dwellings in the countryside". Statement that the Green Belt is too tightly drawn around Spinkhill

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6308 - 11116 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

6382 Comment **Respondent:** Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171] **Agent:** Caroline McIntyre [8482]

Summary: Policy SS9 'North East Derbyshire Green Belt': The wording of this policy with regards to the exceptions listed from (a) to (f) should reflect the wording of Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") (2012). At present the policy as drafted does not reflect the NPPF and the wording of some parts of the policy is unclear.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6382 - 8171 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

6441 Comment **Respondent:** Mr & Mrs N Beecroft [11244] **Agent:** Caroline McIntyre [8482]

Summary: Policy SS9 'North East Derbyshire Green Belt': The wording of this policy with regards to the exceptions listed from (a) to (f) should reflect the wording of Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") (2012). At present the policy as drafted does not reflect the NPPF and the wording of some parts of the policy is unclear.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6441 - 11244 - Policy SS9: North East Derbyshire Green Belt - None

4696 Object

Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas  [10351]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I object the review of the green belt. It should stay as green belt land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4696 - 10351 - Safeguarded Land - None

- 4695 Object** **Respondent:** Mrs Anna Lomas ☎ [10351] **Agent:** N/A
 Summary: I object to green belt land being re-designated.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4695 - 10351 - Policy SS10: Safeguarded Land - None
- 5422 Object** **Respondent:** Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724] **Agent:** Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]
 Summary: Object to the need for this policy as we do not believe that there is a requirement to release green belt land or to safeguard land for future release.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5422 - 10724 - Policy SS10: Safeguarded Land - None
- 5644 Object** **Respondent:** Define (Mr Mark Rose) [7847] **Agent:** N/A
 Summary: It is important that sufficient land is released to meet the full-identified development needs, and that consideration is given to potential long term development needs to ensure that the new boundaries use recognisable and permanent features.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5644 - 7847 - Policy SS10: Safeguarded Land - None
- 6155 Object** **Respondent:** Sheffield FC (Mr Richard Timms) [8364] **Agent:** DLP (Planning Ltd) East Midlands (Mr Doug Moulton) [8357]
 Summary: R Timms objects to Policy SS10. If the Sheffield FC site is not allocated then it should be removed from the Green Belt due to its sustainable location and lack of Green Belt functions. It is suggested to insert an additional point within the policy:
 iii) it would assist in meeting the 5 year supply of housing land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6155 - 8364 - Policy SS10: Safeguarded Land - None
- 6318 Object** **Respondent:** Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158] **Agent:** DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]
 Summary: Strata Homes object to Policy SS10. If the site off Harehill Road to the west of Walton Hospital is not allocated for development at the present time its sustainable location and lack of green belt function would strongly suggest that it should be removed from the Green Belt and allocate as safeguarded land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6318 - 10158 - Policy SS10: Safeguarded Land - None
- 6162 Comment** **Respondent:** The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598] **Agent:** N/A
 Summary: The purpose of Green Belts is to keep land permanently open. In order to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt the Council will need to demonstrate that there are exceptional circumstances (NPPF paragraph 83) taking account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development (NPPF 84).
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6162 - 4598 - Policy SS10: Safeguarded Land - None

6221 Comment **Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: In terms of the rationale for that delineation, CPRE is broadly supportive of the policy. However, there is a very high risk that it will be ineffective, and must therefore be considered unsound. (see submission for more.)

SS10 should clearly state the function that safeguarded land is intended to provide and the consequences of developing it during the plan period. In particular, this will include a statement of how the settlement hierarchy, infrastructure provision and distribution of development are pertinent to the plan period and cannot in themselves be rendered out-of-date by lack of a 5-year land supply.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6221 - 7581 - Policy SS10: Safeguarded Land - None

6470 Comment **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]** **Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**

Summary: Hallam Land supports the principle of Policy SS10, although proposes that further revisions should be made to increase the size of the safeguarded land to the extension shown on the enclosed drawing (Plan A) which would represent an increase from approx. 31ha to 84ha. This amended boundary would cause no additional harm, would respond to the existing natural features and would be contained by Foxstone Wood.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6470 - 11228 - Policy SS10: Safeguarded Land - None

4694 Object Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas [10351]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to building on the green belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4694 - 10351 - Local Settlement Gaps - None

4889 Object Respondent: Wildgoose Homes (Mr Reuben Spears) [10498]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to the boundary of the settlement gap between Stretton and Clay Cross. A site that has a live planning consent for 31 dwellings is included within the proposed gap and must be removed. A settlement gap should be permanent and provide longevity. Proposing to include a site that has planning consent causes confusion and does not accord with what the local authority have granted consent for. The site will be developed and a forthcoming application will be submitted. Please remove this site from the proposed settlement gap and redraw the boundary.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4889 - 10498 - Local Settlement Gaps - None

5227 Object Respondent: Mr David Munn [8193]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Settlement Gap identified between Holmewood and Heath is unlikely to be effective in relation to its aspect from the A6175. The ground is generally higher than the road and as such it would be unclear whether housing on the Settlement Gap area is present or not. Consequently the perception will be that housing exists all the way from Holmewood to Heath. The Settlement Gap should be increased to extend to Heath's Settlement Development Limit thus preventing development where the ground is lower and new housing would be visible from the road.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5227 - 8193 - Local Settlement Gaps - None

5703 Object Respondent: Mr Peter MacKay [10902]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 4.73 notes that "the Local Plan seeks to protect settlement identity and avoid further settlement coalescence and erosion of character by identifying Local Settlement Gaps". Releasing the land off Shakespeare Crescent & Sheffield Road, Dronfield (Section 5.19) would move the physical boundaries of Dronfield significantly closer to Unstone, leaving only a small green space to separate the two. As Chesterfield Council has given planning permission for Residential development right up to the southern borders of Unstone the net effect will be to remove the distinct nature of Dronfield.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5703 - 10902 - Local Settlement Gaps - None

6566 Object Respondent: Plexus Consultants Ltd (Mr K Pearson) [11275]**Agent: Emery Planning (Mr John Coxon) [8001]**

Summary: We object to the proposed designation of land to the south-west of Grassmoor as a Strategic Gap. We disagree with the findings of the Local Settlement Gap Study (LSGS) in relation to Grassmoor. We consider that the threat of actual merger between the two settlements is non-existent. We agree with the authors of the LSGS in this regard. We also consider that the potential for visual merger has been hugely overstated in the LSGS. There are very limited public vantage points. Grassmoor.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6566 - 11275 - Local Settlement Gaps - None

- 6037 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The identification of Local Settlement Gaps is supported in Policy SS11. Historically, DCC has been supportive of the definition of Strategic Gaps and Green Wedges in Local Plans
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6037 - 10098 - Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 6262 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Hardwick [8097]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for the importance of local settlement gaps 4.70 - 4.75
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6262 - 8097 - Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 5081 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The plans for Dronfield will only leave one field between Dronfield and Unstone. When the new Peak resort is developed this then merges into Chesterfield. The proposals go against the need for local settlement gaps to preserve 'sense of place',
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5081 - 10593 - Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 5333 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs K Goodwin [10739]** **Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**
 Summary: Evidence on which LSG designation is based on is fundamentally flawed.
 The Draft Local Plan does not include narrative about the merits of each gap and whether the perceived need for a gap should outweigh the opportunity to deliver development adjacent to existing settlements. It is resulting in loss of Green Belt land elsewhere.
 Explanation for the Gap to south of New Street Higham is lacking. There is no gap between Higham and Shirland because the area to the north east is part of Shirland and the area to the north has Higham in the address. See map for information.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5333 - 10739 - Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 5389 Comment** **Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Planning Advisor) [4266]** **Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**
 Summary: Evidence on which LSG designation is based is fundamentally flawed.
 The Draft Local Plan does not include narrative about the merits of each gap and whether the perceived need for a gap should outweigh the opportunity to deliver development adjacent to existing settlements. It is resulting in loss of Green Belt land elsewhere.
 Explanation for the Gap at Hanging Banks is lacking. There is already development on the east of the A61, which is part of Wingerworth. It is not logical to keep a field between two parts of the same settlement. The development would unify the settlement, not harm.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5389 - 4266 - Local Settlement Gaps - None

5540 Comment**Respondent: Mr David Burton [11309]****Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**

Summary: Evidence on which LSG designation is based is fundamentally flawed.

The Draft Local Plan does not include narrative about the merits of each gap and whether the perceived need for a gap should outweigh the opportunity to deliver development adjacent to existing settlements. It is resulting in loss of Green Belt land elsewhere.

Explanation for the Gap on the south side of Mill Lane is lacking. Statement that the settlement gaps is unneeded as a gap between Wingerworth and Grassmoor will always exist because of the River Rother, mainline railway and wildlife site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5540 - 11309 - Local Settlement Gaps - None

5545 Comment**Respondent: S&G Dore [11308]****Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**

Summary: Evidence on which LSG designation is based is fundamentally flawed.

The Draft Local Plan does not include narrative about the merits of each gap and whether the perceived need for a gap should outweigh the opportunity to deliver development adjacent to existing settlements. It is resulting in loss of Green Belt land elsewhere.

Explanation for the Gap West of Chesterfield Road at Holmewood is lacking. There is no discernible gap between Holmewood and North Wingfield. There is no justification for keeping the two settlements separate as they already adjoin each other. LSG in this area should be removed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5545 - 11308 - Local Settlement Gaps - None

6764 Comment**Respondent: Clay Cross Parish Council (Michelle Cowin) [11303]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The settlement gap which extends into the single field adjacent to Kenning Park. Should it be taken back to the line of CX Footpath 1?

The Parish Council needs to re-enforce and agree to any realignment of the settlement gap and this must be a main priority.

There is a need to add and re-enforce the buffer zone in the southern boundary.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6764 - 11303 - Local Settlement Gaps - None

- 5223 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Statement that Policy SS11 Local Settlement Gaps is worthless as it has never worked before. Concern over urban sprawl in Dronfield also referenced.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5223 - 9166 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 6179 Object** **Respondent: John Church Planning Consultancy Limited (Mr John Church) [4417]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Statement that the Policy SS11 relates specifically to "Local Settlement Gaps" but neither the policy nor its reasoned justification in paragraphs 4.70 - 4.75 explain, other than a brief acknowledgement in paragraph 4.75, that there are instances where there is an extant planning permission, or one soon to be issued, as in the case of the objection site. Statement that due to this the Local Plan therefore lacks clarity.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6179 - 4417 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 6232 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Margaret Gray [11155]** **Agent: Fisher German LLP (Liberty Stones) [10150]**
 Summary: M Gray objects to Policy SS11 which represents a blanket policy approach that restricts development. It is argued that such policies should be supported by robust evidence. However, the Council only provides a single document which does not include a landscape assessment but this would be a core evidence requirement. Therefore, this policy would not be justified and should be deleted from the Plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6232 - 11155 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 6549 Object** **Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Statement that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. Questions over the purpose of settlement gap designation. Objection to the use of settlement gaps if these would only serve to act as a tool to prevent development in otherwise sustainable locations.

 Acknowledgement of need to maintain settlement identity, request that associated policies are carefully considered and drafted in a manner that is suitably permissive to not unnecessarily restrict development opportunities.

 Policy S11 considered by Gladman to be overly restrictive.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6549 - 10071 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 6646 Object** **Respondent: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd [11285]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Bob Woollard) [10128]**
 Summary: Statement that policy SS11, is not supported by the NPPF, it does not promote a criteria based policy. Policy SS11 should be modified to clarify that it is not a restrictive policy on all development and that if the extent of the Local Settlement Gap is to be retained, the policy should allow development to be considered on its own merits against the test of separation.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6646 - 11285 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None

- 6066 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: SS11 Settlement Gaps
 SUPPORT the proposed policy approach. We note that the proposed Calow Gap extends up to the Chesterfield Borough/North East District boundary. In preparing the next iteration of both the Chesterfield and North East Local Plans consideration should be given jointly to whether the Brimington East gap and Calow Gap should meet to form a continuous allocation across LPA borders.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6066 - 8156 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 6121 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps is supported where it will assist in protecting landscape character in those areas defined by nucleated settlement patterns such as the Derbyshire coalfield, and also those areas with a more dispersed settlement pattern with small villages and hamlets, typical of the Peak Fringe. Overall this approach will assist in preventing urban sprawl and alongside other policies in the Plan, it should help to restrict development within the countryside.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6121 - 10098 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 6163 Support** **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: National Trust supports the principle of identifying local settlement gaps.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6163 - 4598 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 6495 Support** **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Local Settlement Gaps - this policy is welcomed as separation can form part of local identity and historic environment character.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6495 - 10819 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 5990 Comment** **Respondent: Advance Land & Planning Limited (Mr Andy Williams) [9755]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Question over need for LSG's. Statement that development has already gone ahead within LSG's. Questions the need.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5990 - 9755 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None
- 6219 Comment** **Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: In terms of the rationale for that delineation, CPRE is broadly supportive of the policy. However, there is a very high risk that it will be ineffective, and must therefore be considered unsound. (see submission for more.)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6219 - 7581 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None

6565 Comment**Respondent: Plexus Consultants Ltd (Mr K Pearson) [11275]****Agent: Emery Planning (Mr John Coxon) [8001]**

Summary: Concerns with the purpose and justification of the policy: constrains the districts ability to meet housing and employment land targets, more suitable sites have been overlooked, policy introduces a quasi Green Belt policy, too many areas identified for designation, if a strategic gap is justified then consideration should be given to land allocations, evidence base lacks sufficient detail and clarity.
No support in the NPPF for secondary tiers of landscape protection. In our view, the designation should only be proposed if there is actual risk of merger between settlements, which would severely diminish the individual character of a settlement.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6565 - 11275 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None

6620 Comment**Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council should also re-consider whether or not the level of protection proposed in Policy SS11 - Local Settlement Gaps is justified.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6620 - 4414 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None

6664 Comment**Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]****Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**

Summary: Policy SS11 Local Settlement Gaps: scope for settlement boundary of Heath to be extended westward"

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6664 - 692 - Policy SS11: Local Settlement Gaps - None

- 4655 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Lisa Bell [10308]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Request that the settlement boundaries are reviewed ASAP and that the area shown on Appendix C is included within the Temple Normanton settlement to ensure that the curtilage of the dwelling house which is used as a garden is included and the boundary is 'defensible'.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4655 - 10308 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 4693 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas [10351]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I object to building on the green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4693 - 10351 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 5256 Object** **Respondent: Mr Andrew Goodwin [10686]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The value of property will reduce based on properties being built on green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5256 - 10686 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6649 Support** **Respondent: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd [11285]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Bob Woollard) [10128]**
 Summary: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd strongly supports the review and amendments of the Settlement Boundary around Shirland. However, the Settlement Boundary as presented within the adopted Local Plan and therefore shown on the current Consultation Draft Policies Map does not fully reflect the extent of existing development or have regard to development opportunities that may have arisen since the adopted Local Plan was prepared, having regard to all other relevant considerations.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6649 - 11285 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6665 Support** **Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**
 Summary: Para 4.80: support for the review and amendments of the Settlement Boundary around Heath (but need for publication of the same as part of the NEDLP)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6665 - 692 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6757 Support** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Nigel & Marie Hamilton [8163]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The policy proposing limited infilling is welcome, particularly for Holymoorside which has sufficient land within the village where infilling could create small pockets of housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6757 - 8163 - Settlement Development Limits - None

- 4841 Comment** **Respondent: Mr A Petrie [6413]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concerns over proposed review of the SDL. Seen as unsatisfactory on two counts. Firstly, the statement that land outside the SDLs is not required, is meaningless if those SDLs are not yet determined, and, secondly, if revised boundaries are not to be available until the Published version of the Plan is available, it would appear that any changes proposed cannot be the subject of public consultation though the public ought to be given the opportunity to comment before the boundaries are consolidated in the Plan.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4841 - 6413 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 5038 Comment** **Respondent: Ms Janet Mort [6914]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Request to add garden in Calow into Calow's settlement development limit during the update.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5038 - 6914 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 5224 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Statement that taking land out of the Green Belt outside the current Dronfield settlement limit is the exact opposite of this statement. Statement the plan states "Further land outside Settlement Development Limits is therefore not required to meet this need." Consequently, there is no need to take land out of the Green Belt around Dronfield. In para 4.80 the plan states the council does not intend to change the settlement development limit of Dronfield. Therefore, on what basis does the council justify the proposal to take land out of the Green Belt?
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5224 - 9166 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 5230 Comment** **Respondent: Mr David Munn [8193]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The Plan indicates SDLs under review and revisions will be identified alongside Publication version. At Heath, the SDL closely encircles existing development leaving little or no vacant space within which new housing could be built. Outward movement of the SDL would almost certainly be viewed as an invitation to new building. In view of the low sustainability rating for the village, as reported in the Plan, development of any appreciable size could have a detrimental impact on the village. Discussions about repositioning the SDL should be undertaken in a transparent manner with participation of village residents.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5230 - 8193 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 5280 Comment** **Respondent: Heath Village Development Committee (Mr David Oliver) [8202]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The Plan indicates that Settlement Development Limits(SDL) are under review and that any proposed revisions to these will be identified alongside the Publication version of the Plan later this year. At Heath, the SDL closely encircles the existing development. We would wish to be consulted about any proposals to change the SDL.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5280 - 8202 - Settlement Development Limits - None

- 5294 Comment** **Respondent: Stenfold Resources Ltd (Mr Philip Barltrop) [8177]** **Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**
- Summary: It is unclear whether smaller settlements will have a settlement boundary and therefore full plans are requested for the entire District. A settlement limit should be provided for Fallgate. Clarification should be provided for the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group as it is understood that they have some concerns about continuing with the allocation proposals for site with permission 15/01302/OL for risk of their Plan being found 'not in conformity' with the Draft Local Plan. Draft Policy SS13 needs to be clearer how a Neighbourhood Plan will be able to allocate sites for larger developments in small villages and hamlets.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 5294 - 8177 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 5909 Comment** **Respondent: Ms Janet Mort [6914]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: I am applying to have boundary settlement amended to reflect the fact that a triangular piece of land at the rear of 206 Top Rd and adjoining Eastwood Drive is not, in fact agricultural land, but has been used as the garden of 206 for at least 40 years. (Proof attached deeds/neighbours testimony We would be grateful if you could consider this when you are drawing up the settlement boundary for Calow.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 5909 - 6914 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6067 Comment** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Para 4.80
We note the intention to publish revised boundaries in the publication version of the plan. We are presuming that the revised boundaries will take account of new development that has occurred since 2005 and sites allocated within the Local Plan. As some settlements are in close proximity to the CBC boundaries, we would welcome ongoing engagement on this issue as the boundaries of these settlements are identified in order to identify any emerging cross boundary issues that may require resolution through the Duty to Co-operate.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6067 - 8156 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6220 Comment** **Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: In terms of the rationale for that delineation, CPRE is broadly supportive of the policies. However, there is a very high risk that they will be ineffective, and must therefore be considered unsound. (see submission for more.)
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6220 - 7581 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6263 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Hardwick [8097]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Concerned that the revised settlements boundaries will be published alongside the Publication Version of the Local Plan without public consultation.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6263 - 8097 - Settlement Development Limits - None

- 6439 Comment** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs N Beecroft [11244]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**
 Summary: Statement that within Policy SS3 'Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development' and Tables 4.1 and 4.2 Wadshelf is defined within Table 4.1 as a Level 3 Settlement.
 Statement that due to paragraph 4.80, there has been no review of the boundaries of most Level 3 settlements as part of the current draft Plan.
 Statement that 'land to the west of the Millstone', Wadshelf (Ref BRAM/2301), should be included within Wadshelf's SDL.
 See submission for more.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6439 - 11244 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6552 Comment** **Respondent: Ashover Parish Council (Mrs S Atkinson) [7554]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We welcome the proposal to develop Settlement Development Limits for the "settlements that fall within categories 1, 2 and 3".
 We welcome that they should not be introduced for the less sustainable settlements in the District.
 We welcome clarification on the relationship between Settlement Development Limits proposed as part of the development of a Neighbourhood Plan.
 We would welcome confirmation that any proposed changes to the Settlement Development Limits will be the subject of public consultation prior to their publication in the Publication Version of the Plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6552 - 7554 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6553 Comment** **Respondent: Ashover Parish Council (Mrs S Atkinson) [7554]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We noted that Para. 4.79 states that further land outside Settlement Development Limits is not required to meet the development requirement of the Plan period, but Para. 4.80, however, states that these limits are being reviewed. To avoid any future tensions, the scope of the review should be clearly set out and at the earliest opportunity. The focus should be updating the boundaries to reflect the built-form rather than a wider review of development opportunities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6553 - 7554 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6619 Comment** **Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: HBF suggests that the Council considers providing greater flexibility by varying Policies SS12 and SS13 to include sustainable development which is adjacent to as well as within development boundaries.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6619 - 4414 - Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6689 Comment** **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
 Summary: It is crucial that the Settlement Development Limits, which are significantly out-dated, are updated at the earliest opportunity to ensure that the District's future development needs can be met at the most sustainable settlements in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy set out in Table 4.1.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6689 - 11287 - Settlement Development Limits - None

6721 Comment **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: It is crucial that the Settlement Development Limits, which are significantly out-dated, are updated at the earliest opportunity. RPS has identified an area to the south-west of Clay Cross where the Settlement Development Limits will need to be revised to take account of the Local Plan proposals. RPS recommend that the Settlement Boundary should be revised at this location to take account of the proposed allocated development, land uses and land with potential for development and incorporate them within the built framework of the settlement,

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6721 - 8407 - Settlement Development Limits - None

6761 Comment **Respondent: Clay Cross Parish Council (Michelle Cowin) [11303]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Land which has now been developed at Holmgate Road/Mill Lane - Should be marked as housing. Will the developed area be included within the settlement boundary?

The Pegasus Development proposed for land off Coupe Lane. When outline come through, what will be the Parish Councils observations? If it passed will it be included within the settlement boundary?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6761 - 11303 - Settlement Development Limits - None

4692 Object **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas** [10351]**Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to building on the green belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4692 - 10351 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None

6579 Object **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Brailsford** [11278]**Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood)** [5231]

Summary: Mr & Mrs Brailsford argue that there would be a fundamental error within this policy because it would refer to "defined settlement limits" but, other than for those settlements shown on the Policies Maps, there is no way of determining whether these settlement limits have been appropriately defined. This is a major deficiency and calls into question the validity of the consultation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6579 - 11278 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None

6585 Object **Respondent: Mr Neil Mowatt** [11279]**Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood)** [5231]

Summary: Mr Mowatt argues that there would be a fundamental error within this policy because it would refer to "defined settlement limits" but, other than for those settlements shown on the Policies Maps, there is no way of determining whether these settlement limits have been appropriately defined. This is a major deficiency and calls into question the validity of the consultation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6585 - 11279 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None

6592 Object **Respondent: Mr Grey** [11280]**Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood)** [5231]

Summary: Mr Grey argues that there would be a fundamental error within Policy SS12 which refers to "defined settlement limits" but, other than for those settlements shown on the Policies Maps, there is no way of determining whether these settlement limits have been appropriately defined. This is a major deficiency and calls into question the validity of the consultation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6592 - 11280 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None

- 6600 Object** **Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Objection to the use settlement limits if the approach would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. Policy seen as overly restrictive.
- Development proposals that are adjacent to sustainable settlements should be considered favourably by the Council in circumstances where there is a clear and demonstrable need for growth. Such proposals could then be considered against relevant policy-led criteria.
- Flexibility is required within the Plan, an overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 6600 - 10071 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6677 Object** **Respondent: Mr Perez [11288]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
- Summary: Mr Perez argues that there would be a fundamental error within this policy because it would refer to "defined settlement limits" but, other than for those settlements shown on the Policies Maps, there is no way of determining whether these settlement limits have been appropriately defined. This is a major deficiency and calls into question the validity of the consultation.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 6677 - 11288 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None
- 5493 Support** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
- Summary: Support for policy SS12 which allows for new development and the redevelopment of sites within existing urban areas
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 5493 - 10724 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None
- 5570 Support** **Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: We support this policy. Whilst the re-use of previously developed land can be considered sustainable development, an avoidance of high flood risk areas should still be the favoured approach.
- We strongly recommend that a bullet point should be added to this policy to indicate that sights outside of flood risk areas will be given preference in the first instance.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 5570 - 10840 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None
- 6008 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: The definition of settlement boundaries for the Level 1 Principal and Secondary Towns and Level 2 Larger Settlements identified on the relevant Policies Maps and the approach to development set out in Policy SS12, is fully supported.
- It will provide clarity and certainty to the public and to developers as to which land is included within the built form of the settlements and which other land should be considered as open countryside for planning policy purposes relating to Policy SS14, where a more restrictive approach to development is to be applied.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 6008 - 10098 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None

5137 Comment**Respondent: Mr A Hardwick [8085]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy SS12 refers back to Settlement Development Limits, which appear to still be under review (para 4.80) which is unsatisfactory. Also there does not seem to be the current SDL's stated as plans within the Draft for all settlements.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5137 - 8085 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None

6352 Comment**Respondent: Mr Martin Speed [11212]****Agent: WYG (Harrogate office) (Mr John Dickinson) [11213]**

Summary: Policy SS12

Policy SS12 should be amended to make clear that sustainable sites in locations adjoining settlement limits will be considered suitable locations for development if there is a shortfall against the Council's 5-year housing land supply requirement, and subject to the distribution strategy provided by SS3 (once amended as per the comments made above).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6352 - 11212 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None

6666 Comment**Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]****Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**

Summary: Policy SS12 Development of Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits: need for greater clarity regarding NEDDC's approach in applying Policy SS12

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6666 - 692 - Policy SS12: Development on Unallocated Land within Settlements with defined Settlement Development Limits - None

- 5057 Object** **Respondent: Mr Damian Williams [9478]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The Stretton Settlement Development limits as currently drawn out , are not in the best overall interests of the Community and the potential for development on our site should not be excluded per se .
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5057 - 9478 - Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages & Hamlets - None
- 6601 Object** **Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the use settlement limits if the approach would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. Policy seen as overly restrictive.
 Development proposals that are adjacent to sustainable settlements should be considered favourably by the Council in circumstances where there is a clear and demonstrable need for growth. Such proposals could then be considered against relevant policy-led criteria.
 Flexibility is required within the Plan, an overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6601 - 10071 - Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages & Hamlets - None
- 6122 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages and Hamlets is supported where it will assist in protecting landscape character in those areas defined by nucleated settlement patterns such as the Derbyshire coalfield, and also those areas with a more dispersed settlement pattern with small villages and hamlets, typical of the Peak Fringe. Overall this approach will assist in preventing urban sprawl and alongside other policies in the Plan, it should help to restrict development within the countryside.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6122 - 10098 - Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages & Hamlets - None
- 6307 Comment** **Respondent: Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: In Spinkhill the land shown on the attached plan as Allotment area could make a significant contribution to housing need and the funds released by this development could help improve facilities at the Mount St Mary's College.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6307 - 11116 - Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages & Hamlets - None
- 6385 Comment** **Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**
 Summary: There is more scope for development in Level 4 Settlements under Policy SS13 which would allow for development of 1 to 2 dwellings than there would be for Level 3 Settlements which would be more sustainable locations in terms of access to facilities and public transport.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6385 - 8171 - Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages & Hamlets - None

6443 Comment **Respondent: Mr & Mrs N Beecroft [11244]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**
Summary: Statement that there is more scope for development in Level 4 Settlements under Policy SS13 which would allow for development of 1 to 2 dwellings than there would be for Level 3 Settlements which would be more sustainable locations in terms of access to facilities and public transport.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6443 - 11244 - Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages & Hamlets - None

6581 Comment **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Brailsford [11278]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**

Summary: Mr & Mrs Brailsford argue that limiting development in villages to "limited infilling of one or two dwellings" is too restrictive.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6581 - 11278 - Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages & Hamlets - None

6587 Comment **Respondent: Mr Neil Mowatt [11279]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**

Summary: Mr Mowatt points that limiting development in villages to "limited infilling of one or two dwellings" is too restrictive.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6587 - 11279 - Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages & Hamlets - None

6594 Comment **Respondent: Mr Grey [11280]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**

Summary: Mr Grey argues that limiting development in villages to "limited infilling of one or two dwellings" is too restrictive.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6594 - 11280 - Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages & Hamlets - None

6681 Comment **Respondent: Mr Perez [11288]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**

Summary: Mr Perez argues that limiting development in villages to "limited infilling of one or two dwellings" is too restrictive.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6681 - 11288 - Policy SS13: Development in Small Villages & Hamlets - None

CHAPTER: 4: Spatial Strategy Development in the Countryside

4691 Object **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas [10351]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to building on the green belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4691 - 10351 - Development in the Countryside - None

- 4690 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas** 🗨️ [10351] **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I object to building on the green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4690 - 10351 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None
- 5411 Object** **Respondent: PMW Property** [10783] **Agent: Cerda Planning Limited (Michael Robson) [10782]**
 Summary: See attached.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5411 - 10783 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None
- 6031 Object** **Respondent: Mr W Smith** [11115] **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
 Summary: W Smith states that if the proposed site off Mill Lane/to the west of A61 is not allocated for housing development at the present time it should be removed from the countryside due to its sustainable location and lack of countryside function. It would also assist in meeting the five year housing land supply. The respondent objects therefore to the identification of any part of the site as Countryside outside the SDL or suggests to include affordable housing within the policy.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6031 - 11115 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None
- 6602 Object** **Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite)** [10071] **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the use of settlement limits if the approach would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. Policy seen as overly restrictive. Policy SS14 appears to be more akin to policies prepared prior to the publication of the NPPF.
 Development proposals that are adjacent to sustainable settlements should be considered favourably by the Council in circumstances where there is a clear and demonstrable need for growth. Such proposals could then be considered against relevant policy-led criteria.
 Flexibility is required within the Plan, an overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6602 - 10071 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None
- 6164 Support** **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller)** [4598] **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: National Trust supports Policy SS14 which aims to ensure that only small scale and appropriate development is allowed in the countryside.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6164 - 4598 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None

- 6667 Support** **Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**
Summary: Policy SS14 Development in the Countryside: Support for proposed policy subject to caveats
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6667 - 692 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None
- 4545 Comment** **Respondent: National Farmers Union (Mr P Tame) [3615]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: In Policy SS14, criteria c) I think there is a slight problem with the drafting. I think it should read, "... local farming, forestry, recreation or tourism ..." to make proper sense. Also, in this section I think there needs to be provision for barn conversions to residential use as per Class Q of the General Permitted Development Order to be in line with what is permitted under this Order and the National Planning Policy Framework.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4545 - 3615 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None
- 4984 Comment** **Respondent: PDNPA (Mr Ian Fullilove) [10430]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: It would be useful if the character of the adjacent National park landscape was also protected by development in countryside since the scope to harm the setting of the Park could otherwise go unchecked.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4984 - 10430 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None
- 6327 Comment** **Respondent: Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
Summary: Strata Homes wishes to include affordable housing within Policy SS14 which deals with development in the countryside.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6327 - 10158 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None
- 6353 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Martin Speed [11212]** **Agent: WYG (Harrogate office) (Mr John Dickinson) [11213]**
Summary: Policy SS14

Policy SS14 should be amended to make clear that sustainable sites in locations adjoining settlement limits will be considered suitable locations for development if there is a shortfall against the Council's 5-year housing land supply requirement, and subject to the distribution strategy provided by SS3 (once amended as per the comments made above).
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6353 - 11212 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None

6384 Comment **Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**

Summary: It is considered that there is conflict between this Policy and Policy SS9 'North East Derbyshire Green Belt'. Any proposals on land which fall within both the Green Belt and also the Countryside would be covered by conflicting policy with regards to 'limited infill' development, with there being no support for such development proposals under Policy SS14.

The wording of Policy SS14 should be amended accordingly to make reference to infill development being acceptable where this meets the other objectives and considerations of Policy SS9.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6384 - 8171 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None

6442 Comment **Respondent: Mr & Mrs N Beecroft [11244]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**

Summary: Policy SS14 'Development in the Countryside': As drafted it is considered that there is conflict between this Policy and Policy SS9 'North East Derbyshire Green Belt'. Any proposals on land which falls within both the Green Belt and also the Countryside would be covered by conflicting policy with regards to 'limited infill' development, with there being no support for such development proposals under Policy SS14.

The wording of Policy SS14 should be amended accordingly to make reference to infill development being acceptable where this meets the other objectives and considerations of Policy SS9.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6442 - 11244 - Policy SS14: Development in the Countryside - None

CHAPTER: 4: Spatial Strategy **Figure 4.9: Key Diagram**

4676 Object **Respondent: Mr Michael Daley [10333]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Given the unknown impact of the recently started Peak Resort leisure development as well as existing congestion within the main arteries of Dronfield I do not believe that the town's infrastructure can cope with an additional 800 plus houses so I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Green Belt around the town. I also believe that existing undeveloped sites within Unstone (e.g. the garden centre and adjacent boat sales yard) and Dronfield (e.g. the Hearty Oak pub site which has been unused for the last few years) demonstrate a lack of demand for housing on such a scale

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4676 - 10333 - Figure 4.9: Key Diagram - None

CHAPTER: 5: Living Communities **Introduction**

6538 Comment **Respondent: Harworth Estates (Mr T Love) [4431]** **Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**

Summary: Harworth Estates comments that the Council must make every endeavour to ensure that its density and level of development is maximised to the fullest extent. The respondent refers to the Housing White Paper which states that Local Authorities must 'make efficient use of land and avoid building homes at low densities where there is a shortage of land.'

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6538 - 4431 - Introduction - None

- 4659 Object** **Respondent: Mr Philip Brightmore [10318]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over potential urban sprawl that could lead Dronfield into merging with Sheffield, Chesterfield, Unstone and Low Edges. Concerns over whether existing infrastructure can accommodate proposed population increase. Questions over public transport and facilities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4659 - 10318 - Housing Allocations - None
- 4672 Object** **Respondent: Ms Julie Fisher [10329]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I wish to object to the removal of green belt status the areas identified within Dronfield. As a homeowner at a Hilltop the changes proposed in the plan will have a significantly adverse affect on the area and quality of life for those currently living in the area. This includes increases in traffic and increased pressure on services and the removal of popular walks and footpaths.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4672 - 10329 - Housing Allocations - None
- 4898 Object** **Respondent: June and Trevor Reed [10508]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over infrastructure, impact on heritage, loss of green belt land and urban sprawl. Concerns that social housing will attract the wrong kind of people to Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4898 - 10508 - Housing Allocations - None
- 5361 Object** **Respondent: Coverland UK Ltd (Ms Sarah Foster) [8583]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The process behind the housing allocations is flawed, as one site submitted by Coverland UK Ltd (GRA/1605(2)) was not properly assessed in the SHLAA.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5361 - 8583 - Housing Allocations - None
- 5388 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Windfall housing including small sites with planning permission have not been factored into the plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5388 - 9166 - Housing Allocations - None
- 5476 Object** **Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
 Summary: Please see attached statement
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5476 - 10799 - Housing Allocations - None

- 5515 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
- Summary: We have a site in North Wingfield for 230 dwellings which has not been included as a housing allocation list. The site has no highway, coal mining, flood risk, ecology, access or other constraints and can be developed within the first 5-6 years of the local plan. Information on this site has been submitted to the council. The council should meet the housing needs in the district through more allocations in the southern area and the housing needs identified in the first draft in 2015 for North Wingfield.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5515 - 10724 - Housing Allocations - None
- 5604 Object** **Respondent: Gleeson Regeneration Ltd [10846]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**
- Summary: Please see attached statement
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5604 - 10846 - Housing Allocations - None
- 5635 Object** **Respondent: W Redmile & Sons Ltd [10859]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Michael Edgar) [4355]**
- Summary: To be amended in accordance with increased housing requirement.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5635 - 10859 - Housing Allocations - None
- 5077 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Lisa Bell [10308]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: We welcome the key aims of this section/policy in terms of ensuring that the key strategic function of the Sheffield/Derbyshire Green Belt remains intact and as such support the direction of growth for Dronfield to other areas of the town.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 5077 - 10308 - Housing Allocations - None
- 5568 Support** **Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: We note that the list of housing allocations within LC1 does not include sites where delivery is a concern, where major sites with permission do not accord with the spatial strategy, or sites for fewer than 10 new homes. This, in conjunction with the decision not to make an allowance for large or small site windfalls means that there will be a good degree of future flexibility in the housing supply, which is welcomed.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 5568 - 7769 - Housing Allocations - None
- 5680 Support** **Respondent: The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Support - The Coal Authority is pleased to see that the descriptive text identifies those allocations which are within the defined Development High Risk Area and where proposals need to be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 5680 - 9528 - Housing Allocations - None

5083 Comment **Respondent: Mrs Lisa Bell [10308]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Although it is acknowledged that the potential housing site - WEST OF SHEFFIELD ROAD, DRONFIELD (DRO/2201) has not been allocated for housing it is noted that NEDDC's Housing Sites Assessment Report (Appendix C) does not consider that the submitted site includes the Coach and Horses public house which has been accepted by NEDDC as an Asset of Community Value and as such we would respectfully request that further text is included in the site assessment report which takes this into account for completeness.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5083 - 10308 - Housing Allocations - None

5338 Comment **Respondent: Highways England (Mr Steve Pearce) [10741]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Highways England notes that sites at Hunloke Road, Holmewood for 138 dwellings and North East of Hague Lane, Renishaw for 270 dwellings are both less than 2 miles from M1 J29 and M1 J30 respectively. Due to the proximity of these sites to the SRN, it is considered that their impacts should also be considered as part of the development management process.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5338 - 10741 - Housing Allocations - None

5385 Comment **Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Planning Advisor) [4266]** **Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**
Summary: The two parcels of land shown on the attached plan were previously submitted to the 'call for sites' process. They can be considered as one large site or two separate sites. They are both available and deliverable within 5 years.

We do not believe that sufficient consideration has been given to the opportunity that these sites offer to deliver housing adjacent to Chesterfield under the Duty to Cooperate.

The development of these sites could reduce pressure on the Green Belt to the north of the District and/or deliver future housing for Chesterfield, either as an allocation or safeguarded land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5385 - 4266 - Housing Allocations - None

5534 Comment **Respondent: Messrs S & K Whittam & Grayson [8368]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Site submission, Land at Stuble Lane submitted for housing. Arguments for the removal of the site from the green belt and the allocation of housing is included in supporting document.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5534 - 8368 - Housing Allocations - None

5559 Comment **Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: A handful of proposed housing sites are located in flood risk areas. We support the fact that several sites in flood risk areas are not currently proposed for allocation, but in particular, some sites have been identified as having some sort of flood risk or constraint or implication. These if put forward would need flood risk sequential tests to be undertaken in accordance with NPPF and Draft Policy SDC12. Request made to see evidence of this test being carried out, prior to any examination, to ensure that the Plan is based on a sound evidence base.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5559 - 10840 - Housing Allocations - None

5586 Comment Respondent: NHS Hardwick Clinical Commissioning Group (Jean Richards) [1647] Agent: N/A

Summary: The CCGs would like to further develop our relationship with NEDDC planning, particularly in relation to the housing developments identified in the local plan consultation draft; Further conversations are needed on the relationship between our strategic objective of keeping people in their own homes and the ability of existing and future local housing stock to support that.

We believe that any new applications for housing at the following developments will require a contribution to health; we would like to see this reflected in planning policy, and would like an opportunity to discuss these developments with planners at an early stage;

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5586 - 1647 - Housing Allocations - None

6017 Comment Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098] Agent: N/A

Summary: It is noted that Policy LC1: Housing allocations, identifies a range of over 40 proposed housing allocations, which would contribute to meeting the housing requirement for the District over the Plan period of 6,600 dwellings.

Under the Duty to Cooperate, NEDDC is requested to liaise with DCC on an ongoing basis to identify and secure the strategic infrastructure requirements that would be required to support the development of the proposed allocation sites in order to ensure that they provide for a sustainable form of development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6017 - 10098 - Housing Allocations - None

6109 Comment Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098] Agent: N/A

Summary: A number of level 1 settlements are identified for housing growth north of Chesterfield in Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh. Cumulatively these sites could add 2,000+ dwellings, however, no information is provided either individually or cumulatively about their likely impacts for each town's transportation networks. Similarly, there are a number of sites within the Level 2 settlements which cumulatively together with the more strategic sites could have significant impacts upon the corridors and in areas discussed above.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6109 - 10098 - Housing Allocations - None

6118 Comment Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098] Agent: N/A

Summary: As noted above, the LPCD has proposed the allocation of over 40 strategic and other housing allocation sites to meet the District's housing requirement of 6,600 dwellings over the Plan period. NEDDC's Officers are requested to continue to liaise with DCC's Children's Services Officers to consider the primary and secondary school place requirements generated by these proposed housing developments in the LPCD.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6118 - 10098 - Housing Allocations - None

6606 Comment Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071] Agent: N/A

Summary: Site submitted; Land at Hagg Hill, Grassmoor (See submission).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6606 - 10071 - Housing Allocations - None

- 6622 Comment** **Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: If it is determined that the Council's housing requirement should be increased because of an under-estimation of OAHN then a corresponding increase in site allocations will be necessary.
 It is noted that the Council is proposing a variety of housing site allocations which is an appropriate approach that the Council should continue to follow.
 This approach is also advocated in the Housing White Paper because a good mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways and creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6622 - 4414 - Housing Allocations - None
- 6668 Comment** **Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**
 Summary: Para 5.8: need to revise settlement boundaries so as to plan positively for growth
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6668 - 692 - Housing Allocations - None
- 6701 Comment** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management [7114]** **Agent: Pegasus Group (East Midlands Office) (Ian Deverell) [11291]**
 Summary: Hallam Land Management are promoting land at Coupe Lane, Tupton for a residential development of up to 300 dwellings. Comments made over the appropriateness of Tupton for further Housing Growth. (See attachments)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6701 - 7114 - Housing Allocations - None
- 6720 Comment** **Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]** **Agent: Spawforths (Mr Gavin Winter) [8147]**
 Summary: Site submission, Land off Camdale Rise, Ridgeway.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6720 - 8171 - Housing Allocations - None
- 6766 Comment** **Respondent: Clay Cross Parish Council (Michelle Cowin) [11303]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Should we be designating the area covered by St. Modwen's ownership adjacent to Kenning Park/A61/Clay Lane/Smithy Brook as urban greenspace and proposed housing allocation?
 The area at the top of Jackson Road has no determination. Is NEDDC considering housing or for it to be grazing?
 The piece of land behind Guildford Close and Guildford Lane Allotments. What is the lands status as it is believed that the owners would like to site a house/manse.
 Why hasn't the piece of land owned by DCC or GMI on Market Street opposite Sharley Park Leisure Centre been designated as Proposed Housing Allocation?
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6766 - 11303 - Housing Allocations - None

4607 Object**Respondent: Mr Edward Throp [10272]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: sites g,h,and i represent an increase in close to 30% of dwellings in the Dronfield south area. This seems excessively large and will put significant strain on the infrastructure in that part of the town where there have already been traffic issues identified. The sites considered are not only all green belt land but are not in the vicinity of shops, schools or public transport links. Dronfield has already been identified as a mainly commuter town. A national focus is to reduce CO2 emissions. There seems no sense in a massive increase in the population that will rely on cars

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4607 - 10272 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

5037 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sandra Fraser [8828]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Specifically for Killamarsh there does not appear to be a plan to improve the transport infrastructure BEFORE building an extra 618 houses. Sheffield Road at the point of the bridges is chaotic almost constantly during the day/evening. Since air pollution is made worse by standing traffic this will cause even more problems for Killamarsh.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5037 - 8828 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

5047 Object**Respondent: Mr Alex Godfrey [10603]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: In summary I object to the proposed housing developments on Hallows Lane and Hilltop. This is primarily due to road restrictions, traffic build up and the impact on local habitats and countryside.

Building on the greenbelt would lead to a loss of character in Dronfield and thus result in a loss of grand appeal. It could also possibly lead to a merge with other surrounding areas through the loss of green spaces and create a unpleasant place to live.

As well as this the developments would have a huge impact on local services such as medical practices and schools.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5047 - 10603 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

5082 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The land proposed at sites g, h and i are all privately owned pockets of the green belt that landowners set to make a large amount of money from. These are sites where low density, executive homes will be built as these will provide excellent profit. The approximate capacity will not be achieved in these areas.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5082 - 10593 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

- 5154 Object** **Respondent: Miss Jennie Garrett [10644]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I request that you do not consider the application at Hallowes Lane based on the following:
 *Congestion / parking / narrow road
 *Unique Character of Dronfield
 *Threat to Dronfield's infrastructure
 *Threat to wildlife
 *Threat to leisure facilities
 *Threat to the community feel of Dronfield
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5154 - 10644 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 5320 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Hannah Knowles [10725]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing allocations on green belt land
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5320 - 10725 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 5495 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
 Summary: Object to the release of the following Green Belt Sites:
 SS5 (g),(h),(i),(j),(k);(l);(n),(p),(q),(r)& (s) - sites around Dronfield; Killmarsh & Eckington a total of 1855 dwellings.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5495 - 10724 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 5518 Object** **Respondent: Mr Philip Tooley [10825]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We are a group of nearby residents who are opposed to the proposed allocation for new housing development of a site measuring 38.64 hectares in area known as Clay Cross South. Letter submitted that cover main concerns, e.g. infrastructure, lack of brownfield land used, urban sprawl, suggestion that development at Biwaters is increased instead of in the south of the town.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5518 - 10825 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 5542 Object** **Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Site of Former Danesmoor Infant School includes playing field land and the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 74 have not been demonstrated. Further evidence base work under preparation in relation to playing fields and sport provision should be considered once available.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5542 - 4563 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6292 Object **Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: CPRE objects to the proposed allocations on land taken from the Green Belt, as they do not accept that the strategic case for Green Belt change is soundly based.

The resulting proposed site allocations (g to s, excluding m and o) have varying impacts on the function of the Green Belt itself, but our principal objection is that these will tend to release sites for development that is unsustainable. Concerns over: out-commuting, impact on environment, counter to economic evidence, encroachment on countryside and landscape.

Removal from the plan of the allocations most damaging to the Green Belt and the landscape - sites g, h, l and p - would remove 1,195 dwellings based on the proposed capacities. Our recommended housing target of 5,400 could be met without those four sites.

The remaining proposed Green Belt sites - l, j, k, n, q, r and s account for a further 660 dwellings. In our view, small increases in development densities on other sites - principally the regeneration sites at The Avenue and Biwaters (SS4 and SS5) - would eliminate the need for those Green Belt deletions.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6292 - 7581 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6301 Object **Respondent: Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**

Summary: Strata Homes Ltd objects to Policy LC1 because Land of Harehill Road to the west of Walton Hospital should be allocated for housing. It is argued that the exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt boundary exist and that the site is a very sustainable and suitable location.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6301 - 10158 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6437 Object **Respondent: Martin Hanrahan [11138]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Further to my earlier letter of objection I wish to add that there will be a significant negative impact on bees which will adversely affect pollination especially with regard to crops if houses are built on the greenbelt land. Dronfield and Coal Aston have taken more than their fair share of housing developments and other areas covered by NEDDC and Chesterfield should be considered first for new housing. Surveys of housing need state that the estimates for the Dronfield and Coal Aston area have been overestimated

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6437 - 11138 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6584 Object **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Brailsford [11278]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**

Summary: Mr & Mrs Brailsford object to Policy LC1 and request that Land to the south side of Well Lane (S&H/1402) to be allocated for housing. This site could make a significant contribution to housing need in Highham. It is located in a sustainable location, on the edge of the village and its development would have limited impact on the landscape.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6584 - 11278 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

- 6590 Object** **Respondent: Mr Neil Mowatt [11279]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
- Summary: Mr Mowatt objects to Policy LC1 and requests that Land to the East of Windy-Lea, Matlock Road (WES/2302) to be allocated for housing. This site could make a significant contribution to housing need in Wessington. It is located in a sustainable location, on the edge of the village and its development would have limited impact on the landscape.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 6590 - 11279 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 6598 Object** **Respondent: Mr Grey [11280]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
- Summary: Mr Grey objects Policy LC1 and proposes that Land adjoining Warren House Farm (ECK/1606) would be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing or included in the settlement boundary. This site could make a significant contribution to housing need. It is located in a sustainable location, on the edge of the village and its development with a well designed housing scheme would have limited impact on the landscape and would not detract from the character of the Conservation Area.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 6598 - 11280 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 6688 Object** **Respondent: Mr Perez [11288]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**
- Summary: Mr Perez objects to Policy LC1 and requests that it should be allocated for housing or included in the settlement boundary. The site could make a significant contribution to the housing need in Walton. It is located in a sustainable location, on the edge of the settlement and its development with a well designed housing scheme would have limited impact on the landscape. This land was put forward for allocation in the Council's "Call for Sites" consultation (ref. HOLY/2301).
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 6688 - 11288 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 6068 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: LC1 Housing Allocations
SUPPORT the approach to meeting housing need. We note that sufficient allocations have been made to meet the outstanding housing need arising from applying the housing target in SS2 when completions up to 2016 are taken into account. The supporting text could be clearer on the distinction between OAN and housing Target. It may be useful to identify any assumptions that have been made for non-implementation of committed sites.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 6068 - 8156 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 6411 Support** **Respondent: Mr Paul Stock [8388]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: We support the proposal set out under Renishaw (ai) in the Table accompanying Policy LC1 to allocate at least 270 dwellings on land described as to the north east of Hague Lane. We consider the site represents a logical and appropriate location for development. The site adjoins to the south of the existing settlement boundary of Renishaw and is contained and enclosed on three sides by existing residential development.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 6411 - 8388 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6722 Support **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
Summary: RPS fully supports the inclusion of housing allocation SS5 Former Biwaters Strategic Site. However RPS consider this site has a greater capacity for delivery within the plan period.
Unlike brownfield allocation, the greenfield allocation a. Clay Cross South does not include any employment or infrastructure delivery. RPS is concerned that allowing a significant greenfield allocation with no clear infrastructure delivery role could be detrimental to the delivery of the site.
It is recommended that to ensure the brownfield site can come forward, the greenfield allocation should be reserved to be delivered later in the plan period.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6722 - 8407 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

5168 Comment **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steve Baker) [7985]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policy LC1: housing allocations
Detailed comments on the proposed allocation sites have been made at the Initial Draft Local Plan (Part 1) Consultation stage, and need not be reproduced here. A number of sites have known archaeological issues or archaeological potential, but on current evidence these are thought to be manageable through the planning process through application of policies at NPPF chapter 12, and do not preclude allocation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5168 - 7985 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

5302 Comment **Respondent: Mr and Mrs Dring [10712]** **Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**
Summary: Wish to promote the site shown on attached plan. This site is not shown with any constraint or allocation on the draft plan. It is available and deliverable (with a developer identified). Requested that this site be allocated for residential development.

A development of 15 dwellings to the frontage of the site shown on the attached plan has a resolution from NEDDC Planning Committee (application number 15/00502/OL).

We believe however that it would be more efficient if the whole site were to be developed in order to deliver a development similar to the permission granted for draft housing allocation site ab.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5302 - 10712 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

5477 Comment **Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]** **Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]**

Summary: We support in principle the allocation of Clay Cross b) Land North of Clay Lane, Clay Cross but request that Policy LC1: Housing Allocations is amended as follows:
'The following sites are allocated on the Policies Map for housing to deliver the housing land requirement set out in policy SS3: Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development:
Site Approximate Capacity within the Plan Period
Clay Cross
b. land north of Clay Lane, Clay Cross 42
Grassmoor
z land at Windwhistle Farm, Grassmoor 155
zz land east of B6038 (North Wingfield 120 Road) North of Cotswold Drive

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5477 - 10799 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

5991 Comment **Respondent: Advance Land & Planning Limited (Mr Andy Williams) [9755]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: With the completion of site aa before or soon after adoption of the Plan, a further new allocation should be made for at least 230 dwellings on land to the west of Tibshelf Road Holmewood as indicated edged red on the attached aerial photograph.

We also consider that it would be prudent to identify reserve sites to add flexibility to the Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5991 - 9755 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6223 Comment **Respondent: Hallam Land Management [7114]** **Agent: DPDS Consulting (Derby office) (Mr Neil Arbon) [11168]**

Summary: Concern is that land between the bypass (A617) and to the rear of 109 to 247 Mansfield Road, Hasland has not been allocated for development within the draft Local Plan, and in particular Policy LC1 despite the site benefiting from a previous outline planning consent determined at appeal and subsequent reserved matters application.

The site is considered to be in a sustainable location, outside of the Green Belt where the housing numbers would contribute towards NED's housing land supply. Statement that Housing Site Assessment Report Appendix C concludes that there is 'No apparent LAA or policy constraints' in respect of the deliverability of the site.

It is considered that draft POLICY LC1: Housing Allocations should be amended to include and allocate Land Between Bypass (A617) and the rear of 109 to 247 Mansfield Road, Hasland for 160 dwellings. (See submission for more.)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6223 - 7114 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6335 Comment **Respondent: Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**

Summary: Strata Homes suggests to allocate the Land off Harehill Road to the west of Walton Hospital because the site would make a logical and sustainable addition to the urban area of Chesterfield and there are no physical constraints to the site. It is argued that the site would be available, suitable (due to its highly sustainable location) and achievable for residential development. Strata Homes would be committed to deliver this site within the next five years.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6335 - 10158 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6355 Comment **Respondent: Mr Martin Speed [11212]** **Agent: WYG (Harrogate office) (Mr John Dickinson) [11213]**

Summary: Policy LC1 should be amended to include the allocation of a site to the south of Hallfieldgate Lane, Shirland, for residential development as a sustainable extension to the southern boundary of this settlement. A location plan for the site is attached.

Identification of Shirland as a Level 2 settlement confirms its sustainability and suitability for accommodating residential development.

The constraints and opportunities of the site have been assessed. attached Option 3 and Option 4 masterplans for the site would either provide for approximately 100 or 107 residential units respectively. Topography and access to the site have been covered in the full submission.

Statement that a Design Review Panel, broadly commented that there are no fundamental design, heritage or landscape constraints.

The allocation of the site will ensure the delivery of a sustainable development in an accessible location, on land which is suitable, available and achievable.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6355 - 11212 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

- 6419 Comment** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]** **Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**
- Summary: Hallam Land writes in support of Land to the South East of Bochum Parkway which is currently not included within the proposed housing allocations. This site would represent a significant opportunity to be allocated to meet Sheffield's unmet housing needs. The respondent also argues that the site could be released from the Green Belt because it would not impact on its openness given that the site adjoins the settlement's existing urban framework and would not dilute the Green Belt's role in preventing coalescence with other settlements. Eventually, the site also presents a sustainable and logical extension to the built environment.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6419 - 11228 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 6554 Comment** **Respondent: Ashover Parish Council (Mrs S Atkinson) [7554]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Policy LC1 Housing allocations: We note that while it states that "although historically windfalls have made a positive contribution to housing delivery in the District, an allowance has not been factored into the calculation of housing supply". We would strongly urge that an allowance should be made for 'windfalls'. These have, an important contribution to housing delivery. In Ashover that majority of housing development that has taken place in the Parish has been in the form of 'Windfall Development.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6554 - 7554 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 6567 Comment** **Respondent: Plexus Consultants Ltd (Mr K Pearson) [11275]** **Agent: Emery Planning (Mr John Coxon) [8001]**
- Summary: The allocation of just one site for the whole of the housing requirement for Grassmoor is inappropriate. There are other sites, such as that promoted by our client, which would offer significant opportunities to help meet the Council's significant housing need. The provision of such affordable housing in this location could enable further regeneration of the housing stock on Broom Lane through the re-allocation of residents. Alternatively Section 106 contributions could be used to improve the existing affordable housing stock in the area.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6567 - 11275 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 6603 Comment** **Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: No specific comments to make on the individual merits of the proposed housing allocations at this stage.
- Is vital that the Council publishes sufficient information within its housing trajectory to demonstrate how the proposed suite of allocations will maintain a rolling five year housing land supply whilst meeting OAN.
- Gladman consider that it is necessary for NEDDC to increase the number of sites that are proposed for allocation within the emerging LP. As a result, further allocations should be directed to sustainable locations such as Land at Hagg Hill, Grassmoor.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6603 - 10071 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None
- 6690 Comment** **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
- Summary: With regard to The Avenue, this site should effectively be treated as a new settlement. It is not part of Wingerworth settlement, separated by the A61. RPS does not consider The Avenue Strategic Site serves the needs of the settlement of Wingerworth and should not therefore be classed as a Wingerworth allocation.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6690 - 11287 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6691 Comment**Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]****Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: The housing allocations in LC1 include a significant number of Green Belt releases at other settlements. The Housing White Paper proposes to alter NPPF to require a sequential approach to Green Belt release requiring LPAs to demonstrate all other reasonable options for meeting their housing requirements. RPS recommend the Council re-consider Omission Site WW1609 Deerlands Road, Wingerworth as a reasonable alternative to Green Belt releases for a housing allocation under Policy LC1 for the reasons stated below.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6691 - 11287 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6750 Comment**Respondent: Harron Homes Ltd. (Mr Mark Beevers) [11293]****Agent: ID Planning (Mr Jonathan Dunbavin) [11292]**

Summary: Harron Homes wishes to allocate Land at Street Road (LAA site MOR/2203) and Land off Little Morton Road (NW/701). With regards to the former site the respondent argues that the extent of land which has been assessed by the Council does not reflect the site area which was submitted to the Council through the call for sites. Regarding LAA site NW/701 the Council would have to justify why the site has not being allocated given the scores achieved. Eventually, the respondent questions the deliverability of housing allocations site 'ad' and 'ag' in North Wingfield.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6750 - 11293 - Policy LC1: Housing Allocations - None

6656 Object**Respondent: Mr Matt Slack [11286]****Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**

Summary: Mr Matt Slack objects to Policy LC1 and states that the Land opposite of Rykneld House (CX/2301) should be allocated for housing which adjoins housing allocation site a) on the north and east sides. It would be illogical to leave this site unallocated as it does a logical extension of the housing allocation. There would be no significant harm to the landscape and no constraints top its development. It would be in a sustainable location, with good access to the community facilities in Clay Cross. The development could be delivered quickly to help meet the 5-year housing requirement.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6656 - 11286 - Clay Cross - None

6781 Object**Respondent: Mrs N & J Woodward & Tuplin [11317]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to housing development in and around Clay Cross. Main concerns are for road network, traffic, school places, doctors appointments, affects on wildlife, flood risk.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6781 - 11317 - Clay Cross - None

6108 Comment**Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The LPCD proposes significant housing allocations in Clay Cross and in some of the Level 2 settlements. Traffic from these sites could have additional impacts upon the A61 corridor and on routes between the A61 corridor south of Chesterfield and M1 principally the A6175. However, no information is provided in the transportation evidence base about this.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6108 - 10098 - Clay Cross - None

6129 Comment**Respondent: Mr W Smith [11115]****Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**

Summary: W Smith wishes that the site off Mill Lane to the West of A61 should be allocated for housing and included within the Clay Cross settlement boundary. It is argues that there would be no physical constraints to the site, that it is available for development and is situated in a highly sustainable location. The site could deliver up to 36 new houses and could come forward within the first five years of the plan period.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6129 - 11115 - Clay Cross - None

6448 Comment**Respondent: Mr Alan Wilson [10880]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Comment on Clay Cross site allocations Bywater Site, Avenue Plant Site, Coalite Plant. Concerned over remediated land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6448 - 10880 - Clay Cross - None

4813 Comment**Respondent: Malcolm Cattermole [10432]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I appreciate these are early days for the plan, but are there any indicative timescales for the initial commencement of the site development? Similarly, would it be one development or a series of phases? If the latter, are there any indicative timescales for those?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4813 - 10432 - Clay Cross, a. Clay Cross South - None

6217 Comment**Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed housing allocation south of Clay Cross is large and has good potential to provide a sustainable extension to the town. However there is a high risk that it will simply be a large housing estate, with minimal supporting uses (eg corner shops, community facilities), tokenistic green spaces and a lack of social infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6217 - 7581 - Clay Cross, a. Clay Cross South - None

6769 Comment**Respondent: Clay Cross Parish Council (Michelle Cowin) [11303]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Why has A61/Springvale Road Allotments been designated as Housing Allocation? Have the tenants or allotments society put forward this land as an access to open up the area marked 'a'?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6769 - 11303 - Clay Cross, a. Clay Cross South - None

5563 Support**Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site specific comments for CX/2104:

We support the statement within the supporting Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which suggests that development will only be permitted if it 'passes the sequential test' - we would like to see this evidence submitted in advance of any allocation, to ensure that the any allocation can be supported by robust and defined evidence.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5563 - 10840 - Clay Cross, b. Land North of Clay Lane, Clay Cross - None

6765 Comment**Respondent: Clay Cross Parish Council (Michelle Cowin) [11303]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Area marked 'b' will be susceptible to flooding where it joins with Smithy Brook.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6765 - 11303 - Clay Cross, b. Land North of Clay Lane, Clay Cross - None

6767 Comment **Respondent: Clay Cross Parish Council (Michelle Cowin) [11303]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Noted that the Old Junior School is not included within the proposed housing allocations area marked 'd'.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6767 - 11303 - Clay Cross, d. Land at Broadleys, Clay Cross - None

6768 Comment **Respondent: Clay Cross Parish Council (Michelle Cowin) [11303]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Should 'e' be enlarged to accommodate the Parish Council's wishes?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6768 - 11303 - Clay Cross, e. Land at 117 Pilsley Road, Danesmoor - None

4542 Object **Respondent: Mr Andrew Scott [10203]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: i object totally to plans to build 655 houses on green belt land around hallown their scale and proper consideration has not be given to the impact on the enviroment, infrastructure and balance of the no. of houses in relation to town centre which is small. their effect will be catastrophic because the scale and unrealistic nature of the proposals. WE LIVE HERE AND WILL HAVE TO SUFFER THE CONSEQUENCES OF THIS RIDICULOUS PLAN!!! BUILDING ON ALL SIDES OF hallowes will destroy the balance in our town!!! thank you for reconsidering and rejecting these unrealitic and damaging proposals!!

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4542 - 10203 - Dronfield - None

4548 Object **Respondent: Mrs Enid Lumb [10204]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: I am very strongly opposed to the council's plan for development on green belt land in Dronfield, in particular the Hilltop area. No thought has been given to the infrastructure that will be needed to support these plans. There are issues with; parking, doctor's appointments, school places.

Also where are all these people going to work? Dronfield does not have large amounts of employment prospects.

I suggest the council re-think these proposals and put forward a more sensible plan taking into account the infrastructure needed to support any new housing as a first priority. It should also use brown sites and leave our green belt alone

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4548 - 10204 - Dronfield - None

4550 Object **Respondent: Mrs Beatrix Sanderson [10205]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: I would formally like to raise my objection to the plan to erode green belt areas in Dronfield . I cannot believe that any council with an ounce of brain would consider building in total 860 dwellings in the not too distant future a good idea.

There are concerns over the consideration of future fracking proposals in Eckington/ Marsh Lane. There are concerns over medical facilities, safety in the community, social care in the community, parking, litter and crime rates that could come from more housing in the area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4550 - 10205 - Dronfield - None

4551 Object **Respondent: C Collins [10216]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: I write to record my formal notification against your proposed plans to build (currently 860 planned) on & around Dronfield's Green Belt & 15 Acre Extension of Callywhite Industrial Estate. Such a plan would result in impossible traffic situations not to mention a deterioration of our current community spirited environment. We should, in fact, be cherishing, maintaining & appreciating our Green Belt areas - as was previously the case in the UK.

Concerns have been raised over potential fracking near Dronfield, and the nearby Peak Resort Development. Which could potentially could traffic problems, and problems with anti-social behaviour etc.

If you go ahead with your proposed plans you will, I am sure, create a nightmare situation, in many respects including traffic, parking, social & general well being & I urge you not to proceed with any of this ridiculous plan. We, in Dronfield & surrounding areas, are a peaceable community & you appreciate that by leaving us to continue with this lifestyle which must, in reality, make life much easier for you as an Authority

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4551 - 10216 - Dronfield - None

- 4553 Object** **Respondent: Sarah Adey [10218]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I am totally against the proposal for houses proposed to be built in and around Dronfield due to the influx of extra traffic that this would bring. Surely Dronfield would be unable to cope with the extra population, it is already such a busy town. The schools are full, it is already difficult to get a doctors appointment and the green belt should be protected.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4553 - 10218 - Dronfield - None
- 4554 Object** **Respondent: Elliott Lumb [10219]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I wish to register my objection for parcels of green belt land in Dronfield to be used for housing. I feel the plans are to the detriment of the town and should be cancelled.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4554 - 10219 - Dronfield - None
- 4559 Object** **Respondent: Laura Green [10226]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Strong objection to the proposal to build 860 extra houses in Dronfield. Dronfield is already overdeveloped and therefore overcrowded. This is a small town that does not want to be a big city. There is also an environmental impact of building 860 extra houses on Green Belt land. The wildlife who rely on Green Belt land for food and shelter would also suffer if these houses were to be built. Dronfield residents therefore do not want any extra housing being built on Green Belt Land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4559 - 10226 - Dronfield - None
- 4560 Object** **Respondent: Eric Green [10227]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Strong objection to any further house building in the Dronfield area. Dronfield is already overdeveloped, overcrowded and congested. There should be no building on Green Sites at any cost. No more house building in Dronfield or North East Derbyshire. Hands off our Green Belt.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4560 - 10227 - Dronfield - None
- 4561 Object** **Respondent: Kate Bancroft [10228]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concerns raised over the local plan to build on huge amounts of Dronfield's well loved green belt. The Green belt is important for those who live in Dronfield. If this green belt is lost, it will hugely effect the wildlife.

Another concern is the number of houses that are in the plan for Dronfield. This will have a devastating impact on our infrastructure, Dronfield does not have the capacity to deal with this volume of new people. It is already struggling with doctor's appointments, limited school places, congestion in and out of Dronfield and the pollution this would cause.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4561 - 10228 - Dronfield - None

- 4562 Object** **Respondent: Mr Ben Dowle [10229]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns over the local plan to build on Dronfield's green belt. The green belt is important for those who live in Dronfield. If the green belt is lost, it will hugely effect the wildlife, some of the plans even include conservation land. If this land is lost to the huge number of houses that are planned it will have an impact on infrastructure, Dronfield just does not have the capacity to deal with this volume of new people. There is currently a struggle for doctor's appointments, limited school place. The is congestion going in and out of Dronfield and pollution caused by this.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4562 - 10229 - Dronfield - None
- 4563 Object** **Respondent: Mr Stephen Hill [8914]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the removal of land from the green belt. Against any more development being made on the outskirts of Dronfield. Suggests that other brownfield sites should be used instead of green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4563 - 8914 - Dronfield - None
- 4566 Object** **Respondent: Susan Hickman [10231]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection against development in Dronfield, as there will be substantial increases in traffic on the Chesterfield Road especially when the link from Callywhite Lane is built yet no provision appears to have been made to improve substantially the road. Concern over impacts on schools, doctors surgeries. Currently all surgeries have waiting lists and getting appointments is very difficult.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4566 - 10231 - Dronfield - None
- 4570 Object** **Respondent: Mr Ben Morris [10232]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I object to the plan to build 860 new homes in Dronfield. The town is already overbuilt with characterless rows of housing and the few green areas are very precious. I believe there are plans to turn my quiet cul-de-sac into a through road for a new housing development, which seems unsafe, noisy and will diminish our quality of life. Services, schools and infrastructure are already over subscribed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4570 - 10232 - Dronfield - None
- 4573 Object** **Respondent: Julie Bancroft [10240]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections have been made to the concerning plans to build on Dronfield's green belt. Concerns have been raised about potential pollution issues from development on the green belt and from the strain that could be put on doctors and school.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4573 - 10240 - Dronfield - None
- 4574 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Faye Pratt [10241]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns and objections raised to potential development on the green belt. Concerns raised over pressure 800+ extra house could place on schools, doctors surgeries, busier roads, local facilities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4574 - 10241 - Dronfield - None

4578 Object **Respondent: Mrs and Mr Patricia and Christopher Case [10243]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern has been raised about the proposal to allocate green belt land as housing. Suggestions have been made that housing should instead be directed towards wasteland and brownfield areas. Concerns have been raised over Dronfield's separation from Sheffield. Concern has been raised over the potential loss of amenities in Coal Aston. Suggestions have been made that areas of land around the old main road towards Chesterfield that are brown field sites that could be more suitable than green belt. Concerns have been raised over traffic issues in Dronfield, particularly around Green Land roundabout.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4578 - 10243 - Dronfield - None

4579 Object **Respondent: Mr Oliver Hewitt [10177]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I object to removal of greenbelt, suggesting other brownfield sties be considered.

I also express concern over Dronfeild infrastructure and ability to cope with even a small expansion

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4579 - 10177 - Dronfield - None

4581 Object **Respondent: Mr Mark Hickman [10245]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objections have been made to the release of green belt land around Dronfield. Concern has been raised about how erosion of the green belt could lead to Unstone and Killamarsh merging. Concerns that Dronfield is lacking in green space, that their could be an increase in traffic on Chesterfield Road, further concerns over the proximity of schools to the potentially effected roads. Concerns raised about the potential impact of new development on schools and doctors surgeries. Concerns have been raised over the additional impact of the Peak Resource Development. Comments have been made on how potential access roads to the proposed allocation in Hallowes are not appropriate.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4581 - 10245 - Dronfield - None

4589 Object **Respondent: Audrey Parnham [10250]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to development on the green belt around Dronfield. Believe that housing is necessary but that it should be smaller scale. Questions whether 40% of all new buildings will actually be social housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4589 - 10250 - Dronfield - None

4590 Object **Respondent: Emma Thompson [10251]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection against removal of greenbelt land around Dronfield. Concerns that removal of this proposed land would impact negatively on the town's character and attractiveness. Suggestions made that brownfield sites exist, and that they could be better used for housing. Concern raised over the scale of the proposed new housing and over whether the local services; doctors, schools and roads are able to handle the increase in population.

Pressure on infrastructure, urban sprawl, no exceptional circumstances, empty houses, impacts on physical and mental health and wildlife; loss of habitat, recreation space and heritage; increase in traffic, congestion, pollution, flood risk; lack of parking at station, coal mining risk, no employment provision, unsustainable.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4590 - 10251 - Dronfield - None

- 4592 Object** **Respondent: Sarah Adey [10218]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to proposed new housing in Dronfield. Concern has been raised over the sheer scale of the proposed new housing and over whether the local services; doctors, schools and roads are able to handle the increase in population. Safety issues have been raised in regards to the roads around schools.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4592 - 10218 - Dronfield - None
- 4593 Object** **Respondent: Emma Thompson [10251]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection has been in regards to the proposed removal of land from the green belt. Questions have been raised in regards to the exceptional circumstances. further comment has been made on how National Guidance is clear that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Concern has been raised over how the Draft Plan acknowledges that there is insufficient local employment opportunities to support the influx of people who will occupy the proposed housing development.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4593 - 10251 - Dronfield - None
- 4594 Object** **Respondent: Steve Bullock [10262]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing being allocated in the green belt.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4594 - 10262 - Dronfield - None
- 4595 Object** **Respondent: Lee Alexander [10263]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection against the proposed removal of land from the greenbelt around Dronfield. Concerns that the removal of this proposed land would impact negatively on the town's character and attractiveness. Suggestions have been made that brownfield sites exist in Dronfield, and that they could be better used for housing. Concern has been raised over the sheer scale of the proposed new housing and over whether the local services; doctors, schools and roads are able to handle the increase in population.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4595 - 10263 - Dronfield - None
- 4596 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Anthony Stephen Jackson [6606]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection against the proposed removal of land from the greenbelt around Dronfield. Concerns that the removal of this proposed land would impact negatively on the town's character and attractiveness. Suggestions have been made that brownfield sites exist in Dronfield, and that they could be better used for housing. Concern has been raised over the sheer scale of the proposed new housing and over whether the local services; doctors, schools and roads are able to handle the increase in population.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4596 - 6606 - Dronfield - None
- 4597 Object** **Respondent: Lauren Brown [10238]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection against the proposal to allocate parts of the green belt for housing.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4597 - 10238 - Dronfield - None

- 4599 Object** **Respondent: Ms Yvonne Taylor [10247]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation at Hilltop and Longacre Roads. Concern over: access, lack of brownfield sites used, exceptional circumstances, infrastructure, impact on health. Statement that housing could be put on smaller brownfield sites in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4599 - 10247 - Dronfield - None
- 4602 Object** **Respondent: Anne Bailey [10264]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on green belt. Concern sover existing infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4602 - 10264 - Dronfield - None
- 4605 Object** **Respondent: Mr Benjamin Johnson [10195]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I wish to strongly object this proposal based on the fact that there are other brownfield sites available within Dronfield which could be developed prior to Greenbelt being compromised. Dronfield's infrastructure will not cope with additional housing and will add to the risk of flooding. It is already challenging to get children in any of Dronfield's schools as it is, or to get a GP appointment. As for our town's roads, they are already overwhelmed with traffic and will not stand anymore. The boundaries around the town need to be retained to keep the town away from the Sheffield boundary.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4605 - 10195 - Dronfield - None
- 4609 Object** **Respondent: Mr Edward Throp [10272]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection against proposed Housing Allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over: whether Dronfield's infrastructure can handle an increase in the population, scale of proposals, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, sustainability of Dronfield for proposals, duty-to-cooperate with CBC, justification of exceptional circumstances, impact on health, loss of green and recreation space, traffic and air quality, access to railway station, lack of parking, Suggestion to move some development to Callywhite estate. Questions why development is in the north not the south. Question whether council can show the funding they would receive from the "New homes bonus" if development went ahead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4609 - 10272 - Dronfield - None
- 4614 Object** **Respondent: Sarah Slack [10275]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection against the proposed housing allocations in green belt land. Concern over how schools, GP surgeries, roads and shops can accommodate the proposed population increase. Suggestions made to instead build housing on brownfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4614 - 10275 - Dronfield - None
- 4615 Object** **Respondent: Joanne Williams [10276]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern raised over how Dronfield's infrastructure (schools, doctors) can accommodate proposed population increase.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4615 - 10276 - Dronfield - None

- 4616 Object** **Respondent: Barbara Childs [10277]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to proposed release of green belt land at Coal Aston. Concerns over how infrastructure (doctors, schools, roads) can accommodate a proposed 860 extra houses around the town.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4616 - 10277 - Dronfield - None
- 4619 Object** **Respondent: Catherine Barber [10280]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land. Concerns over whether schools, doctors, dentists and roads can accommodate an increase in population. Concerns over the potential threat to wildlife.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4619 - 10280 - Dronfield - None
- 4620 Object** **Respondent: Louise Sharpe [10273]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed allocation of 655 houses on sites i, h and g in the south of Dronfield, on green belt land. Concerns have been raised over whether the existing infrastructure can accommodate proposed population increase. Suggestion to use brownfield land instead. Request for more affordable housing have been made. Regeneration of Dronfield civic centre has been suggested.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4620 - 10273 - Dronfield - None
- 4621 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Alexia Newman [10281]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield green belt sites. Concerns raised over traffic and potential harm to wildlife and conservation. Negative impacts on climate change referenced. Concern over roads, schools, doctors, shops etc. and whether these could accommodate the proposed population increase. Concerns over loss of heritage, impacts on mental health, effects on landscape, overcrowding of the town, local jobs and public services.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4621 - 10281 - Dronfield - None
- 4623 Object** **Respondent: Mr Michael & Jill Lee [8282]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed allocation of housing on the green belt. Concerns over social problems, property prices, infrastructure, road quality, schools, GP surgeries. Concerns over potential fracking near Dronfield.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4623 - 8282 - Dronfield - None
- 4628 Object** **Respondent: K.D. Hull-Hatton [10288]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of land from the green belt. Concerns over traffic, noise, unsightly development and loss of countryside.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4628 - 10288 - Dronfield - None

- 4631 Object** **Respondent: Elizabeth Dashper & Ben Johnson [10290]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on the green belt. Concerns raised over potential urban sprawl, existing infrastructure. Suggestion that brownfield sites should be used instead of greenbelt. Questions over whether their are exceptional circumstances which justify releasing land from the green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4631 - 10290 - Dronfield - None
- 4632 Object** **Respondent: Kathryn M Harper [10291]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing allocations proposed on the green belt for Dronfield. Concerns about infrastructure, public transport, shopping facilities and congestion.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4632 - 10291 - Dronfield - None
- 4637 Object** **Respondent: Claudia Collins [10297]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over how infrastructure would accommodate proposed population increase. Concern over possible extensions into the Moss Valley conservation area.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4637 - 10297 - Dronfield - None
- 4638 Object** **Respondent: Brian & Christine Haydock [10298]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over effects on environment, concerns over the effects on farmers. Further concerns raised over how the infrastructure can accommodate the proposed population increase. Suggestions to instead focus development on brownfield land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4638 - 10298 - Dronfield - None
- 4641 Object** **Respondent: Mr Mick Harrison [10214]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I strongly appose the removal of the green belt in Dronfield.
 the infrastructure of Dronfield will be put under immense pressure if this went ahead. The doctors would be put under pressure ,The schools are already full and the roads would not be able to cope with the extra traffic load
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4641 - 10214 - Dronfield - None
- 4642 Object** **Respondent: Jordan Schofield [10301]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing at Hallowes Lane. Concerns over whether infrastructure can accommodate increased population. Concerns over pollution from proposed housing development which could lead to fracking in areas of Dronfield. Suggestion that the Council instead build a new town in the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4642 - 10301 - Dronfield - None

- 4643 Object** **Respondent: Gavin Brant [10302]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4643 - 10302 - Dronfield - None
- 4644 Object** **Respondent: Mary South [10303]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over infrastructure and the type of housing that will be built. Concerns over whether public services and facilities can manage with the proposed increase in population.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4644 - 10303 - Dronfield - None
- 4648 Object** **Respondent: Mr Robert Hickman [8910]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over whether infrastructure can accommodate proposed population increase. Concern over possible noise pollution and health problems. concern over the size of roads and whether they would be big enough to allow fire and emergency services easy access. Questions raised over potential impact on the area.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4648 - 8910 - Dronfield - None
- 4650 Object** **Respondent: Julie Briggs [10306]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt land. Concerns raised about urban sprawl and protection of wildlife areas. Concerns over roads and whether they can cope with proposed population increase.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4650 - 10306 - Dronfield - None
- 4651 Object** **Respondent: Mrs E Turner [10309]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield green belt. Concerns over Dronfield potentially merging with Unstone, Sheffield and Chesterfield. Concerns over whether or not services and amenities can accommodate proposed population increase. Suggestion for brownfield sites to be used for development instead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4651 - 10309 - Dronfield - None
- 4652 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Lilian Gosney [10310]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing being allocated on Dronfield green belt. Concerns over whether infrastructure can accommodate proposed population increase. Concerns over environmental impact of proposed development in the green belt. Suggestion that development be moved to brownfield land, or that other towns should use their brownfield land and existing empty houses instead of putting development in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4652 - 10310 - Dronfield - None

- 4653 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs M. S. Dickerson [10311]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing allocations on green belt land. Concerns over road safety and air quality. Suggestion to move potential development to brownfield sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4653 - 10311 - Dronfield - None
- 4658 Object** **Respondent: Mr Michael O'Neill [10317]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Building on green-belt land is not legal. Dronfield & Coal-Aston are local Town/villages, concerns have been raised over potential urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4658 - 10317 - Dronfield - None
- 4662 Object** **Respondent: Mr Donald Bradbury [10321]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over how Dronfield would cope with increased in population.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4662 - 10321 - Dronfield - None
- 4664 Object** **Respondent: Mr IAN LIMB [10307]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on land in Dronfield's greenbelt. Concern raised over how existing infrastructure can accommodate the proposed increase in the population. Concern over how proposed housing may negatively impact on existing neighbourhoods. Concerns about the roads around Dronfield Hill Top and about how they will accommodate the proposed housing. Suggestions have been made that brownfield land should be developed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4664 - 10307 - Dronfield - None
- 4670 Object** **Respondent: Stephen Rundell [10327]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Removal of green belt around Dronfield is completely unacceptable. Dronfield is already over populated with limited infrastructure for its many many inhabitants. Land marked as green Belt should remain just that. I see no clear justification for this expansion of Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4670 - 10327 - Dronfield - None
- 4675 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Rebecca Crook [10332]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Green belt developments are totally inappropriate for Dronfield. It's infrastructure cannot support new housing on the scale planned. There is only one heavily oversubscribed secondary school and this cannot support the influx of potentially more students. Traffic is already a problem at certain times of the day and this would be made worse. However my main objection is that ALL green belt should remain untouched, it is there for a specific reason, wildlife, walking, playing and simply to look at. I wholeheartedly object to the proposed plan to release this land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4675 - 10332 - Dronfield - None

- 4682 Object** **Respondent: Lauren Hewitt [10347]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on green belt land in Dronfield. Suggestion made to use other brownfield sites in the district, or to make a whole new settlement. Questions over what the exceptional circumstance were that led to the proposed release of parcels of green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4682 - 10347 - Dronfield - None
- 4683 Object** **Respondent: Angie Young [10348]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on the green belt. Concerns over whether infrastructure can accommodate proposed population increase. Suggestion to use existing brownfield site instead of greenfield. Concerns over flooding that could arise from proposed development.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4683 - 10348 - Dronfield - None
- 4684 Object** **Respondent: Gillian & Michael Moore [10349]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on green belt land in Dronfield. Concerns over whether infrastructure can accommodate proposed population increase. Suggestion to use brownfield land instead of green field.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4684 - 10349 - Dronfield - None
- 4702 Object** **Respondent: Jim Ward [10350]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concerns raised over number of houses proposed, whether or not the infrastructure can accommodate the proposed population increase, would not be as opposed if infrastructure were better improved so as to accommodate population increase. Concern over social housing being proposed for Dronfield. Concerns over whether existing services and facilities can accommodate proposed population increase. Suggestions raised that brownfield sites should be used for housing development. Suggestions made that Council should use areas in Sheffield for housing instead of North East Derbyshire. Suggestions that land for employment should instead be used for housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4702 - 10350 - Dronfield - None
- 4704 Object** **Respondent: Mr David Pearson [10352]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield.
 Traffic Congestion
 Extra Pollution
 Increased strain on local services such as schools, doctors etc
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4704 - 10352 - Dronfield - None

- 4706 Object** **Respondent: Mr Craig Murray [10353]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over whether the infrastructure can accommodate the proposed population increase. Concern over proposed use of green belt land. Concern over the type of housing proposed and how it could reduce house prices.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4706 - 10353 - Dronfield - None
- 4708 Object** **Respondent: Mr William Thornhill [10354]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed new housing allocation at Coal Aston/Eckington Road. Concern over impact on Moss Valley and the local character of the area. Suggestion that the Council should use urban green spaces instead of green belt land for housing. Suggestion to use capital from sale of land to improve outdoor recreation sites within the town.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4708 - 10354 - Dronfield - None
- 4713 Object** **Respondent: Mr Graham Briggs [10207]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns raised over potential impact to the environment from increased pollution, concerns over whether or not infrastructure can accommodate proposed population increase. Concerns over possible flooding in Dronfield. Concern over potential increase in crime due to new housing. Concern over impact on environment and wildlife, especially in Coal Aston. Suggestion to move proposed housing allocations from Dronfield to Unstone, or to other brownfield sites in the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4713 - 10207 - Dronfield - None
- 4717 Object** **Respondent: Anne Briggs [10356]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over impact on the environment, potential increase in flood risk, concerns over whether or not existing infrastructure, services and facilities can accommodate proposed population increase.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4717 - 10356 - Dronfield - None
- 4718 Object** **Respondent: Mr Chris Paxton [10357]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on the green belt in Dronfield. Objection is not based on where the areas are located, but on how the existing infrastructure would not accommodate the proposed population increase.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4718 - 10357 - Dronfield - None
- 4719 Object** **Respondent: Sharron Allen [10358]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over whether infrastructure can accommodate the proposed population increase.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4719 - 10358 - Dronfield - None

- 4720 Object** **Respondent: John Taylor [10359]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's greenbelt. Suggestion that existing brownfield land should be used instead. Concern over whether existing infrastructure can accommodate proposed population increase. Concern over the effect the Peak Resort development at Unstone could have on Dronfield.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4720 - 10359 - Dronfield - None
- 4721 Object** **Respondent: Karen & John Goldthorpe Goldthorpe [10360]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed Housing Allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over existing infrastructure and whether it can accommodate proposed population increase.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4721 - 10360 - Dronfield - None
- 4722 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Ruth Stubbs [10338]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield greenbelt. Concerns raised over whether or not existing infrastructure can accommodate proposed population increase.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4722 - 10338 - Dronfield - None
- 4723 Object** **Respondent: Jenny Paxman [10361]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on green belt land. Concerns over infrastructure. Concerns over potential fracking at Marsh Lane.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4723 - 10361 - Dronfield - None
- 4724 Object** **Respondent: Mr Lewis Hemstall [10362]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation on the Dronfield Green Belt. Concerns over infrastructure. Objection to social housing in Dronfield. Concerns over existing services. Concerns over potential reduction of house prices.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4724 - 10362 - Dronfield - None
- 4725 Object** **Respondent: Mr Ben Paxman [10340]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Questions what the exceptional circumstances were that justified the proposed release of green belt land. Concern over infrastructure.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4725 - 10340 - Dronfield - None

- 4748 Object** **Respondent: David Jameson [10365]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over infrastructure. Concerns over flooding. Suggestion to build houses on brownfield land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4748 - 10365 - Dronfield - None
- 4749 Object** **Respondent: Mr Benjamin Johnson [10195]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on green belt land. Suggestion that brownfield sites should be used instead. Concerns over infrastructure, road safety, air pollution, flooding.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4749 - 10195 - Dronfield - None
- 4750 Object** **Respondent: Elizabeth Welton [10366]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on green belt sites. Suggestion to use brownfield sites instead. Concerns over health impact, environment, air quality, climate change and wildlife.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4750 - 10366 - Dronfield - None
- 4751 Object** **Respondent: Mr Michael Burls [10342]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield green belt. Concerns over environmental impact, infrastructure, local amenities, traffic and pollution, potential urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4751 - 10342 - Dronfield - None
- 4752 Object** **Respondent: Dr Michael Romano [10367]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concerns over infrastructure, amenities. Concern over impact heavy vehicles would have on the roads in Dronfield.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4752 - 10367 - Dronfield - None
- 4753 Object** **Respondent: Jane Derbyshire [10368]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I am submitting a brief email to say I am against the proposal to build 860 new houses on Dronfield Green belt.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4753 - 10368 - Dronfield - None

- 4757 Object** **Respondent: Mr Sean Byrne [10345]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over impact on the green belt, traffic congestion and over whether infrastructure can accommodate the proposed housing. Not opposed to new developments, however is opposed to the scale of the developments and the possible impact on the character of Dronfield. Suggestion made that development should be scaled down, or housing should be moved to Chesterfield or other areas in need of economic stimulation.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4757 - 10345 - Dronfield - None
- 4758 Object** **Respondent: Suzanne Garrett [10376]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over proposed housing on green belt land. Concerns over infrastructure and services. Questions raised over whether their were any brownfield sites available.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4758 - 10376 - Dronfield - None
- 4760 Object** **Respondent: Ruth Rodgers [10378]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over infrastructure and whether it could accommodate proposed population increase. Concern over impact on Dronfield's character.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4760 - 10378 - Dronfield - None
- 4762 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas [10351]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over potential urban sprawl. Concern over whether existing infrastructure and services can accommodate proposed housing allocations.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4762 - 10351 - Dronfield - None
- 4765 Object** **Respondent: Kathryn Bullock [10387]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the housing allocation in Dronfield. Concern over infrastructure and services and whether they can accommodate the proposed new housing. Objection to social housing being built in Dronfield. Suggestion has been made that existing brownfield land should be used instead, suggestion also made that NEDDC makes a brownfield register. Suggestion made that underused recreation sites could be used for housing instead of green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4765 - 10387 - Dronfield - None
- 4767 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Ruth De Almeida [10363]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over impact on the environment, infrastructure, local facilities, roads and transport. Concern raised over proposed loss of green belt land and potential urban sprawl. Question raised over whether a infrastructure capacity study has been taken. Question raised over whether potential impact on roads have been taken into account by the council when allocating land for housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4767 - 10363 - Dronfield - None

- 4769 Object** **Respondent: Steve Hides [10391]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Suggestion to instead use the plenty of existing brownfield sites in Dronfield. Concern over wildlife, local services, infrastructure and the impact the proposed housing might have.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4769 - 10391 - Dronfield - None
- 4772 Object** **Respondent: Andrea Baxter [10393]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over loss of open space on the edge of Dronfield. Concern over impact on roads that could come from proposed housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4772 - 10393 - Dronfield - None
- 4773 Object** **Respondent: Margaret Oliver [10394]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Suggestions made that brownfield land outside Dronfield should be used instead, boatyard in Chesterfield suggested and garden centre in Unstone as possible brownfield sites to be used. Concern raised over possible impact on infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4773 - 10394 - Dronfield - None
- 4774 Object** **Respondent: Jane Hawgate [10395]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over the scale of the proposed allocations. Concern over the impact of services, facilities and infrastructure from proposed housing. Suggestion made that the number of allocated sites should be reduced from five sites to one.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4774 - 10395 - Dronfield - None
- 4775 Object** **Respondent: Lesley Jarvis [10396]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over loss of green belt land, potential urban sprawl, traffic, pollution, and impact on services and infrastructure that could come from the proposed housing going forward. Concern over potential increase in accidents and congestion on the roads.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4775 - 10396 - Dronfield - None
- 4777 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Rodgers [9134]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over loss of green belt land. Suggestion that the Padley & Venable site should be used instead or the old Gladys's Buxton School (Oakhill Road) which although still currently used could be instead used for housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4777 - 9134 - Dronfield - None

- 4782 Object** **Respondent: Julie Price [10399]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over loss of green belt land and potential impact on wild life and the environment. Questions raised over whether or not there are other places in the District that could be built on. Concern over potential issues over noise, pollution and traffic that could be caused if the proposed housing goes forward. Concern raised over impact on infrastructure. suggests using brownfield sites and empty homes in stead of green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4782 - 10399 - Dronfield - None
- 4785 Object** **Respondent: Sandra Barnes [10404]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of land from the green belt around Dronfield for proposed housing allocations. Concerns raised over infrastructure, pollution, impact on wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4785 - 10404 - Dronfield - None
- 4789 Object** **Respondent: Matt Carl [10409]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern raised over potential traffic congestion that could be caused if the proposed housing allocations go forward. Further concern raised over whether Dronfield's infrastructure and services can accommodate the proposed housing increase in Dronfield. Comments made that green belt land is needed to help with the local environment. Flooding risks could be a possibility should green belt land be removed and be replaced by tarmac roads and driveways.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4789 - 10409 - Dronfield - None
- 4790 Object** **Respondent: Jack Revill [10410]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Questions raised over whether brownfield land is available. Suggestion made that the boat yard in Chesterfield or the Garages in Unstone would be more suitable for housing than Dronfield. Concern raised over whether services and infrastructure can accommodate proposed housing allocations.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4790 - 10410 - Dronfield - None
- 4795 Object** **Respondent: Sarah Hopwood [10415]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4795 - 10415 - Dronfield - None
- 4797 Object** **Respondent: Jean Hobson [10418]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over infrastructure and services.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4797 - 10418 - Dronfield - None

- 4800 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Haslam [10421]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on green belt land in Dronfield. Concerns over whether services and infrastructure can accommodate proposed housing. Suggestion to instead regenerate Dronfield Civic Centre, instead of building more housing.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4800 - 10421 - Dronfield - None
- 4808 Object** **Respondent: Mr Charles Dickens [10194]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over traffic, infrastructure, services and wildlife. Suggestion that there are plenty of brownfield sites in Dronfield that can be used instead of green belt.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4808 - 10194 - Dronfield - None
- 4809 Object** **Respondent: Mrs D Smith [10426]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns raised over infrastructure, environment and wildlife.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4809 - 10426 - Dronfield - None
- 4810 Object** **Respondent: L Dickens [10427]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over wildlife, infrastructure, services, traffic.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4810 - 10427 - Dronfield - None
- 4811 Object** **Respondent: S Dickens [10428]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concerns raised over wildlife.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4811 - 10428 - Dronfield - None
- 4812 Object** **Respondent: JM Dickens [10431]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over existing infrastructure and wildlife.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4812 - 10431 - Dronfield - None
- 4816 Object** **Respondent: Katy Gregory [10437]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over services and infrastructure.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4816 - 10437 - Dronfield - None

- 4821 Object** **Respondent: Mr Keith Green [10375]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield green belt. Concern raised over infrastructure, services, road safety, pollution, loss of green belt land and potential urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4821 - 10375 - Dronfield - None
- 4824 Object** **Respondent: Terry Pashley [10443]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over potential loss of green belt land. Statement that Dronfield does not need more housing. Question raised over why land being used by developers for the Peak Resort was not instead used for housing. Concern over housing sprawl, infrastructure, services and potential loss of character. Concern over wildlife. Questions over why the golf course isn't designated as a recreation area.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4824 - 10443 - Dronfield - None
- 4826 Object** **Respondent: Pat Basford [10403]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over infrastructure, services and pollution. Concern over loss of green belt and potential pollution.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4826 - 10403 - Dronfield - None
- 4828 Object** **Respondent: Mrs D Coyle [10447]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation in Dronfield's greenbelt. Concern over infrastructure, services, and loss of green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4828 - 10447 - Dronfield - None
- 4829 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Wallace [10448]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation on Dronfield's green belt. Concerns over infrastructure, local amenities, services, loss of green belt land, impact on wildlife and environment. Suggestion to look at brownfield sites and empty housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4829 - 10448 - Dronfield - None
- 4844 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns over whether infrastructure and services in Dronfield can accommodate proposed housing. Suggestion that provision be sorted out before any plans go ahead. Suggestion to move housing to the north of Dronfield in order for residents to have easier access to Sheffield. Concern over Urban sprawl, pollution and employment.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4844 - 9167 - Dronfield - None

4846 Object **Respondent: David Boardman [10464]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over wildlife, infrastructure, pollution and services.
Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4846 - 10464 - Dronfield - None

4847 Object **Respondent: Mrs E Jayne Morris [10201]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation on Dronfield's green belt. Concerns over infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4847 - 10201 - Dronfield - None

4849 Object **Respondent: Suzannah MacKay [10466]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Map currently used by planning department does not correctly define the boundaries of Dronfield, it does not mention the land between Dronfield and Unstone. Suggestion to use land in Unstone for housing. Concerns over infrastructure and wildlife. Questions over whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify release of green belt land.

Hallowes Golf Club is not intending development.

There are over 100 empty properties.

Dronfield has already exceeded growth statistics over last 29yrs.

Green Belt Land survey 2017 states that Dronfield sites should NOT be removed and ARE NOT suitable for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4849 - 10466 - Dronfield - None

4851 Object **Respondent: mr peter hopkinson [10451]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation on Dronfield's green belt. Suggestion to use existing brownfield land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4851 - 10451 - Dronfield - None

4852 Object **Respondent: Sam Badger [10468]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over potential impact on infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4852 - 10468 - Dronfield - None

4853 Object **Respondent: Ann Middlemiss [10469]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to proposed release of green belt land for housing. Concern raised over impact on the environment and Wildlife. Concern over whether existing infrastructure can accommodate proposed population increase.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4853 - 10469 - Dronfield - None

- 4854 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Anna Fisher [10470]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation on Eckington Road, Coal Aston. Concern over loss of green belt and farming land, infrastructure, wildlife, loss of recreation sites. Suggestion to build houses in other parts of the country.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4854 - 10470 - Dronfield - None
- 4855 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Eleanor Byrne [10455]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over infrastructure and increase in traffic that could come from the proposed housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4855 - 10455 - Dronfield - None
- 4859 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Theresa Bingham [10459]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Accepts the need for more housing, however objects to said housing being on released green belt land. Suggestion that there is sufficient brownfield land to accommodate housing requirement. Concern over loss of farming land. Concern over increase in the size of Coal Aston. Concern over infrastructure
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4859 - 10459 - Dronfield - None
- 4860 Object** **Respondent: Nick and Angela Beasley [10474]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield's green belt. Concern over impact on Dronfield's infrastructure, services, increase in traffic and potential loss of recreation space.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4860 - 10474 - Dronfield - None
- 4861 Object** **Respondent: Mrs K Morris [10475]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over potential impact on infrastructure, concern over loss of recreation site.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4861 - 10475 - Dronfield - None
- 4863 Object** **Respondent: Robert Williams [10477]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns over the release of green belt land for housing in Dronfield. Questions raised over the exceptional circumstances that justify the removal of green belt land. Statement made that unmet housing need does not qualify as exceptional circumstances. Questions raised over whether the Council properly reviewed the Green Belt. Concern over lack of an up to date infrastructure plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4863 - 10477 - Dronfield - None

- 4865 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Maralyn Dommett [10326]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concerns over existing infrastructure, loss of community and impact on services.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4865 - 10326 - Dronfield - None
- 4868 Object** **Respondent: mr rod cooper [10461]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over proposed housing allocation on Dronfield green belt. Suggestions to use brownfield site instead. Concern over urban sprawl, impact on services and infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4868 - 10461 - Dronfield - None
- 4871 Object** **Respondent: James Mcelhattan [10482]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over overcrowding and impact on infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4871 - 10482 - Dronfield - None
- 4881 Object** **Respondent: Deborah Etches [10493]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern raised over infrastructure in Dronfield. Statement made that most people commute by car and not by rail, which would mean that the proposed housing would not reduce emissions for Dronfield. Comment made that brownfield land should be used not green belt. Concern over impact on the character of Dronfield. Questions raised over bringing Dronfield's empty homes into use before using green belt land. Questions raised over exceptional circumstances to release green belt land. Concerns over impact on employment and environment.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4881 - 10493 - Dronfield - None
- 4883 Object** **Respondent: David Crossland [10495]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4883 - 10495 - Dronfield - None
- 4886 Object** **Respondent: Roy Phillips [10496]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Questions raised over the exceptional circumstances identified that justify proposed release of green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4886 - 10496 - Dronfield - None

- 4887 Object** **Respondent: Linda and Trevor Dawes [10499]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns over proposed housing allocations on green belt land. Concern over potential impact from new homes on Dronfield and its infrastructure and facilities. Concern over urban sprawl. Concern over loss of community assets. Questions raised over how many of the proposed houses are going to be social housing. Questions raised over why land proposed for Callywhite Lane extension is not used for housing. Suggestion raised to use the boatyard and old unused garden centre in Unstone instead of green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4887 - 10499 - Dronfield - None
- 4891 Object** **Respondent: Lindsey Crowson [10501]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over impact on infrastructure. Concern over impact on the character of Dronfield from Urban Sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4891 - 10501 - Dronfield - None
- 4892 Object** **Respondent: Joy Lincoln [10503]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing allocations. Concerns over impacts on wildlife, environment, health and well being. concerns over traffic and infrastructure. Understands need for housing, interest raised in affordable housing. Suggestion to use Padley and Venable site and land in Unstone instead of using land in Dronfield. Concern over rise in anti social behaviour from the proposed housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4892 - 10503 - Dronfield - None
- 4895 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Anita Murray [10506]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over loss of green belt land and urban sprawl. Concern over potential impact on existing infrastructure from the proposed housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4895 - 10506 - Dronfield - None
- 4900 Object** **Respondent: Sue and Barry Knowles [10509]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We are strongly opposed to the proposed building developments on greenbelt land. The road structures cannot take the traffic, the schools are already full and doctors waiting times are much too long.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4900 - 10509 - Dronfield - None
- 4904 Object** **Respondent: Richard Walters [10512]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over loss of green belt land and urban sprawl. Suggestion to use brownfield sites instead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4904 - 10512 - Dronfield - None

- 4915 Object** **Respondent: Elaine Hinman [10524]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing allocations. Concern over impact on infrastructure and suggestions made to use brownfield land in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4915 - 10524 - Dronfield - None
- 4918 Object** **Respondent: Diane Mallett [10525]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed social housing in Dronfield. Concern over infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4918 - 10525 - Dronfield - None
- 4919 Object** **Respondent: Mr and Mrs Robert and Janet Hardcastle [6900]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Suggestions made that there are brown field sites in the area which could be built on e.g. The Padley and Venables site on Callywhite Lane and the old nursery and boatyard south of Unstone Green. Also the Sheffield football ground at Stubley Lane. Concern over loss of green belt land and impact on wildlife. Concerns over infrastructure and lack of parking for the railway station in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4919 - 6900 - Dronfield - None
- 4920 Object** **Respondent: Mr Stephen Hill [10521]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection over the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over potential loss of green belt land. Concern over infrastructure and the impacts the proposed development could have.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4920 - 10521 - Dronfield - None
- 4921 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Lindsay Jane Fox [10526]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over impact on infrastructure and traffic. Concern over how 40% of the proposed housing will be social housing, which will would significantly change the nature of the local community.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4921 - 10526 - Dronfield - None
- 4924 Object** **Respondent: Margaret Harrison [10530]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over loss of green belt land and impact on existing infrastructure and services. Concern over impact additional pupils will have on secondary school standards. Concern over loss of heritage. Concern over impact on traffic and pollution. Concern over proposed social and affordable housing and potential rise in crime and antisocial behaviour.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4924 - 10530 - Dronfield - None

- 4926 Object** **Respondent: William F Jones [10531]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land in Dronfield for housing. Concern over the impact on residents of Dronfield. Concern over impact on infrastructure, services and utilities, and questions asked over whether this will be taken into account when applications are put forward. Concern over the potential density of the housing proposed in green belt land and concern over, taking into account the 40% social housing, whether more land is being released than is necessary. Concerns over potential impact on Dronfield character. Questions raised over whether Coal Mining Assessments or impact assessments on flora and fauna have been taken for the proposed sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4926 - 10531 - Dronfield - None
- 4927 Object** **Respondent: Barbara F Arnold [10532]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on green belt land. Concern over impact on infrastructure and potential urban sprawl. Suggestions to use the nursery/garden centre and boat yard near Unstone.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4927 - 10532 - Dronfield - None
- 4928 Object** **Respondent: Susan and Doug Oaspring [10533]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation in Dronfield. Concern over loss of green belt and potential impact on infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4928 - 10533 - Dronfield - None
- 4933 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Lynn Bennett [10192]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I would like to object to the proposed building of 860 new houses on green belt land surrounding Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4933 - 10192 - Dronfield - None
- 4934 Object** **Respondent: George Lee [10538]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield, concern over infrastructure, access and civil amenities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4934 - 10538 - Dronfield - None
- 4936 Object** **Respondent: Mr Richard Alliot [10334]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Building on areas h,l and j in Dronfield would detract from the positive feel of residents created by surrounding greenbelt.It will destroy wildlife and definitely have a negative impact on the character of a small town.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4936 - 10334 - Dronfield - None

- 4938 Object** **Respondent: Steven Hemsley [10540]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Statement made that there are no exceptional circumstances and that there are brownfield sites still available in Dronfield. Concerns over potential loss of green belt land, farm land and recreation space. Concern over infrastructure .
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4938 - 10540 - Dronfield - None
- 4939 Object** **Respondent: Mr David F Kurley [10541]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern over potential impact on infrastructure the proposed housing allocations may have. Objection to the use of greenbelt land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4939 - 10541 - Dronfield - None
- 4941 Object** **Respondent: Mr Roger Howe [10542]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Strong objections to NEDDC plans to change areas of Green Field sites in the Dronfield area to Brown Field sites. Concern over impact on infrastructure, traffic and urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4941 - 10542 - Dronfield - None
- 4943 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Susan Howe [10543]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Strong objections to NEDDC plans to change areas of Green Field sites in the Dronfield area to Brown Field sites. Concern over impact on infrastructure, traffic and urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4943 - 10543 - Dronfield - None
- 4947 Object** **Respondent: Marilyn Bakewell [10546]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections raised to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over potential impact on infrastructure.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4947 - 10546 - Dronfield - None
- 4950 Object** **Respondent: Sarah Brooks [10548]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land around Dronfield. Statement that brownfield sites exist in Dronfield that can be used for the proposed 860 houses. Concern over impact on lifestyles of residents and loss of wildlife. Concern over impact on infrastructure. Does not disagree with the need for more housing, but states that it should be on a smaller scale and in brownfield sites.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4950 - 10548 - Dronfield - None

- 4951 Object Respondent: Mrs Susan Wells [10200] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over loss of green belt land and impact on Dronfield's character. Concern over the town's infrastructure and services.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4951 - 10200 - Dronfield - None
- 4962 Object Respondent: Mr Paul Stocks [10559] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Statement that release of greenbelt is against national policy. Concerns raised over urban sprawl, impact on wildlife, lack of employment, impact on infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4962 - 10559 - Dronfield - None
- 4963 Object Respondent: Dr Clare Freeman [10223] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Statement that release of greenbelt is against national policy. Concerns raised over urban sprawl, impact on wildlife, lack of employment, impact on infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4963 - 10223 - Dronfield - None
- 4964 Object Respondent: Mrs Deborah Keenan [8964] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: NO TO DRONFIELD DEVELOPMENT WHICH SEEMS TO BE A DEVELOPERS MONEY MAKING SCAM IN THE MAKING!!
 RESIDENTS VALUE THEIR HOMES, LIVES AND GREEN BELT
 RESIDENTS DON'T WANT TO BE IN AN URBAN SPRAWL OR GHETTO!! WE WANT TO MAINTAIN OUR CALIBER OF RESIDENTS - SOCIAL HOUSING WILL ATTRACT A WHOLE RAFT OF PEOPLE WHO WILL NOT RESPECT GREEN BELT & WHAT DRONFIELD OFFERS.
 HAVE OTHER AREAS BEEN CONSIDERED? BOUNDARY AREA AT BOTTOM OF DYCHE LANE AND START OF DRONFIELD BY-PASS CURRENTLY HOME TO FAIR GROUND & CAR BOOT SALES,
 WHY COMPULSORY PURCHASE A GOLF COURSE ONE OF DRONFIELD'S TREASURED GEMS!!
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4964 - 8964 - Dronfield - None
- 4966 Object Respondent: Miss Kate Bradshaw [10564] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Development of this site would have a negative impact - this would affect the infrastructure of Dronfield as it stands including schools, doctors, traffic and parking.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4966 - 10564 - Dronfield - None
- 4969 Object Respondent: Vincent and Anna Steele [10568] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over impact on infrastructure. Statement that the encroachment onto Green Belt is to be resisted, in particular in respect of the brown field site policy which it seems has gone largely ignored.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4969 - 10568 - Dronfield - None

- 4970 Object** **Respondent: Gerald Horrocks [10570]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield, concern over impact on infrastructure. Suggestion if more houses are needed to find non green belt land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4970 - 10570 - Dronfield - None
- 4971 Object** **Respondent: Mr Paul Toothill [10561]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over loss of green space, impact on character and infrastructure. Concern over increased noise from traffic and pollution. Suggestion made that brownfield sites should be looked at first.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4971 - 10561 - Dronfield - None
- 4976 Object** **Respondent: Helen R. Hill [10576]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concerns raised over the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over impact on character of the town, also concern over impact on existing infrastructure.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4976 - 10576 - Dronfield - None
- 4990 Object** **Respondent: Daniella Haydock [10583]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's greenbelt. Concerns over potential urban sprawl, loss of recreation sites and countryside. Concern over impact on the environment and wildlife, and increased flooding risk. Concerns over infrastructure.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4990 - 10583 - Dronfield - None
- 4992 Object** **Respondent: Joy Spurr [10585]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Statement that proposed release of greenbelt land for housing seems unlawful. Questions raised over exceptional circumstances that justify the release of green belt land. Concern over impact on existing infrastructure. Suggestion to use industrial site Callywhite Lane for housing.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4992 - 10585 - Dronfield - None
- 4999 Object** **Respondent: Maggie Holland [10588]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over impact on Dronfield's character and potential urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4999 - 10588 - Dronfield - None

- 5001 Object** **Respondent: Barbara & Geoff Stork [10591]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over potential urban sprawl due to loss of green belt. Need for more affordable housing understood, however suggestions made that housing is moved else where in the District, and not in a place that is abutting onto a large industrial area.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5001 - 10591 - Dronfield - None
- 5002 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helen Bell [10369]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Statement made that Dronfield needs more affordable housing, but not on green belt land. Suggestion that there are numerous brownfield sites within Dronfield that could be used: old Padley & Venables site identified, also the area of Holmley Bank and the Alma area. Question raised over why the 10 unit threshold, with a statement being made that an accumulation of smaller sites could meet requirements. Concern raised over impact on recreation/green spaces and environment. Concerns raised over impact on infrastructure. Concern over lack of infrastructure plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5002 - 10369 - Dronfield - None
- 5025 Object** **Respondent: Lisa Pitchford [10594]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the local plan for the Dronfield community. Concern over negative impacts on Dronfield due to the proposed housing allocations and other proposed developments. Concern raised over infrastructure, loss of wildlife, increase in traffic and pollution that could come from the proposed housing allocations. Concern over impact on mental health from loss of green belt land. Questions raised over why brownfield land in Dronfield isn't used to build Dronfield's housing requirement. Concern over urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5025 - 10594 - Dronfield - None
- 5026 Object** **Respondent: Martin Fisher [10595]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to local plan for Dronfield's community. Concern over impact proposed housing allocations could have on Dronfield. Concern over existing infrastructure and how it can accommodate the proposed housing. Questions raise dover why the Councils is not allocating housing on the brownfield in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5026 - 10595 - Dronfield - None
- 5029 Object** **Respondent: Mr James Singleton [10596]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Questions raised over what the exceptional circumstances are that justify the release of greenbelt land. Concern over loss of greenbelt land and impact to the local environment. Concern over impact loss of greenbelt will have on people's health and well being. Concern over precedent release of greenbelt will make. Concern over impact of proposed housing on existing services and facilities. Concern over lack of infrastructure plan. Concern over urban sprawl from proposed housing in the south of the town, with Unstone. Statement accepting that house building is necessary. Suggestion to redesignate Callywhite Lane industrial site as housing. Concern over lack of empty houses used or brought back into circulation, questions over duty-to-cooperate with CBC.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5029 - 10596 - Dronfield - None

- 5048 Object** **Respondent: Mr David Meechan [10605]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Concern raised over exceptional circumstances and the justification for the release of green belt land for housing. Concern over impact on Dronfield's character, impact on infrastructure, air pollution and health. Concern over scale of housing proposed. Suggestion to consider brownfield sites and empty housing. Suggestion to move housing to other parts of the District and increase housing on the strategic sites. Concerns on five allocated sites raised. Concerns over urban sprawl, impact on conservation area and impact on existing sporting facilities. Concern over access and impact on green belt boundary. Concern over urban sprawl and Peak Resort. Concern over visual impact and impact on character of the site. Concern over impact on heritage in the area and on infrastructure. Questions raised over landowners and whether they want to develop the land. Suggestion to use Padley and Venables site, suggestions to reclassify employment land for housing. Suggestion to think about moving development to neighbouring authorities.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5048 - 10605 - Dronfield - None
- 5069 Object** **Respondent: Robert Welton [10614]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Statement that the Council is going about things wrong and that detailed site analysis should be undertaken before any plan are put forth. Suggestion that brownfield sites in Dronfield should be used for development and not green belt land. Concern over impact on environment and wildlife and loss of greenbelt land.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5069 - 10614 - Dronfield - None
- 5079 Object** **Respondent: Tom and Barbara Smiles [10615]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Concerns over proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over planners not giving information on locations of improved road infrastructure to be put in place. Concern over impact on the services, facilities and infrastructure from housing in Dronfield. Concern over urban sprawl. Statement that there will be 40% of the planned homes designated as Social Housing. We are concerned that these properties would be safeguarded specifically for local people to use. Concern over impact on house value in Dronfield. Concern over impact on character of Dronfield and loss of countryside for housing.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5079 - 10615 - Dronfield - None
- 5093 Object** **Respondent: Michelle Chaplain [10616]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation on land that has been proposed to be released from the green belt. Concern over impact on infrastructure, traffic, access, services. Concern over loss of greenbelt land and the impact on people's health. Statement that companies have been proposed to move Dronfield's station out of Dronfield, as such it cannot be used as the basis for the justification of supporting additional housing from the Green Belt. Suggestion to use brownfield sites in Dronfield first before using its green belt. Suggestion to join local plans with Chesterfield borough and move NEDDC housing needs into CBC. Concern over lack of an infrastructure plan.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5093 - 10616 - Dronfield - None
- 5103 Object** **Respondent: Katharine Rodgers [10617]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. concern over infrastructure, loss of greenbelt land and urban sprawl.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5103 - 10617 - Dronfield - None

5110 Object **Respondent: Mrs Elizabeth Holmes [10622]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern raised over potential urban sprawl due to the proposed housing. Concern over impact on existing infrastructure and services from proposed housing. Concern over increase in traffic and impact on Dronfield's character due to proposed housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5110 - 10622 - Dronfield - None

5111 Object **Respondent: Norma and Barbara Short [10623]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised with regard to the proposed Dronfield Local Plan, statement made that this plan is impracticable and that it would ruin our town. Objection due to the proposed release of greenbelt land for housing. Concern over existing infrastructure and urban sprawl. Of particular concern are the roads in the Hilltop area. Both Hilltop Road and Hallowes Lane are little more than country lanes in places and already very busy and difficult. The whole plan is totally impracticable and we would request that it be abandoned.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5111 - 10623 - Dronfield - None

5124 Object **Respondent: Mrs Sandra Herman [10624]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing being built on green belt land, with suggestions that it should instead be moved to brownfield areas and to parcels of land alongside existing developments. Statement Green Belt land should only be used as a last resort and in consultation and by agreement with local residents. Statement that brownfield areas along side the A61 going towards Chesterfield could be used as long as enough space was left to identify each separate village and town. The old boat yard and nursery in Unstone have been empty for many years. Space identified at Dunston, Sheepsbridge and Callywhite Lane on the old Padley and Venables site, as well as some other areas.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5124 - 10624 - Dronfield - None

5126 Object **Respondent: Mr Mike Herman [10627]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing being built on green belt land, with suggestions that it should instead be moved to brownfield areas and to parcels of land alongside existing developments. Statement Green Belt land should only be used as a last resort and in consultation and by agreement with local residents. Statement that brownfield areas along side the A61 going towards Chesterfield could be used as long as enough space was left to identify each separate village and town. The old boat yard and nursery in Unstone have been empty for many years. Space identified at Dunston, Sheepsbridge and Callywhite Lane on the old Padley and Venables site, as well as some other areas.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5126 - 10627 - Dronfield - None

5130 Object **Respondent: Mrs Kate Lyon [10629]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to the local plan for Dronfield, due to proposed housing allocations. Concern over urban sprawl and loss of green space/green belt land. Concern over impact on existing infrastructure, increase in traffic and pollution. Concern over increase in flooding risk and impact on wildlife from removing trees.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5130 - 10629 - Dronfield - None

5132 Object**Respondent: Amy Nolan [10630]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over urban sprawl, impact on infrastructure (medical, roads and schools), overpopulation and congestion. Question over where the study to identify brownfield sites in Dronfield is. Suggestion to move Dronfield's housing requirements to Unstone (Boat yard and garden centre). Statement made that NEDDC should meet with Sheffield and Chesterfield and move its housing onto their brownfield land. Concern over loss of green space, farmland and potential impacts on flooding and health from loss of agricultural land. Concern over lack of infrastructure plan. Concern over lack of parking at the railway station and in the town centre, railway station not fit for purpose. Infilling proposed is not limited it is extensive.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5132 - 10630 - Dronfield - None

5144 Object**Respondent: Sally Gisborne [10631]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield, particularly those in the south. Concern over loss of greenbelt land, impact on existing infrastructure and amenities. Concerns about increase in traffic and road safety in the southern part of Dronfield. Statement that there are many other brownfield sites in Dronfield and other options to consider before release green belt land for housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5144 - 10631 - Dronfield - None

5145 Object**Respondent: Mr Alan Catchpole [10632]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the release of four green belt sites in Dronfield for housing. Reasons given: No evident consideration has been shown about using brownfield sites in Dronfield, and in other neighbouring districts. Statement that no exceptional circumstances are shown that justify green belt release. Concerns that: there could be precedent for more green belt to be taken in future, loss of green space, impact on health, urban sprawl, environmental impact, impact on infrastructure. Does not think that such a high number of houses needs to be built in Dronfield. Other neighbouring areas with more brownfield land should be considered first.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5145 - 10632 - Dronfield - None

5147 Object**Respondent: Mark Boardman [10633]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed building of 860 houses, in Dronfield. Concerns over impact on existing infrastructure, not enough parking, congestion and road safety, concern over increase in pollution from proposed housing, impact on Dronfield character and impact on wildlife and environment. Suggestion that there are plenty of areas of brown field sites that could be used as an alternative.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5147 - 10633 - Dronfield - None

5148 Object**Respondent: Charlotte Boardman [10634]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over impact on local infrastructure, lack of existing parking, loss of green belt land, impact on environment, wildlife, increase in pollution. Suggestion to use brownfield land instead.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5148 - 10634 - Dronfield - None

5149 Object**Respondent: Mr Rob Oldale [10635]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: objection to proposed local plan in consultation period, by North East Derbyshire District Council.
Objection centres on the removal of the Green Belt land surrounding Dronfield.
My reasons for this objection are as follows:-

Local community

The Purpose of Greenbelt Status

Wildlife & environment

Health and wellbeing

Transport & infrastructure

Schools & education

Doctors

Heritage

Previous coal mining activity

Loss of Recreational Space / Reduced Access to Countryside and Footpaths

Loss of Farmland

The Fracking Threat

Concerns Regards Employment and Industrial Development

Brownfield Sites and Vacant Properties

Dronfield's Railway Station

Dronfield is not a Sustainable Community for Large Scale Development

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5149 - 10635 - Dronfield - None

5176 Object**Respondent: Joanna Boardman [10652]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's greenbelt. Concern over: impact on wildlife, impact on environment, increase in pollution, impact on resident's health. Concern over impact on existing infrastructure, increase in traffic and congestion.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5176 - 10652 - Dronfield - None

- 5177 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Smith [10653]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Statement that there is a need for more housing but that using greenbelt land is not an option. Concerns raised over impact on health from loss of greenbelt land. Questions that since Dronfield is lacking in green space why take green belt land. Concerns over impact on existing infrastructure. Concern over rise in pollution levels and increase in traffic and congestion. Statement that Dronfield will change from the rural town surrounded by beautiful green spaces to an over-congested urban town.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5177 - 10653 - Dronfield - None
- 5178 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Diane O'Shea [10230]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection allocations in Dronfield. Statement that the council has not shown any consideration for the use of Brownfield sites. Statement that there are 130+ empty homes in Dronfield where have you shown your consideration of bringing these back into use. Concerns over impact on existing infrastructure from proposed housing. Statement that there is inadequate parking. Concerns over: increase in traffic, impact on wildlife, loss of outdoor space, urban sprawl, increase in flooding risk.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5178 - 10230 - Dronfield - None
- 5183 Object** **Respondent: Beverley Stead [10655]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations. Concern over urban sprawl, loss of greenbelt land, impact on health and wellbeing. Further concern over impact on: traffic, existing infrastructure and pollution. Statement that there is a need for housing in Dronfield, but that all brownfield sites should be used before considering greenbelt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5183 - 10655 - Dronfield - None
- 5184 Object** **Respondent: Mr Dave Gray [10656]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the propose housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over loss of green belt land, impact on wildlife. Concern over impact on infrastructure. Suggestion to try and fill the 500 or so empty houses in Chesterfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5184 - 10656 - Dronfield - None
- 5186 Object** **Respondent: A Burrows [10658]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the planned build on the greenbelt areas in and around Dronfield
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5186 - 10658 - Dronfield - None
- 5188 Object** **Respondent: Sheila Pyke [10659]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns raised over proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Need for new homes accepted, statement that they should be mainly affordable homes and bungalows. Concern over the type of housing that might be developed. Concern over impact on existing infrastructure, suggestion that other sites more suitable. Suggestion to use Callywhite land and Gomersall Lane Allotments, as well as empty and derelict housing, Unstone boatyard, brownfield land in Sheffield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5188 - 10659 - Dronfield - None

- 5195 Object** **Respondent: Ian J Smith [10663]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Arguments: pollution, loss of green space, infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5195 - 10663 - Dronfield - None
- 5196 Object** **Respondent: Alan Tomlinson [10664]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed developments on Dronfield's green belt. Arguments: Urban sprawl, infrastructure, environment, land stability, conservation, loss of amenities.
 Suggestion: Use of brownfield lands and undeveloped green spaces both in Dronfield and NE Derbyshire which are more suitable for development.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5196 - 10664 - Dronfield - None
- 5198 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Christine Tomlinson [10665]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Arguments: pollution, loss of green space, infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5198 - 10665 - Dronfield - None
- 5200 Object** **Respondent: Mr Gerald D Lee [10666]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to release of green belt for housing. Reasons: agricultural land, wildlife, air quality, infrastructure, environment, traffic.
 Suggestions: Use brownfield sites and derelict land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5200 - 10666 - Dronfield - None
- 5231 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Pam Caddy [10670]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Arguments: Impact on quality of life, loss of green space, impact on health, urban sprawl, impact on infrastructure and facilities, lack of parking. Statement that brownfield sites in Dronfield should be used and not green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5231 - 10670 - Dronfield - None
- 5233 Object** **Respondent: Reuben Partner [10673]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Questions raised over the exceptional circumstances that allow green belt release. Statement that there are more suitable brownfield sites to use instead of green belt. Concern over impact on traffic and infrastructure from the proposed housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5233 - 10673 - Dronfield - None

- 5234 Object** **Respondent: Dave Chilvers [10674]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's greenbelt. Statement that these areas were designed for people, for health and recreational purposes, and under no circumstances should these areas be taken away.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5234 - 10674 - Dronfield - None
- 5236 Object** **Respondent: Marie Partner [10676]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Questions raised over the exceptional circumstances that allow green belt release. Statement that there are more suitable brownfield sites to use instead of green belt. Concern over impact on traffic and infrastructure from the proposed housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5236 - 10676 - Dronfield - None
- 5238 Object** **Respondent: Elizabeth Gray [10677]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: loss of green belt land, impact on environment and wildlife, increase in pollution.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5238 - 10677 - Dronfield - None
- 5239 Object** **Respondent: Samuel Mitchell [10678]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns over proposed housing. Concerns raised: infrastructure, social pressures, quality of life, loss of green belt and green field.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5239 - 10678 - Dronfield - None
- 5240 Object** **Respondent: Ann Middlemiss [10469]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the removal of green belt land in Dronfield. Concern over: the impact on countryside, impact on infrastructure, traffic and congestion, impact on wildlife, urban sprawl, overcrowding, pollution and health.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5240 - 10469 - Dronfield - None
- 5244 Object** **Respondent: Helen Graham [10680]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt for housing in Dronfield. Concern over: loss of green belt land, loss of recreation space, increase in traffic, impact on Moss Valley, potential increase in flooding, impact on infrastructure, urban sprawl. Statement that Council should use brownfield sites in the District and consult with Dronfield Town Council with a view to adopting the proposals in their Neighbourhood Plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5244 - 10680 - Dronfield - None

- 5245 Object** **Respondent: Mr Benjamin Newman [10683]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: impact on Heritage, loss of green belt land, exceptional circumstances, loss of agricultural and recreation land. Statement that there are multiple brownfield sites in the district. Statement that there has not been any evidence of duty to cooperate. Statement that the 731 empty homes in the District should be used. Concern over infrastructure, road safety, traffic.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5245 - 10683 - Dronfield - None
- 5249 Object** **Respondent: mrs clare vardy [10571]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I object to the proposals in the local plan regarding the building of 860 houses on green belt land. I have concerns about the impact this will have on traffic, pollution, loss of green space/wildlife, increased urban sprawl, lack of facilities/pressure on facilities to accommodate this number of people in the area (policing, schools, doctors, recreation, parking, public transport). I also object to an extension of callywhite lane industrial estate as there are already empty units so there needs to be buisnesses in place prior to expansion. I also object to this due to increased pollution and traffic.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5249 - 10571 - Dronfield - None
- 5259 Object** **Respondent: Anita Naylor [10688]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: loss of green belt land, loss of character, urban sprawl, land stability on the sites, environment, wildlife, health, loss of recreation space, congestion and infrastructure. Questions over exceptional circumstances, and statement that there are brownfield sites and derelict houses in the district that can be developed instead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5259 - 10688 - Dronfield - None
- 5265 Object** **Respondent: Rachael Richardson [10692]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: infrastructure, local services, loss of green belt land, impact on health and urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5265 - 10692 - Dronfield - None
- 5267 Object** **Respondent: Miss Carol Dent [10694]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Opposition to development on Dronfield's greenbelt. Concern over: traffic, infrastructure, congestion, local services and impact on character.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5267 - 10694 - Dronfield - None
- 5272 Object** **Respondent: Doreen Stuart [10696]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: Infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5272 - 10696 - Dronfield - None

5273 Object Respondent: Mr Tony Stevens [10697]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: infrastructure, wildlife, traffic and local services.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5273 - 10697 - Dronfield - None

5274 Object Respondent: Dee and John Smillie [10698]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: infrastructure, congestion, pollution, traffic, type of housing built, impact on Moss Valley, loss of recreational land, loss of greenbelt land, Statement that there should be a greater investigation of the available brown field sites which, if developed, could ease the need for housing in a more sustainable way.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5274 - 10698 - Dronfield - None

5279 Object Respondent: Mrs Sophie Ruddiforth [10700]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over: loss of green land, impact on infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5279 - 10700 - Dronfield - None

5281 Object Respondent: Mrs Annemarie Barker [10278]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objections to proposed housing in Dronfield. Concerns over: lack of brownfield sites, loss of green belt land and green space, lack of empty properties used, impact to wildlife, infrastructure, pollution, urban sprawl.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5281 - 10278 - Dronfield - None

5282 Object Respondent: Heather Brown [10265]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to proposed release of green belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concern over: exceptional circumstances, loss of green belt land, conflict with vision and objectives, loss of recreation space, urban sprawl, impact on character, empty homes and brownfield not used, lack of land stability assessments on proposed sites, lack of employment opportunities in Dronfield, impact on infrastructure, lack of parking, congestion, air pollution. Suggested use of Padley and Venables site, also use of Unstone boatyard. Statement that there is spare housing capacity in Chesterfield borough that the North East should use.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5282 - 10265 - Dronfield - None

5284 Object Respondent: Bob Mitchell [10702]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Statement that plan is unsound for Dronfield, because it creates a town where people cannot walk or cycle to work or shop locally and only offers an unsustainable future for all the residents. The key objectives are not deliverable. What is being proposed is irresponsible without a sound infrastructure plan being included at the consultation stage and it is contrary to both national planning policy in respect of Green Belt legislation and some of the councils own policies within the Local Plan. Questions over the consultation for Dronfield in regards to proposals.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5284 - 10702 - Dronfield - None

- 5287 Object** **Respondent: Mr and Mrs W. E. Clark [10705]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: loss of green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5287 - 10705 - Dronfield - None
- 5288 Object** **Respondent: Linda Marsh [10706]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: impact on character, urban sprawl, impact on health, wildlife, traffic congestion, impact on infrastructure and pollution.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5288 - 10706 - Dronfield - None
- 5289 Object** **Respondent: Stacey Lavda [10707]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: lack of brownfield sites used, exceptional circumstances that justify release, potential precedent of GB release in the future, loss of GB land, impact on health, urban sprawl, impact on environment and wildlife, pollution, volume of houses proposed, infrastructure, land stability, impact on heritage assets, access to Hallows site and traffic. Statement that so many houses should not be built in Dronfield, and that brownfield land in other areas should be considered first.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5289 - 10707 - Dronfield - None
- 5290 Object** **Respondent: Mr and Mrs Johnson [10708]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed release of green belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concern over: exceptional circumstances, loss of green belt land, conflict with vision and objectives, loss of recreation space, urban sprawl, impact on character, empty homes and brownfield not used, lack of land stability assessments on proposed sites, lack of employment opportunities in Dronfield, impact on infrastructure, lack of parking, congestion, air pollution. Suggested use of Padley and Venables site, also use of Unstone boatyard. Statement that there is spare housing capacity in Chesterfield borough that the North East should use.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5290 - 10708 - Dronfield - None
- 5297 Object** **Respondent: Betty Bartrim [10711]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: urban sprawl, loss of green belt land, concern over impact on visual amenity of Dronfield from 40% social housing, impact on infrastructure, congestion.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5297 - 10711 - Dronfield - None
- 5304 Object** **Respondent: Hugh Chaplain [10717]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed release of green belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concern over: exceptional circumstances, loss of green belt land, conflict with vision and objectives, loss of recreation space, urban sprawl, impact on character, empty homes and brownfield not used, lack of land stability assessments on proposed sites, lack of employment opportunities in Dronfield, impact on infrastructure, lack of parking, congestion, air pollution. Suggested use of Padley and Venables site, also use of Unstone boatyard. Statement that there is spare housing capacity in Chesterfield borough that the North East should use.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5304 - 10717 - Dronfield - None

- 5307 Object** **Respondent: Kelly Warburton [10719]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for development. concern over: urban sprawl, loss of GB land, impact on infrastructure, impact on character, potential precedence for release, congestion, lack of use of brownfield land and empty homes, justification of exceptional circumstances, loss of countryside, agricultural and recreation land, flood risk, impact on health and pollution, lack of parking. Statement that Dronfield's GB fulfils all its functions. Suggestion to cooperate with Chesterfield and Sheffield and use there land supply and brownfield sites for NEDDC housing. Statement that Dronfield is not sustainable, for more housing, overpopulation.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5307 - 10719 - Dronfield - None
- 5311 Object** **Respondent: Joe Sidney [10720]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed alteration of the Green Belt land reference 047A Hallows Golf Club for proposed housing. Concern over loss of open space and recreation land, urban sprawl, limited access, impact on infrastructure. Statement that there are enough brownfield sites in Dronfield and that the proposal to build 655 houses on Green Belt land should not even be up for consideration.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5311 - 10720 - Dronfield - None
- 5319 Object** **Respondent: Fiona Jow [10722]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: impact on infrastructure, fall in house prices, loss of green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5319 - 10722 - Dronfield - None
- 5322 Object** **Respondent: Roger Bellamy [10726]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposals in Dronfield. Concern over: infrastructure and services, drainage, land stability, access to sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5322 - 10726 - Dronfield - None
- 5335 Object** **Respondent: Mr David Oliver [10740]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Statement that there is available brownfield land in Unstone. Concern over infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5335 - 10740 - Dronfield - None
- 5340 Object** **Respondent: Mr John Hinchcliffe [10701]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Questions over why housing has moved from the south of the District to the north. Objection to proposed housing on Dronfield's GB. Concerns over: lack of brownfield and empty homes used and council owned land, lake of duty-to-cooperate, questions over exceptional circumstances.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5340 - 10701 - Dronfield - None

- 5342 Object** **Respondent: Mr Alan Griffiths [10742]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: infrastructure, increase in traffic, fracking in Dronfield and loss of GB land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5342 - 10742 - Dronfield - None
- 5347 Object** **Respondent: Julie Pelly [10746]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: impact on infrastructure, traffic, environment and urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5347 - 10746 - Dronfield - None
- 5348 Object** **Respondent: Rikki Dobson [10747]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: loss of GB land, urban sprawl, impact on wildlife and environment, loss of farmland, increase in pollution, impact on infrastructure, congestion in Dronfield and impact on road safety. Suggestion to look at brownfield sites in stead of GB land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5348 - 10747 - Dronfield - None
- 5358 Object** **Respondent: Ophelia Tilly [10751]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: infrastructure, urban sprawl, traffic that could come from the proposals.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5358 - 10751 - Dronfield - None
- 5360 Object** **Respondent: Dudley and Beryl Taylor [10752]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection tot he proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character and impact on infrastructure.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5360 - 10752 - Dronfield - None
- 5363 Object** **Respondent: Sarah Mellor [10753]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: impact on wildlife, loss of green belt land, impact on infrastructure, traffic, parking.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5363 - 10753 - Dronfield - None
- 5364 Object** **Respondent: David McMahon [10754]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concerns over: impact on character, impact on infrastructures and services, pollution.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5364 - 10754 - Dronfield - None

- 5365 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jennifer Downsborough [10755]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on 4 places in Dronfield's GB. Concern over: impact on countryside and wildlife, traffic, road safety, infrastructure, impact on Dronfield's character.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5365 - 10755 - Dronfield - None
- 5366 Object** **Respondent: Miss Fiona Hobson [10731]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to use of farm land/GB for development at Dronfield. Concern over: loss of green belt land, infrastructure, loss of green space and recreation land, impact on environment, impact on wildlife and community, urban sprawl. Suggestion that Council use brownfield sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5366 - 10731 - Dronfield - None
- 5367 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs William and Maralyn Dommatt [8020]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing allocations on Dronfield's Green Belt. Concerns over: Impact on character, impact on infrastructure, traffic, air pollution, effects on wildlife, mental health concerns. loss of GB land and lack of brownfield sites being used.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5367 - 8020 - Dronfield - None
- 5369 Object** **Respondent: Paul Sheard [10758]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: Loss of green belt, lack of brownfield sites used (boatyard in Unstone), impact on infrastructure, scale of proposals.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5369 - 10758 - Dronfield - None
- 5370 Object** **Respondent: Joanna Mottram [10759]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over access, infrastructure, impact on character, parking in the town centre, congestion.
 Also, the Golf Club has informed members that they are not intending to develop/sell the land. There are empty properties. There are brownfield sites elsewhere. The Green Belt Survey 2017 states that proposed sites should not be released.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5370 - 10759 - Dronfield - None
- 5372 Object** **Respondent: Susan and Anthony Hewitt [10761]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: impact on infrastructure, traffic, urban sprawl, loss of green space, lack of brownfield land used.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5372 - 10761 - Dronfield - None

- 5373 Object** **Respondent: Mr T Brewitt [10757]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to Dronfield and Coal Aston Local Plan based on concerns regarding removing Green Belt land, urban sprawl, over stretched public services and amenities and infrastructure, congestion, parking. Suggestion to re-designate Callywhite Lane for housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5373 - 10757 - Dronfield - None
- 5374 Object** **Respondent: Hazel Dunkey [10763]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing. concern over: infrastructure, overcrowding, lack of brownfield sites used.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5374 - 10763 - Dronfield - None
- 5375 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Kathryn Spurr [10765]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over proposed allocations on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: impact on infrastructure, and impact on wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5375 - 10765 - Dronfield - None
- 5376 Object** **Respondent: Christine Bye [10764]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerned about housing developments on the Green Belt in Dronfield. Main concerns regarding overpopulating Dronfield and stretching all infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5376 - 10764 - Dronfield - None
- 5377 Object** **Respondent: Mrs and Mr Diane and Robert Bailey [10727]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing. Concern over: loss of green belt land, impact on infrastructure, increase in traffic, impact on road safety, impact on Dronfield's character and urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5377 - 10727 - Dronfield - None
- 5378 Object** **Respondent: Christine Bye [10764]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns regarding housing development on the Green Belt in Dronfield. Main concerns: wildlife, urban sprawl, busy roads, parking, road safety, schools places, affects of coal mining.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5378 - 10764 - Dronfield - None

- 5390 Object** **Respondent: Mike Priestley [10768]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed allocation on Dronfield's GB. Concerns over: greenbelt land being used when there are plenty of brown belt land sites around the area, impact on infrastructure, access to Shakespeare Crescent.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5390 - 10768 - Dronfield - None
- 5391 Object** **Respondent: B Marsden [10769]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposals for the green belt. Concern over: infrastructure, loss of greenbelt. Statement that a new village should be made instead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5391 - 10769 - Dronfield - None
- 5419 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Kate Lyon [10629]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to development on green belt land in Dronfield and surrounding area. Main concerns are urban sprawl, congestion, health, impact on wildlife, strain on public services and infrastructure, damage to roads and flood risk.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5419 - 10629 - Dronfield - None
- 5423 Object** **Respondent: Mr Robert Harrison [10786]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: After reading the plan and looking at the proposals, there has not been a deep consideration to facilities within Dronfield, namely nurseries, schools, doctors and sports facilities which all appear to reaching maximum capacity or are about to become over subscribed. I do not object to building new houses, however this would need to be carefully considered by an outside independent party. The 10 year timescale is too short and the amount of housing proposed needs to be introduced over +40 years with an increase in schools and facilities increasing the same.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5423 - 10786 - Dronfield - None
- 5424 Object** **Respondent: Mrs M Farmer [10787]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to development on Green Belt land in Dronfield. Main concerns are impact on the road network with constructions vehicles, urban sprawl, lack of existing bus services, increase in traffic and potholes, danger to pedestrians, lack of school places, strain on GP services, negative impact on health, overall development making Dronfield a less desirable place to live.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5424 - 10787 - Dronfield - None
- 5425 Object** **Respondent: Mrs B Sutton [10789]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to development on Greenbelt Land in Dronfield. Main concerns are infrastructure, public services, Conservation Area, SSSI, high risk building areas, school places, extra traffic, safety for pedestrians, public transport and uncertainty for Dronfield Station.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5425 - 10789 - Dronfield - None

- 5457 Object** **Respondent: Neil Ashby-Senior [10795]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: loss of GB land, urban sprawl, loss of green and recreation space, impact on Moss Valley and Wildlife, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, lack of cooperation with neighbouring authorities, impact on existing infrastructure and services, parking, congestion, access, historic expansion of Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5457 - 10795 - Dronfield - None
- 5458 Object** **Respondent: Richard Sharpe [10796]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, impact on environment, impact on infrastructure, traffic, urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5458 - 10796 - Dronfield - None
- 5460 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Hague [10797]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to developing housing on Green Belt land. Main concerns, brownfield land has not been maximised, demands on infrastructure already at capacity.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5460 - 10797 - Dronfield - None
- 5466 Object** **Respondent: M K & J C Stevens [10800]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concerns over: inconsistency with NPPF, justification of exceptional circumstances, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, urban sprawl, impact on infrastructure, impact on environment and wildlife, loss of green space, impact on landscape, impact on traffic and road safety,
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5466 - 10800 - Dronfield - None
- 5469 Object** **Respondent: Mr Peter Warrington [10801]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: loss of green belt land, impact on infrastructure, loss of green space, urban sprawl, air pollution and health concerns.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5469 - 10801 - Dronfield - None
- 5472 Object** **Respondent: Mr A Dawson [10802]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's GB and conservation area. Concerns over: sites are AONB's and site J is in a conservation area, the precedence for resisting development on GB, proposal against national and local policy, impact on wildlife, land stability, impact on health and pollution, impact on infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5472 - 10802 - Dronfield - None

5475 Object**Respondent: Mr Matthew Dunn [10803]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's GB and conservation area. Concerns over: sites are AONB's and site J is in a conservation area, the precedence for resisting development on GB, proposal against national and local policy, impact on wildlife, land stability, impact on health and pollution, impact on infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5475 - 10803 - Dronfield - None

5478 Object**Respondent: Neil R Cooper [10804]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: impact on traffic, impact on infrastructure, justification of exceptional circumstances, urban sprawl, loss of countryside, impact on heritage, types of housing to be built.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5478 - 10804 - Dronfield - None

5483 Object**Respondent: Mr L Stocks [10798]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to developing housing on Green Belt land in Dronfield. The Housing White Paper does not remove the protection the Green Belt currently has. Exceptional circumstances should be demonstrated. Unmet housing demand does not qualify as an exceptional circumstance. Have the following actions been undertaken: a. all brownfield sites explored, including Callywhite Lane land which has not attracted business for last 10yrs; b+c. looked at neighbouring areas; c. Sheffield Football Ground; d. regeneration in the south; why largest towns should take most development; e. empty properties. No infrastructure Plan. No clear plan for employment provision. Insufficient parking at Railway station.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5483 - 10798 - Dronfield - None

5484 Object

Respondent: Lauren Oldale [10805]

Agent: N/A

Summary: objection to proposed local plan in consultation period, by North East Derbyshire District Council.
Objection centres on the removal of the Green Belt land surrounding Dronfield.
My reasons for this objection are as follows:-

Local community

The Purpose of Greenbelt Status

Wildlife & environment

Health and wellbeing

Transport & infrastructure

Schools & education

Doctors

Heritage

Previous coal mining activity

Loss of Recreational Space / Reduced Access to Countryside and Footpaths

Loss of Farmland

The Fracking Threat

Concerns Regards Employment and Industrial Development

Brownfield Sites and Vacant Properties

Dronfield's Railway Station

Dronfield is not a Sustainable Community for Large Scale Development

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5484 - 10805 - Dronfield - None

5485 Object**Respondent: R. A. Oldale [10807]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: objection to proposed local plan in consultation period, by North East Derbyshire District Council.
Objection centres on the removal of the Green Belt land surrounding Dronfield.
My reasons for this objection are as follows:-

Local community

The Purpose of Greenbelt Status

Wildlife & environment

Health and wellbeing

Transport & infrastructure

Schools & education

Doctors

Heritage

Previous coal mining activity

Loss of Recreational Space / Reduced Access to Countryside and Footpaths

Loss of Farmland

The Fracking Threat

Concerns Regards Employment and Industrial Development

Brownfield Sites and Vacant Properties

Dronfield's Railway Station

Dronfield is not a Sustainable Community for Large Scale Development

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5485 - 10807 - Dronfield - None

5486 Object**Respondent: Erin Oldale [10808]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: objection to proposed local plan in consultation period, by North East Derbyshire District Council.
Objection centres on the removal of the Green Belt land surrounding Dronfield.
My reasons for this objection are as follows:-

Local community

The Purpose of Greenbelt Status

Wildlife & environment

Health and wellbeing

Transport & infrastructure

Schools & education

Doctors

Heritage

Previous coal mining activity

Loss of Recreational Space / Reduced Access to Countryside and Footpaths

Loss of Farmland

The Fracking Threat

Concerns Regards Employment and Industrial Development

Brownfield Sites and Vacant Properties

Dronfield's Railway Station

Dronfield is not a Sustainable Community for Large Scale Development

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5486 - 10808 - Dronfield - None

5487 Object**Respondent: Alison Oldale [10809]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: objection to proposed local plan in consultation period, by North East Derbyshire District Council.
Objection centres on the removal of the Green Belt land surrounding Dronfield.
My reasons for this objection are as follows:-

Local community

The Purpose of Greenbelt Status

Wildlife & environment

Health and wellbeing

Transport & infrastructure

Schools & education

Doctors

Heritage

Previous coal mining activity

Loss of Recreational Space / Reduced Access to Countryside and Footpaths

Loss of Farmland

The Fracking Threat

Concerns Regards Employment and Industrial Development

Brownfield Sites and Vacant Properties

Dronfield's Railway Station

Dronfield is not a Sustainable Community for Large Scale Development

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5487 - 10809 - Dronfield - None

5488 Object**Respondent: Vicki Neil [10811]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: infrastructure, services, parking at railway station, increase in traffic, scale of proposed housing, loss of GB land, lack of brownfield sites and empty houses used.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5488 - 10811 - Dronfield - None

5491 Object **Respondent: Mr J T Wright [10810]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield, concerned about damaging the character of Dronfield, infrastructure, road access, traffic, parking, air pollution, school places, waiting times at the doctors.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5491 - 10810 - Dronfield - None

5492 Object **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Kim Harris [10813]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: noise and pollution, impact on wildlife and conservation, impact on climate change, increase in traffic and congestion, strain on infrastructure, services and amenities, impact on heritage, impact on health, impact on landscape, impact on employment, overcrowding, loss of farm land, loss of privacy, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5492 - 10813 - Dronfield - None

5494 Object **Respondent: Mrs E Wright [10814]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to building houses in Dronfield based on concerns regarding effects on increased traffic and congestion, strain on public services such as school places and waiting times for the doctors. Concerns over losing the character of Dronfield.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5494 - 10814 - Dronfield - None

5510 Object **Respondent: Mrs Judith Parkin [10816]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to developing Green Belt land in Dronfield for housing based on concerns around threats to wildlife, urban sprawl, air pollution, traffic, little parking at the railway station. Concerned that brownfield sites have not been taken into consideration and government policy is not being adhered to.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5510 - 10816 - Dronfield - None

5514 Object **Respondent: M Prentice [10822]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing developments in Dronfield on the Green Belt based on concerns around reducing the width of the Green Belt and merging towns and villages. Further concerns over threats to wildlife, sports facilities, fracking and the whole impact on making Dronfield a less desirable place to live.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5514 - 10822 - Dronfield - None

- 5606 Object** **Respondent: Matthew Reaney [10848]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to using green belt land for housing development in Dronfield. Main concerns over: impact on: infrastructure, traffic and public transport, lack of brownfield sites used, potential noise and traffic pollution, exceptional circumstances, lack of evidence of duty to cooperate, potential precedent for GB release and impact on health.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5606 - 10848 - Dronfield - None
- 5630 Object** **Respondent: Eric Catchpole [10862]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns over: loss of countryside, impact on wildlife, impact on physical and mental health and well-being, urban sprawl, pollution, traffic, impact on environment, impact on infrastructure, lack of parking, lack of brownfield sites used, justification of exceptional circumstances, precedent of GB release, loss of greenfield land. Suggestion to use land near Callywhite Lane for housing.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5630 - 10862 - Dronfield - None
- 5632 Object** **Respondent: Mrs C Gray [10867]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concern over: effects on health, impact on wildlife, loss of countryside land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5632 - 10867 - Dronfield - None
- 5641 Object** **Respondent: E Brown [10869]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development on the Green Belt land surrounding Dronfield. Concerns over: the impact on infrastructure, pollution, health.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5641 - 10869 - Dronfield - None
- 5646 Object** **Respondent: Geoffrey A Flavell [10872]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the use of Green Belt land in Dronfield for housing. Concerns over: impact on infrastructure, traffic. Suggestion for the Council to build a new settlement.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5646 - 10872 - Dronfield - None
- 5653 Object** **Respondent: Mr Robert Gilmore [10344]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The proposed level of housing in Dronfield is significant & the evidence base does not suggest it could sustainably accommodate it. Further work should be provided which correctly supports the level of housing which the Town could accommodate. Until this is provided the Plan should be considered unsound.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5653 - 10344 - Dronfield - None

- 5655 Object** **Respondent: Mr A.S Jackson [10875]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the housing development on Green Belt land in Dronfield. Main concerns over: urban sprawl and loss of identity, loss of countryside, impact on quality of life, traffic, impact on infrastructure, lack of need for new housing in Dronfield, concern over exceptional circumstances. contradiction with earlier policies (SS9). Concerns around the legislation in obtaining Green Belt land for housing and the need for housing in this area.
 Second letter added that also objects to the release of GB land in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5655 - 10875 - Dronfield - None
- 5658 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Shirley Cocking [10882]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development on the Green Belt in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5658 - 10882 - Dronfield - None
- 5662 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs M L Holland [10884]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to Dronfield housing development J & H. Concerns over: the effects of additional cars, traffic, parking and access. Concerned about the future of the golf course and its club house.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5662 - 10884 - Dronfield - None
- 5677 Object** **Respondent: Geoff Hall [10888]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the housing development in Dronfield, main concerns are for the using the Green Belt land to build on, urban sprawl, traffic, strain on local services, making Dronfield a less desirable place to live, impact on existing infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5677 - 10888 - Dronfield - None
- 5687 Object** **Respondent: Mrs P I Bennett [10889]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed development on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: roads in Dronfield, lack of existing parking, impact on infrastructure and loss of GB land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5687 - 10889 - Dronfield - None
- 5690 Object** **Respondent: Miss R Greenfield [10892]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using green belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns regarding the use of green belt land instead of brownfield land, impact on: infrastructure, health care services, parking, traffic congestion, road infrastructure, quality of life for existing residents. Concern over increase in crime. Concern over increase in housing compared with 2011 plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5690 - 10892 - Dronfield - None

- 5691 Object** **Respondent: Mrs J Greenfield [10893]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using green belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns regarding the use of green belt land instead of brownfield land, impact on: infrastructure, parking, traffic congestion, road infrastructure, quality of life for existing residents. Concern over increase in proposed housing concern with 2011 plan. Concern over loss of green space. Acceptance that some development will need to take place in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5691 - 10893 - Dronfield - None
- 5692 Object** **Respondent: Mr D Garside [10894]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using green belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns regarding the use of green belt land instead of brownfield land, impact on infrastructure, health care services, parking, traffic congestion, road infrastructure, impact on quality of life for existing residents. Concern over increase in compared housing compared to the last plan. Acceptance that some development maybe necessary in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5692 - 10894 - Dronfield - None
- 5693 Object** **Respondent: Mrs J Garside [10895]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using green belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns regarding the use of green belt land instead of brownfield land, scale of proposed development, impact on infrastructure, health care services, parking, traffic congestion, road infrastructure, potential increase in crime, quality of life for existing residents, affecting Dronfield as a desirable place to live.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5693 - 10895 - Dronfield - None
- 5694 Object** **Respondent: Michael Bennett [10891]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation on Dronfield's GB (sits (I) and (H)). Concern over: infrastructure, parking, lack of potential to expand existing services, topography of proposed sites, increase in flood risk, impact on wildlife, potential increase in pollution and traffic in and around the proposed sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5694 - 10891 - Dronfield - None
- 5695 Object** **Respondent: Kirsty and Kevin Schofield [10896]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: loss of GB land, impact on environment and wildlife, increase in pollution and traffic, impact on resident's health, impact on infrastructure, roads and sewage system. Statement that there is sufficient brown land for housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5695 - 10896 - Dronfield - None
- 5698 Object** **Respondent: Mr Andrew Brown [10897]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed development on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: justification of exceptional circumstances, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, lack of duty-to-cooperate, urban sprawl, loss of green infrastructure, increase in traffic and air pollution, loss of GB land and loss of recreation space, lack of existing amenities around proposals, impact on existing infrastructure, lack of parking. Comment that it is government policy to include infrastructure in Local Plans, and you clearly have not done so. Suggestion to move development to the south of the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5698 - 10897 - Dronfield - None

5699 Object Respondent: Mr David Ryan [10898]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to proposed housing on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: impact on character, impact on infrastructure, loss of recreation land, road safety.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5699 - 10898 - Dronfield - None

5700 Object Respondent: Mr James Vardy [10900]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: justification of exceptional circumstances, urban sprawl, loss of GB land and green space, impact on Dronfield's character, scale of proposals, impact on health and wildlife, local plan is not in accordance with national policy, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, types of housing proposed, increase in traffic, road safety, access to sites, impact on infrastructure. Questions over duty-to-cooperate with Sheffield and CBC. Statement that development should be in smaller settlements. Suggestion to re-designate Callywhite Lane for Housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5700 - 10900 - Dronfield - None

5701 Object Respondent: Mr M K Newton [10899]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to the use of Green Belt land in Dronfield for housing developments. Main concerns are for: preserving the land, impacts on nature and wildlife, impacts on heritage assets, impact on conservation area, urban sprawl, loss of valuable farm land for food, loss of land for outdoor sports and recreational activities, road safety, noise and pollution, road safety, concern over loss of GB land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5701 - 10899 - Dronfield - None

5704 Object Respondent: Mr Peter MacKay [10902]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to proposed housing on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: impact on infrastructure, lack of duty-to-cooperate, the railway station possibly being moved out of Dronfield, lack of brownfield sites used, urban sprawl.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5704 - 10902 - Dronfield - None

5706 Object Respondent: Corinne Leader [10903]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: loss of GB land, urban sprawl, impact on wildlife.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5706 - 10903 - Dronfield - None

5707 Object Respondent: Steve Lyon [10905]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: loss of GB land, urban sprawl, impact on character, loss of green and recreation space, impact on wildlife and conservation, justification of exceptional circumstances, lack of empty homes and brownfield sites used, lack of duty-to-cooperate, impact on infrastructure and potential precedence of green belt release.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5707 - 10905 - Dronfield - None

- 5708 Object** **Respondent: Brian James [10904]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using green belt land in Dronfield to build housing. Based on concerns regarding the strain on services and infrastructure, impact on character, impact on health, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, increase in traffic and pollution. Concerned brown field has not been considered before proposing green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5708 - 10904 - Dronfield - None
- 5709 Object** **Respondent: Neville Oxnard [10906]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the use of Green Belt land in Dronfield for housing. Main concerns are for infrastructure, health and welfare, type of properties suggested for building, consideration for brownfield land instead of green belt, changing the character of Dronfield, urban sprawl, justification of exceptional circumstances.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5709 - 10906 - Dronfield - None
- 5710 Object** **Respondent: P W Nicholson [10907]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to building housing in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns for the extra households putting strain on infrastructure and services, concern over increase in traffic, urban sprawl and lack of brownfield sites used.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5710 - 10907 - Dronfield - None
- 5711 Object** **Respondent: David & Beryl Axe [10908]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development on Green Belt land in Dronfield. Concerns for urban sprawl, strain on doctors appointments, school places, parking.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5711 - 10908 - Dronfield - None
- 5712 Object** **Respondent: Dr R E Paine [10909]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development on Greenbelt land in Dronfield. Main concerns are for: infrastructure, parking, danger on the roads for children, strain on public services, loss of GB land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5712 - 10909 - Dronfield - None
- 5713 Object** **Respondent: Mrs H Tilly [10910]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development on Green Belt land in Dronfield. Concerns are for: loss of GB land, urban sprawl, impact on wildlife, changing the character of Dronfield, impact on infrastructure, lack of consideration for brownfield sites, old industrial sites and empty homes.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5713 - 10910 - Dronfield - None

- 5714 Object** **Respondent: Mr David Arthur Hobson [10911]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the use of Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerned over: loss of GB land, impact on wildlife, impacts on infrastructure, loss of recreation facilities, loss of green space, pollution, congestion. Suggestion to use brownfield sites and empty houses before Green Belt.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5714 - 10911 - Dronfield - None
- 5715 Object** **Respondent: Anderson [10912]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the Local Plan to build on Green Belt land in Dronfield. Concerns for using Green Belt land, strain on traffic, doctors, schools and parking.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5715 - 10912 - Dronfield - None
- 5717 Object** **Respondent: R H & J M Guite & C J Waddoups [10914]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the use of Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns over: loss of GB land, urban sprawl, impact on infrastructure, parking, traffic.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5717 - 10914 - Dronfield - None
- 5718 Object** **Respondent: David & Beryl Axe [10908]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the housing development on Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns over: overpopulating Dronfield, impact on environment, increase in traffic, pollution, noise, smells, impact on wildlife. Suggestion to use brownfield sites instead.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5718 - 10908 - Dronfield - None
- 5719 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Diane Jackson [10915]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing development in Dronfield. Concerns over: evidence that other options have not been considered, lack of brownfield and empty houses used, temporary requirement for additional housing, justification of exceptional circumstances, urban sprawl, irreversible affects on the countryside and public services, increase in crime.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5719 - 10915 - Dronfield - None
- 5720 Object** **Respondent: Mr Steve Basford [10745]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land in Dronfield for housing. Concerns are for infrastructure, schools, medical services, traffic, parking, pollution.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5720 - 10745 - Dronfield - None

5721 Object **Respondent: Paul Scott [10920]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield. Concerns are for the removal of Green Belt land, strain on public services, traffic on narrow roads, spoiling the environment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5721 - 10920 - Dronfield - None

5722 Object **Respondent: Mrs Tracy J Ellender [10921]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to removal of Green Belt land for housing development in Dronfield and Coal Aston. Concerns are for removing green belt, strain on public services, parking, overall infrastructure, wildlife, traffic.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5722 - 10921 - Dronfield - None

5723 Object **Respondent: Lynne Scott [10922]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield. Concerns are for the removal of Green Belt land, strain on public services, traffic on narrow roads, spoiling the environment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5723 - 10922 - Dronfield - None

5724 Object **Respondent: Richard Sharpe [10796]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection for the use of Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns mainly for consideration for empty houses in Dronfield, urban sprawl, character of Dronfield, traffic, congestion and parking.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5724 - 10796 - Dronfield - None

5725 Object **Respondent: Karen Birtles [10923]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield and industrial expansion. Concerns are for traffic, pollution, use of green belt land, urban sprawl, setting a precedence for the future, strain on GP services, parking, wildlife, reduced access to open spaces.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5725 - 10923 - Dronfield - None

5726 Object **Respondent: Jared Manley [10924]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to loss of Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerned over overpopulating Dronfield with new families, strain on health care services, school places, traffic and congestion, noise pollution, parking.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5726 - 10924 - Dronfield - None

- 5727 Object** **Respondent: Daniel Jackson [10925]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development on Dronfield on Green Belt sites. Concerns around use of brown field sites first, safeguard the countryside, urban sprawl, empty properties, conservation area, green fields, traffic, infrastructure, doctors appointments, school places.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5727 - 10925 - Dronfield - None
- 5735 Object** **Respondent: David, Jayne, Bethan Evans [10926]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development plans in Dronfield on Green Belt land.
 Concerns are for losing Green Belt land, urban sprawl, setting a precedent for the future, mental health, traffic, parking, school places, health care.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5735 - 10926 - Dronfield - None
- 5861 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Rita Dobson [11044]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5861 - 11044 - Dronfield - None
- 5862 Object** **Respondent: Mrs P Horry [11045]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns are for losing the land, merging with surrounding towns, wildlife, facilities, infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5862 - 11045 - Dronfield - None
- 5863 Object** **Respondent: S Fisher [11046]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns are for the affects on residents who use the land, urban sprawl, farming, mental health, infrastructure, consideration for brownfield sites, setting a precedent for more Green Belt land to be used in the future.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5863 - 11046 - Dronfield - None
- 5864 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Christine Dobson [10660]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns are for using Green Belt land, infrastructure, school places, GP services, urban sprawl, character of Dronfield, wildlife, recreational us.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5864 - 10660 - Dronfield - None

- 5869 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Enid Lumb [10204]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns are for not using brownfield sites first and evidence of actions taken, school places, doctors appointments, traffic, health.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5869 - 10204 - Dronfield - None
- 5870 Object** **Respondent: Georgina Veitch [11050]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield. Concerns are for using Green Belt land for development, school places and class sizes, traffic, congestion, pollution, GP appointments, available brownfield sites and empty houses, changing the character of Dronfield, urban sprawl, wildlife, available recreational space.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5870 - 11050 - Dronfield - None
- 5871 Object** **Respondent: Grant Veitch [11051]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield. Concerns are for school places, traffic, congestion, road safety, pollution, GP appointments, use of Green Belt land, wildlife, available recreational space, urban sprawl, protecting the character of Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5871 - 11051 - Dronfield - None
- 5872 Object** **Respondent: Mrs R Goff [11052]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield. Main concerns are for impact on using Green Belt land, more houses on this scales means for buildings for public services, infrastructure, traffic, impact on current residents.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5872 - 11052 - Dronfield - None
- 5873 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Rocca [11053]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for evidence brownfield sites have been considered, infrastructure, school places, GP appointments, traffic and congestion, parking, road safety, lack of green space, mental health, consideration for vacant houses, urban sprawl, flood risk.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5873 - 11053 - Dronfield - None
- 5875 Object** **Respondent: Ms Rachel Sharpe [11054]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the use of Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield and Coal Aston. Concerns are for the Green Belt, urban sprawl, merging towns, safeguarding the countryside, protecting the character of the area, lack of consideration for brownfield and empty houses for housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5875 - 11054 - Dronfield - None

- 5876 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Nichola Goodwin [11055]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land in Dronfield for housing developments. Main concerns are for lack of infrastructure to cope with the increase in population and lack of a proposed plan to improve the infrastructure, urban sprawl, mental health, use of green belt for recreational purposes, use of rail way station, parking, medical services, school places.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5876 - 11055 - Dronfield - None
- 5877 Object** **Respondent: Mr Andrew Goodwin [10686]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land in Dronfield for housing developments. Main concerns are for lack of infrastructure to cope with the increase in population and lack of a proposed plan to improve the infrastructure, urban sprawl, mental health, use of green belt for recreational purposes, use of rail way station, parking, medical services, school places.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5877 - 10686 - Dronfield - None
- 5878 Object** **Respondent: Graham Ellender [11057]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to removal of Green Belt land for housing development in Dronfield and Coal Aston. Concerns are for removing green belt, strain on public services, parking, overall infrastructure, wildlife, traffic.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5878 - 11057 - Dronfield - None
- 5879 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Vivien Hobson [11058]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the use of Green Belt land for housing Dronfield. Concerned about removing greenbelt land used by residents and wildlife, affects on infrastructure, doctors, school places, recreation facilities, pollution. Suggestion to use brownfield sites before Green Belt.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5879 - 11058 - Dronfield - None
- 5880 Object** **Respondent: J Lockwood [11059]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to building more houses in Dronfield, concerned there are enough houses and object to using Green Belt land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5880 - 11059 - Dronfield - None
- 5881 Object** **Respondent: J & L Oldham [11060]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing Development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for consideration for current residents, urban sprawl, school places, GP appointments, changing the character of the town, traffic, consideration for other possible sites not using Green Belt land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5881 - 11060 - Dronfield - None

- 5882 Object** **Respondent: Susan Brown [11061]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the use of Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns are for locations suggested having an impact on crime rates, the use of Green Belt land, school places, doctors appointments, road safety, consideration for alternative sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5882 - 11061 - Dronfield - None
- 5905 Object** **Respondent: Cheryl Bowen [11066]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing development in Dronfield. Main concerns are for urban sprawl, safeguarding countryside, lack of green space, affects on wildlife, complying with government policy, options to use brownfield sites, becoming overpopulated, pollution, congestion and road safety, parking, school places, GP appointments, police presence.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5905 - 11066 - Dronfield - None
- 5906 Object** **Respondent: Nicola Walker [11067]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing development in Dronfield. Main concerns are for urban sprawl, safeguarding countryside, lack of green space, affects on wildlife, complying with government policy, options to use brownfield sites, becoming overpopulated, pollution, congestion and road safety, parking, school places, GP appointments, police presence.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5906 - 11067 - Dronfield - None
- 5907 Object** **Respondent: A & A Dawson [11068]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the use of Green Belt land in Dronfield for housing. Main concerns are for losing the Green Belt, use of brownfield first, impact on wildlife, road access, school places, strain of doctors and dentists practises.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5907 - 11068 - Dronfield - None
- 5908 Object** **Respondent: Martin & Sue Beaumont [11069]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Main concerns are for the use of green belt, urban sprawl, school places, GP services, access to proposed sites, noise pollution, pollution, encouraging residents to down size to make family homes available.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5908 - 11069 - Dronfield - None
- 5910 Object** **Respondent: William Clarke [11070]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land in Dronfield for housing. Main concerns are for steep and narrow roads already congested, pollution, impact on wildlife, school places, strain on medical facilities, parking, use of brownfield sites and empty houses instead of green belt land, urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5910 - 11070 - Dronfield - None

5922 Object**Respondent: Ms Pamela Jones [11081]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Failure to consider alternatives.
No innovative approach to the provision of suitable viable development sites. A number of the areas have technical difficulties making development prohibitively expensive.

Infrastructure for new population

Disproportionate level of Developer led influence. The selection process could be seen to be questionable.

The Plan fails to:

1. Safeguard the risk of "merging of the township".
2. Preserve the setting and character of Dronfield, a Domesday mentioned township.
3. Encourage regeneration via the use of brownfield sites.

Failure to meet the founding purposes of the Green Belt legislation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5922 - 11081 - Dronfield - None

5924 Object**Respondent: Elizabeth & Ben Dashper & Johnson [11082]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land in Dronfield for housing. Concerns are for urban sprawl, change in the character of the land, use of brownfield sites instead, impact on infrastructure, school, doctors, amenities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5924 - 11082 - Dronfield - None

5927 Object**Respondent: Mr L A Joel [11085]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing allocations. Concern over traffic congestion, road safety and pollution. Concern over how the existing infrastructure will accommodate the proposed increase in housing. Concern over the increase in flood risk. concern over loss of farm land and green belt land. Concern over potential urban sprawl ruining the character of Dronfield. Concern over how the Callywhite Lane extension could impact on roads.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5927 - 11085 - Dronfield - None

5928 Object**Respondent: M Grant [11086]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for loss of green space land for recreation and farming, policy guidelines, use of brownfield sites and empty houses first, using land in neighbouring districts first, urban sprawl, infrastructure, school places, medical facilities, parking, employment opportunities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5928 - 11086 - Dronfield - None

5948 Object**Respondent: Benita Cegarra [8086]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objects to building on Green Belt land around Dronfield and Coal Aston. No special circumstances can be demonstrated.

Most pressing concern is the proposed site within Moss Valley Conservation Area. Its is recreational space, open farm land, an SSSI and within an area that has been classified "high risk" by the Coal Authority.

There are hundreds of empty properties.

Concerns about topography, access, environment, railway station, schools and other infrastructure.

Callywhite Lane extension to be used for housing.

No evidence of demand from within the town for additional residences, which means that the homes are intended for people from elsewhere.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5948 - 8086 - Dronfield - None

5954 Object**Respondent: Mr Daniel Cocker [11101]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: object to the changes to local plan to remove existing green belt and replace it with housing allocation. All changes propose impact on 5 purposes of Green Belt.

Brownfield sites should be considered first.

Requesting sites from landowners/developers first and then allocation them is wrong.

Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated.

NEDDC should meet with Chesterfield Borough Council to discuss how they could work together to achieve a suitable housing provision. There is an extensive amount of prime residential brown field within CBC, and little housing within the center of Chesterfield where the bulk of housing should be.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5954 - 11101 - Dronfield - None

5959 Object**Respondent: Mrs Mavis Ashby [8109]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I can't see that sufficient due diligence has been done for the local plan and as it stands, the local plan would cause far more issues than it solves (none of which have been properly addressed). If the local plan went ahead in its current form it would create a dangerous precedent for more green belt building in 2033 when the next local plan would begin. This would greatly reduce the character, heritage and quality of life in Dronfield when the role of the Council should be to preserve and enhance these attributes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5959 - 8109 - Dronfield - None

5962 Object**Respondent: Ms Rhian Harding [10774]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: loss of GB land, impact on environment, wildlife and health, loss of community, scale of the proposals, road safety, urban sprawl, impact on heritage, infrastructure. Request for an EIA and a HIA as part of the consultation process, and also that Coal Aston is treated as a separate village.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5962 - 10774 - Dronfield - None

- 5964 Object** **Respondent: Warren Chinn [11106]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over impact on: countryside, environment, character, infrastructure, traffic. Further concerns over: air pollutions and congestion.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5964 - 11106 - Dronfield - None
- 5969 Object** **Respondent: S Ward [11107]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection over the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Statement that brownfield land exists in Dronfield. Concern over impact on: crime, infrastructure, traffic .
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5969 - 11107 - Dronfield - None
- 5975 Object** **Respondent: David Inkersole [11112]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing developments in Dronfield, Hallows Golf Course and Shakespeare Crescent . Concerns are for loss of green space, impact on recreational facilities, infrastructure, increase in population, traffic, parking, GP appointments, school places. Although regrettable, no objection to Hilltop Road and Eckington Rd.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5975 - 11112 - Dronfield - None
- 5978 Object** **Respondent: Dronfield Green Belt Resident's Group (Mrs Lynne Gadsden) [10537]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Greenbelt Land. Main concerns are for loss of green belt land for its functions, urban sprawl, changing character of Dronfield, loss of green space, use of empty houses and brownfield sites before using Green Belt land, impact on wildlife, increase in population, strain on infrastructure and services, pollution, road safety, congestion, school places, GP appointments.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5978 - 10537 - Dronfield - None
- 5979 Object** **Respondent: Kita Whitehead [11114]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over: Impact on character, urban sprawl, congestion, impact on infrastructure, pollution, road safety, concern over precedent of greenbelt release.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5979 - 11114 - Dronfield - None
- 5993 Object** **Respondent: Mr Alex Dale [8392]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Objections included; loss of character, urban sprawl, loss of countryside, no allowance for windfall housing, impact on infrastructure, pressure on roads in particular around the Callywhite Land Industrial Estate. 116 Supporting documents from surveys to local residents, showed support or objection on a scale from 0-10; 107 oppose development (0-3), 3 neutral to development (4-6), 6 support development (7-10).
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5993 - 8392 - Dronfield - None

- 6003 Object** **Respondent: Liz Salt [11117]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Reasons for objection: impact on infrastructure, roads and traffic, urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6003 - 11117 - Dronfield - None
- 6019 Object** **Respondent: Ronald Hills [11119]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed development allocations in Dronfield. Reasons for objection: Impact on infrastructure, pressure on roads, possible impacts on lifestyle/ health, loss of green space.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6019 - 11119 - Dronfield - None
- 6025 Object** **Respondent: Nicola Clayton [11121]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield and Coal Aston on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for losing green belt land, urban sprawl, lack of brownfield sites used, impact on mental health, school places, traffic, pollution, parking, road safety.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6025 - 11121 - Dronfield - None
- 6029 Object** **Respondent: Lisa Hicks [11120]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I object to the proposals in the Local Plan to redesignate the areas of Green Belt marked G, H, I, J and K. Concerns over: impacts on infrastructure: affect on public bridleways, wellbeing of local residents, lack of car parking provision, increase in congestion, air pollution, lack of co-operation with neighbouring authorities, urban sprawl, impact on employment, access to medical services, distribution of proposed dwellings, school provision. Concern over access to some of the proposed sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6029 - 11120 - Dronfield - None
- 6040 Object** **Respondent: J M Tranmer [11125]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: infrastructure, character and road safety.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6040 - 11125 - Dronfield - None
- 6041 Object** **Respondent: Peter & Beryl Hopkins [11126]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: impact on character, infrastructure and increased traffic.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6041 - 11126 - Dronfield - None

- 6043 Object** **Respondent: Mr Peter Gray [10849]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Reason for objection: lose a vital area of greenbelt land, part of The Moss Valley Conservation land, with the resultant adverse effect on flora and fauna as well as the visual impact and inevitable creep of Urban Sprawl towards Sheffield. Land at the village hall was sold to the Council to be used for sports and recreational activities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6043 - 10849 - Dronfield - None
- 6046 Object** **Respondent: Rebecca Akid [10788]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: exceptional circumstances, lack of brownfield sites used, station not efficient enough for proposed population increase, congestion, urban sprawl, against national policy, lack of employment opportunities, impact on existing infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6046 - 10788 - Dronfield - None
- 6047 Object** **Respondent: Mr Barry Gray [10320]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Reasons for objection: pressure on roads, not enough parking for central facilities, impact on infrastructure especially schools and doctors surgeries, air pollution.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6047 - 10320 - Dronfield - None
- 6048 Object** **Respondent: Dr Tony Drury-Smith [11127]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed building in Dronfield. Concern over: impact on congestions, impact on public services, impact on health, impact on wildlife, pollution, increased flood risk, cost of housing, impact on infrastructure, the need to plan more affordable housing, lack of brownfield and urban sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6048 - 11127 - Dronfield - None
- 6094 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection for proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons for objections: loss of character, urban sprawl, questions whether affordable housing is achievable, underuse of brownfield sites and empty houses, employment development proposals do not match with employment type most residents are in, development locations unsustainable in relation to the railway station, pressure infrastructure, safety of pedestrians and residents on roads.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6094 - 10593 - Dronfield - None
- 6104 Object** **Respondent: Rachel Harris [11131]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I am writing to object to the removal of green belt land surrounding Dronfield, as this is what makes Dronfield special.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6104 - 11131 - Dronfield - None

- 6125 Object** **Respondent: Jennifer Bellamy [11133]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development on Green Belt land in Dronfield. Main concerns are for consideration of brownfield and empty houses, type of housing to be built, road conditions specifically Hill Top Road, traffic, strain on public services, school places, GP appointments, dentist appointments.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6125 - 11133 - Dronfield - None
- 6126 Object** **Respondent: Dronfield Town Council (Mr Andrew Tristram) [7841]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed Housing Allocations on Dronfield's green belt.
 Reason's:
 -No greenbelt land should be used for housing development.
 -Brownfield sites should be reviewed and checked for viability and sustainability.
 -Scale of proposals to high and base on unrealistic and inflated assumptions about jobs and growth, ignoring identity and its economic position, and should be reviewed.
 -The housing and employment site requirements should be in proportion to existing and proven market evidence, taking into account existing needs and to include an element for the real level of suppressed demand from the Dronfield itself.
 - A full review of infrastructure and the cumulative effect further development should be undertaken.
 -Impact on: traffic, pollution, quality of life, infrastructure and loss of greenfield sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6126 - 7841 - Dronfield - None
- 6127 Object** **Respondent: Carole Agar [11134]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield near Green Lane. Main concerns are for traffic, pollution, road safety, school places, loss of leisure facilities, strain on doctors appointments.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6127 - 11134 - Dronfield - None
- 6130 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jennifer Marsden [11135]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing developments on Green Belt land in Dronfield. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land for development instead of brownfield sites or using empty houses, traffic, road safety and conditions, school places, GP appointments.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6130 - 11135 - Dronfield - None
- 6131 Object** **Respondent: Daryll Swift [11136]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Main concerns are for consideration for brownfield sites ahead of green belt, empty houses, over population.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6131 - 11136 - Dronfield - None

- 6132 Object** **Respondent: Toby Hudson [11137]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land, road safety, traffic, lack of local employment, congestion, less access to green space for recreation, strain on public services, loss of the Golf Course grounds.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6132 - 11137 - Dronfield - None
- 6133 Object** **Respondent: Gareth Barber [11129]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to proposed housing developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objections, impacts on infrastructure: impact on public bridleways, proposals do not support Policy ID3, detrimental impacts on health and lifestyle, lack of parking at the railway station, increase in congestion around central facilities and services, air pollution, underuse of neighbouring authority housing capacity, urban sprawl, employment provision not matching with housing provision, pressure on doctors surgeries, implications of developments being built on former coal mining sites, pressure on schools.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6133 - 11129 - Dronfield - None
- 6137 Object** **Respondent: P S Smith [11139]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing developments in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns are for urban sprawl, environmental impacts, changing the character of Dronfield, school places, strain on GP services, roads, parking, pollution, loss of recreation areas.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6137 - 11139 - Dronfield - None
- 6140 Object** **Respondent: Laura Haydock [11140]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: underuse of empty houses, increase in traffic, growth in Dronfield has already been significant, impact and pressure on infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6140 - 11140 - Dronfield - None
- 6142 Object** **Respondent: J Gibbs [11141]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objections: there has already been significant growth in Dronfield, impact on infrastructure, unsustainable growth, pressure on roads, increase in flooding risk, pollution, impact on residents health, lack of existing parking, underuse of brown field sites in the rest of the country and neighbouring counties.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6142 - 11141 - Dronfield - None
- 6144 Object** **Respondent: Charlotte Reardon [11142]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield. Concerns are for loss of green space, losing the gold course for recreation, impact on health and well-being, road network, traffic, school places, road safety.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6144 - 11142 - Dronfield - None

- 6145 Object** **Respondent: Jennifer Abrahams [11143]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objections: underuse of brownfield land both within Dronfield and other areas of the District, underuse of empty houses, significant growth in Dronfield has already taken place, impact on infrastructure, does not agree that the plan meets exceptional circumstances in order to remove greenbelt, proposals contradict Green Belt Land survey 2017 and so the land should not be removed, loss of character.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6145 - 11143 - Dronfield - None
- 6146 Object** **Respondent: Reagan Chinn [11144]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns are for loss of Green Belt land, impact on schools, healthcare, social services, countryside, wildlife, pollution.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6146 - 11144 - Dronfield - None
- 6148 Object** **Respondent: Sheffield FC (Mr Richard Timms) [8364]** **Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) East Midlands (Mr Doug Moulton) [8357]**
 Summary: R Timms objects to Policy LC1 and wishes that the Sheffield FC site is included as a housing allocations site. This would enable Sheffield FC to return to its historical home in Olive Grove, Sheffield. It is also argued that the current site is sustainable and suitable, that there are no ownership constraints and therefore available and deliverable. The site is well linked to Sheffield and Chesterfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6148 - 8364 - Dronfield - None
- 6151 Object** **Respondent: Amy Throssell [11145]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development plans for Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns are for consideration for brownfield sites first, over population of Dronfield, strain on public services, traffic and congestion, impact on the environment and pollution, use of empty houses.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6151 - 11145 - Dronfield - None
- 6161 Object** **Respondent: Brian Dennis [11146]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: traffic, noise, impact on infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6161 - 11146 - Dronfield - None
- 6180 Object** **Respondent: Ms Christine Gray [11147]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield. Concerns are for increase in traffic, school places, loss of greenbelt land for recreation.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6180 - 11147 - Dronfield - None

- 6181 Object** **Respondent: Mr Simon Farmer [10806]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objections: location of development sites do not have adequate roads to support growth, pressure on train station parking, limited rail services, pressure on infrastructure, underuse of brownfield sites and empty houses, questions the sustainability of the plan.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6181 - 10806 - Dronfield - None
- 6184 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jennifer Loftus [10815]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Greenbelt land. Main concerns are for using Green Belt land for housing, volume of additional houses proposed, consideration for Brownfield sites and empty houses before Green Belt sites, impact on infrastructure, traffic and congestion, limited access of train network, school places, GP appointments.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6184 - 10815 - Dronfield - None
- 6185 Object** **Respondent: Lynne Carlisle [11149]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Coal Aston on Green Belt land. Concerns are for size of the development proposed, impact on road network and infrastructure, fracking, increase in traffic, school places, GP appointments.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6185 - 11149 - Dronfield - None
- 6186 Object** **Respondent: Mrs J Goddard [11150]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for loss of green space for recreation, impact on wildlife, loss of Burns Drive for recreation, road safety, traffic, pollution, impact on mental health, school places, GP appointments, parking at Cliffe Park, consideration for brownfield sites before green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6186 - 11150 - Dronfield - None
- 6191 Object** **Respondent: Barbara Williams [11153]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to housing in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns are for poor infrastructure, traffic, congestion, loss on conservation land, consideration for other disused sites, fracking, the future of the town after the proposals and impacts on current residents.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6191 - 11153 - Dronfield - None
- 6195 Object** **Respondent: David and Florence Keeton [11157]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns are for strain on infrastructure, GP appointments, pollution, health, loss of green spaces, impact on wildlife, consideration for brownfield sites and empty houses before green sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6195 - 11157 - Dronfield - None

- 6196 Object** **Respondent: Mr John Fletcher [10864]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing developments in Dronfield. Concerns over consultation process and accessibility of Local Plan, consultation evening, evidence base, strain on infrastructure, use of Green Belt land for housing, loss of green space for recreation, traffic, parking.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6196 - 10864 - Dronfield - None
- 6197 Object** **Respondent: Laura Rainbow [11158]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Greenbelt land. Concerns are for use of brownfield sites before Green Belt sites, strain on traffic and infrastructure, congestion, future of infrastructure, school places, health services, use of rail network, impact on wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6197 - 11158 - Dronfield - None
- 6199 Object** **Respondent: Jim and Jean Munro [11159]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing developments in Dronfield.
 Concerns are:
 destroying parts of the existing green belt;
 change the Town's character;
 put additional strains on existing resources;
 increase the density of traffic;
 increase urban sprawl;
 put the independence of Dronfield at risk.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6199 - 11159 - Dronfield - None
- 6200 Object** **Respondent: Richard Lee [11160]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt, especially around Coal Aston. Concern over: loss of green space, impact on health, impact on wildlife, increase in pollution and congestion, impact on infrastructure, urban sprawl and character.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6200 - 11160 - Dronfield - None
- 6205 Object** **Respondent: Claire Berry [11163]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Greenbelt land. Main concerns are for strain on existing infrastructure, traffic, congestion, pollution, road safety, parking at the train station, school places, loss of green space for recreation, impact on wildlife, consideration for brownfield sites and empty houses, subsidence.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6205 - 11163 - Dronfield - None

- 6206 Object** **Respondent: Mr and Mrs Nic and Heath Denton [11164]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing in Dronfield. Concern over: pollution, health, road safety, impact on infrastructure, impact on character, effect on house prices, loss of recreation space.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6206 - 11164 - Dronfield - None
- 6208 Object** **Respondent: Melanie Carl [11165]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land for recreation and health, consideration for brownfield sites and neighbouring districts, wildlife, flood risk, urban sprawl, school places, GP appointments, pollution, traffic, congestion, road safety,
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6208 - 11165 - Dronfield - None
- 6209 Object** **Respondent: Lisa Collins [11166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposals in the Local Plan to redesignate the areas of Green Belt marked G, H, I, J and K on the map at Appendix B of The Local Plan. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt, using brownfield and empty houses first, infrastructure, health and well-being of residents, parking, congestion, pollution, urban sprawl, employment opportunities, medical services, school places, road safety, access.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6209 - 11166 - Dronfield - None
- 6210 Object** **Respondent: Lindsay Cooper [11167]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Greenbelt land. Concerns are for strain on public services, school places, GP appointments, traffic, pollution, use of brownfield sites, merging towns, wildlife, health.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6210 - 11167 - Dronfield - None
- 6224 Object** **Respondent: John M Gray [11169]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Main concerns are for losing Green Belt land, affects on local services, changing the character of the town, urban sprawl, town already lacking in green space, road congestion, road safety, strain on school places and medical services, farming, traffic, access, use of brownfield at Sheepbridge.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6224 - 11169 - Dronfield - None
- 6229 Object** **Respondent: Jill & Alison Tingle & Hurndall [11170]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield, especially on Hallows Lane. Concern over: impact on Dronfield's road network, impact on infrastructure, increase in pollution, impact on health and on road safety for road users, pedestrians and residents and on congestion. Statement that existing road network is already under stress. Statement that the plan does not encourage more sustainable travel options because there is limited parking at the railway station. Statement that the plan should therefore recognise that Dronfield is already over developed and build houses elsewhere.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6229 - 11170 - Dronfield - None

- 6233 Object** **Respondent: Anthony Baxter [11171]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land, urban sprawl, impact on mental and physical health, pollution, flood risk, traffic, congestion, road safety, parking, school places, GP services, impact on wildlife, Hallowes Gold Club, review as a sustainable town, changing the character of Dronfield, setting a precedent for the future.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6233 - 11171 - Dronfield - None
- 6237 Object** **Respondent: Natalie Baxter [11172]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land, urban sprawl, impact on mental and physical health, pollution, flood risk, traffic, congestion, road safety, parking, school places, GP services, impact on wildlife, Hallowes Gold Club, review as a sustainable town, changing the character of Dronfield, setting a precedent for the future.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6237 - 11172 - Dronfield - None
- 6241 Object** **Respondent: John Ashby [11148]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: justification of exceptional circumstances, lack of brownfield sites and empty houses used, lack of evidence of duty to cooperate on housing, urban sprawl, impact on environment and pollution, impact on infrastructure and services, rail way station not suitable, increase in congestion, impact on road safety, lack of parking, impact on character and precedent for future GB release. Statement that Dronfield is not a sustainable town.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6241 - 11148 - Dronfield - None
- 6244 Object** **Respondent: Robyn Jackson [11175]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's GB. Concern over loss of GB land, impact on wildlife and environment, Dronfield already overpopulated, impact on character.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6244 - 11175 - Dronfield - None
- 6247 Object** **Respondent: Penny & Ken Carter [11176]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation in Dronfield. Concern over: potential increase in traffic in Dronfield, pollution, impact on countryside, impact on local services and infrastructure, urban sprawl, loss of GB land, justification of exceptional circumstances, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, precedent for GB release, impact on health, loss of green space, impact on air quality, impact on wildlife, loss of farmland.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6247 - 11176 - Dronfield - None
- 6249 Object** **Respondent: Gillian Bellamy [11177]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on green belt land. Main concerns are for planning of affordable housing and costs associated, Infrastructure, road network, traffic, GP appointments, empty houses, urban sprawl, parking at rail station, health and well-being, impact on the environment on the land flora and fauna.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6249 - 11177 - Dronfield - None

- 6253 Object** **Respondent: Audrey Garrett [11178]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concerns are for loss of green space for recreation and enjoyment, impact on health, pollution, traffic, congestion, urban sprawl, changing character of Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6253 - 11178 - Dronfield - None
- 6255 Object** **Respondent: Alun Howes [11179]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development on Greenbelt land in Dronfield. Main concerns are for school places and impact on existing schools, changing character and feel of Dronfield, loss of green space, fracking, impact on Dronfield as the 9th most desirable place to live according to a recent survey, use of brownfield sites first, traffic, congestion, road safety, flood risk, medical services.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6255 - 11179 - Dronfield - None
- 6258 Object** **Respondent: Luke Hill [11180]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing developments. Concerns are for losing the Green Belt land which is valued for recreation and wildlife, impact on wildlife, over-population, congestion and traffic, changing the style of the town.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6258 - 11180 - Dronfield - None
- 6260 Object** **Respondent: Joanne Templeman [11181]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for making Dronfield a less desirable place to live, loss of green space, pressure on infrastructure and public services, school places, medical services, urban sprawl, setting a precedent for the future, use of empty houses and brownfield sites, traffic, pollution, mental health, impact on wildlife, flood risk, plans for future infrastructure, school places, medical services, heritage, subsidence.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6260 - 11181 - Dronfield - None
- 6269 Object** **Respondent: Sue & Graham Woolley [11182]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposal of housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for increase in traffic leading to congestion, pollution, parking issues, school places, medical services, mental health, losing Dronfield as a desirable place to live.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6269 - 11182 - Dronfield - None
- 6270 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Read [9112]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: impact on wildlife, wellbeing of the community, loss of heritage, underuse of brownfield sites, congestion, impact on infrastructure, pressure on town centre services, limited parking at the railway station, urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6270 - 9112 - Dronfield - None

- 6272 Object** **Respondent: Matthew Templeman [11183]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for making Dronfield a less desirable place to live, loss of green space, pressure on infrastructure and public services, school places, medical services, urban sprawl, setting a precedent for the future, use of empty houses and brownfield sites, traffic, pollution, mental health, impact on wildlife, flood risk, plans for future infrastructure, school places, medical services, heritage, subsidence.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6272 - 11183 - Dronfield - None
- 6278 Object** **Respondent: Megan Read [11185]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: lack of preservation of the countryside, overcrowding, congestion,, pressure on roads, loss of pleasure for current residents, urban sprawl, impact on wildlife, impact on tourism, underuse of brownfield sites, impact on infrastructure, decrease in quality of life.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6278 - 11185 - Dronfield - None
- 6279 Object** **Respondent: Savage [11186]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6279 - 11186 - Dronfield - None
- 6286 Object** **Respondent: Ms Helen Reah [11188]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield and Coal Aston on Green Belt land. Concerns are for loss of identity, urban sprawl, impact on wildlife, loss of green space for enjoyment and recreation, pollution, health, use of brownfield sites and empty houses first.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6286 - 11188 - Dronfield - None
- 6287 Object** **Respondent: Mr W Barrett [11189]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to the proposed developments and removal of green belt land in Dronfield. Reasons given for objections: some of the proposed developments are in a conservation area, road safety, congestion, noise pollution, overcrowding, impact on infrastructure, impact on character, urban sprawl, disregard for national policy, land for development in other North East Derbyshire areas, lack of parking, more suitable areas for housing.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6287 - 11189 - Dronfield - None
- 6288 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Deborah Shields [10343]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: locations chosen are highly used for farming and recreational use, detrimental impacts on health and wellbeing of community, impact on wildlife, urban sprawl, pressure on roads, road safety, increased traffic ad congestion, lack of parking, impact on infrastructure, pollution, flooding risk, underuse of brownfield land, underuse of empty houses.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6288 - 10343 - Dronfield - None

- 6290 Object** **Respondent: John Moxon [11190]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development on Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for urban sprawl, loss of Greenbelt land and green space for function and recreation, setting a precedent for the future, changing character of Dronfield, plans for infrastructure, traffic, congestion, road safety, pollution, school places, medical services, impact on wildlife and the environment, flood risk, heritage, subsidence, employment opportunities, use of brownfield sites and empty houses first, train station.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6290 - 11190 - Dronfield - None
- 6295 Object** **Respondent: Rebecca Beal [11194]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Opposition to proposed use of Dronfield green belt for housing. Concerns over: lack of brownfield sites used, impact on infrastructure, loss of GB and countryside, urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6295 - 11194 - Dronfield - None
- 6296 Object** **Respondent: Mr Martin Beal [11195]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: lack of brownfield sites used, loss of GB land and countryside, impact on infrastructure, urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6296 - 11195 - Dronfield - None
- 6302 Object** **Respondent: S.E Brailsford [11198]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concerns over: impact on infrastructure, urban sprawl, pollution, precedence of GB release.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6302 - 11198 - Dronfield - None
- 6315 Object** **Respondent: Mike Berry [11200]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns are for traffic, loss of natural habitat, subsidence, school places, medical services, any benefits to the proposals.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6315 - 11200 - Dronfield - None
- 6320 Object** **Respondent: MR Julian Stark [10836]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposals for Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are losing land for recreation, farming, conservation, use of brownfield sites & neighbouring districts & empty houses before using Green Belt, urban sprawl, plans for future infrastructure, school places, medical services, parking, employment opportunities, plans for the rail station.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6320 - 10836 - Dronfield - None

- 6321 Object** **Respondent: Richard Burgess [11202]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: greenbelt land a valued commodity, impact on wildlife and habitat, impact on community health, impact on infrastructure, pressure on roads, congestion, pedestrian safety, impact on bin services, lack of parking at railway station, underuse of brownfield sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6321 - 11202 - Dronfield - None
- 6324 Object** **Respondent: Richard Abrahams [11204]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objections: underuse of brownfield land both within Dronfield and other areas of the District, underuse of empty houses, significant growth in Dronfield has already taken place, impact on infrastructure, does not agree that the plan meets exceptional circumstances in order to remove greenbelt, proposals contradict Green Belt Land survey 2017 and so the land should not be removed, loss of character.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6324 - 11204 - Dronfield - None
- 6325 Object** **Respondent: Charles Wall [11203]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: not demonstrated exceptional circumstances needed for greenbelt removal, impact on health and quality of life for residents, urban sprawl, impact on infrastructure, congestion, road safety, pollution, loss of habitat and effect on wildlife, impact from deep mine workings underground, underuse of empty houses, underuse of brownfield sites, cooperation with neighbouring authorities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6325 - 11203 - Dronfield - None
- 6331 Object** **Respondent: Mrs P Hobson [11205]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: urban sprawl, change of character, Dronfield is already lacking green space, loss of greenbelt use, impact on health and wellbeing of community, pressure on roads, pollution, congestion, lack of parks, impact on infrastructure, other land which could be built on instead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6331 - 11205 - Dronfield - None
- 6337 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Susan Burke [10456]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development plans in Dronfield on green belt land. Concerns are for losing Green Belt land, impact on Dronfield, traffic, pollution, noise, strain on schools, congestion, parking, type of housing to be built, use of brown sites first.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6337 - 10456 - Dronfield - None
- 6338 Object** **Respondent: Helen Wild [11207]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt. Main concerns are for using Green Belt land for housing, impact on wildlife and the environment, pollution, flood risk, changing the character of Dronfield, urban sprawl, loss of recreational ground and green space, mental health.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6338 - 11207 - Dronfield - None

6339 Object **Respondent: Mrs Pauline Wright [11208]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: impact on health, pollution, road safety, loss of recreation land, impact on wildlife, impact on Dronfield's infrastructure, congestion, urban sprawl. Statement that if development was to happen in Dronfield, current infrastructure would need to be upgraded beforehand. Concern over lack of brownfield sites used, Sheffield FC suggested as a site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6339 - 11208 - Dronfield - None

6341 Object **Respondent: Hannah Bazley [11209]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to proposed Housing on Dronfield's Green Belt. Concern over: threats to environment, loss of GB land, urban sprawl, lack of existing green space, pollution, impact on Moss Valley conservation area, lack of evidence that housing can not be built without building on GB land, lack of duty to cooperate, lack of brownfield sites used, impact on infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6341 - 11209 - Dronfield - None

6342 Object **Respondent: Mary Gray [11210]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: lack of compliance with Housing White Paper, lack of encouragement for local people to engage in consultation, lack of brownfield sites used, justification of exceptional circumstances, lack of duty to cooperate, out of date housing requirement, impact on Dronfield's character, impact on health, impact on infrastructure, impact on Moss Valley Conservation Area, impact on Wildlife, urban sprawl.

A consultation period of 6 weeks is insufficient for all in the community to become fully conversant with the plan.

Housing Capacity Study of Northern Settlements is out of date.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6342 - 11210 - Dronfield - None

6345 Object **Respondent: Helen Peckett [11211]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development proposals in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns are for loss of Green Belt land for enjoyment and recreation, strain on schools, strain on facilities, doctors appointments, banks, strain on roads, pollution.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6345 - 11211 - Dronfield - None

6354 Object **Respondent: Pam Perrett [11214]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for infrastructure, school places, GP appointments, traffic, loss of countryside.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6354 - 11214 - Dronfield - None

- 6359 Object** **Respondent: Sally Mason [11215]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for use of brown field sites & empty houses before Green Belt land is used, Hallowes Gold course, infrastructure, road safety, pollution, school places, impact on wildlife, loss of green space for recreation and health.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6359 - 11215 - Dronfield - None
- 6360 Object** **Respondent: Elena Stolyarova [11216]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection tot he proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: urban sprawl, loss of GB land, impact on services and infrastructure, impact on wildlife and the existence of recreational space, loss of access to countryside, increase in traffic and impact on road safety.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6360 - 11216 - Dronfield - None
- 6361 Object** **Respondent: Jean Staniforth [11218]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land for enjoyment and recreation, school places, strain on GP appointments, traffic, access.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6361 - 11218 - Dronfield - None
- 6362 Object** **Respondent: Jeremy Wynne [11219]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the Local Plan which sets out the proposed removal of green belt land in Dronfield to facilitate housing development. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land, strain on local services, increase in population resulting in increase of traffic, pollution, mental health, impact on wildlife, flood risk, plans for transport, road safety, school places, GP services, heritage, employment in the area, coal mining history, use of brownfield and vacant properties first, strain on train station.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6362 - 11219 - Dronfield - None
- 6363 Object** **Respondent: Alison Jow [11220]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: precedent for GB release, increase in pollution, increase in congestion, impact on road safety, parking, impact on infrastructure, urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6363 - 11220 - Dronfield - None
- 6364 Object** **Respondent: Elaine Cresswell [11221]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerned about plans to build housing at Hallowes Lane, golf course, Hill Top. Main concerns are for loss of green space, road network, traffic, pollution, space to exercise, school places, access, access to health care.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6364 - 11221 - Dronfield - None

- 6365 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs J M & S Gill [11223]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Comments on the proposal of housing development in Dronfield. Concerned for greenbelt land, traffic congestion and pollution, pressure on infrastructure, schools, doctors surgeries and dental practices and recreation, such as sports centres and playing fields.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6365 - 11223 - Dronfield - None
- 6368 Object** **Respondent: Louise Bower [11224]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: greenbelt should only be removed in exceptional circumstances, underuse of brownfield sites, underuse of empty houses, Dronfield has already expanded enough, will change the character of the area, urban sprawl, impact on physical and mental health, impact on wildlife, impact on infrastructure, lack of parking at the railway station, congestion and pressure on roads.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6368 - 11224 - Dronfield - None
- 6369 Object** **Respondent: Miss Judith Vernier [10838]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development plans in Dronfield. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land, use of brownfield land and other sites before Green Belt land, plans for infrastructure, strain on roads, school places, medical services, road network.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6369 - 10838 - Dronfield - None
- 6370 Object** **Respondent: Dronfield Green Belt Resident's Group (Mrs Lynne Gadsden) [10537]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: justification of exceptional circumstances, impact on Dronfield's infrastructure and services, impact on recreations and green space, loss of GB land, contradicts National Policy, Contradicts other policies in the Local Plan, impact on wildlife, Dronfield's lack of sustainability, impact on Moss Valley conservation area, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, lack of duty to cooperate, lack of parking, impact on road safety, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on Dronfield's railway.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6370 - 10537 - Dronfield - None
- 6372 Object** **Respondent: Peter Bazley [11226]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development plans for Dronfield. Concerns are for loss of Green Belt land, urban sprawl, traffic, pollution, use of other sites before green belt, using sites in Sheffield, strain on local services, school places, medical services, parking.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6372 - 11226 - Dronfield - None

6374 Object **Respondent: Nigel Wynne [11225]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: change of character, pressure on local services and infrastructure, urban sprawl, no demonstration that there are exceptional circumstances to remove greenbelt, underuse of brownfield sites and empty houses, impacts on physical and mental health, loss of recreation space, increase in traffic, congestion, loss of habitat, impact on wildlife, pollution, flood risk increase, impact on infrastructure, lack of parking at the railway station, loss of heritage, risk from previous coal mining activity, no clear employment provision, unsustainable.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6374 - 11225 - Dronfield - None

6389 Object **Respondent: Mrs Cathy Lewis [10847]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing developments in Dronfield. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land for enjoyment and recreation, strain on infrastructure, school places, medical services, quality of life, making Dronfield a less desirable place to live.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6389 - 10847 - Dronfield - None

6393 Object **Respondent: Freddy Lewis [11230]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: To Whom this may concern,

I do not want to see houses being built in Dronfield in the places where I like to go for walks with my Mummy and Daddy. It's not fair, I like seeing all of the birds and plants when I go walking.

I think my school will be too busy if a lot more people come to live in Dronfield too.

I hope you write back to me about this.

Thank you

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6393 - 11230 - Dronfield - None

6394 Object **Respondent: Mr Steven Myers [11229]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over: methodology used for assessing potential sites is flawed, lack of brownfield sites and non-green belt land taken into account for proposed housing, use of infill sites will lead to urban sprawl, GB land owned by Hallowes Golf Club would lead to a loss of wildlife and trees, impact on infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6394 - 11229 - Dronfield - None

6397 Object **Respondent: Adam Akid [11231]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's greenbelt. Concern over: lack of brownfield sites used, lack of cohesion with National guidelines, encroachment from sites on public rights of way, railway station not suitable, increase in traffic and congestion, urban sprawl, lack of employment opportunities in Dronfield and no more provision planned, impact on Dronfield's services and infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6397 - 11231 - Dronfield - None

- 6398 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Carmel Reilly [10850]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land, urban sprawl, changing the character of Dronfield, use of brownfield sites before Green Belt, impact on infrastructure, roads.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6398 - 10850 - Dronfield - None
- 6401 Object** **Respondent: Lucy Colley [11232]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: Dronfield has already had enough growth, impact on infrastructure, lack of parking, increase in traffic, pollution, loss of heritage, impact on wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6401 - 11232 - Dronfield - None
- 6402 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Carole Taylor [11233]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Coal Aston and Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: loss of character and identity, loss of recreational use, pollution, impact on infrastructure, pressure on roads.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6402 - 11233 - Dronfield - None
- 6403 Object** **Respondent: Ian Warburton [10710]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns are for increase in population, strain on infrastructure, school places, use of brown field sites, traffic, road safety.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6403 - 10710 - Dronfield - None
- 6405 Object** **Respondent: Richard Johnson [11234]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Main concerns are for use of Green Belt land, traffic, transport plans, use of train station and its already full car park, use of empty houses and brownfield sites. FOI request.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6405 - 11234 - Dronfield - None
- 6414 Object** **Respondent: Andrew Wilson [11235]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: decrease in quality of life for residents, impact on infrastructure, pressure on roads, no evidence for exceptional circumstances needed for greenbelt removal, underuse of empty houses and brownfield sites, Dronfield has already expanded in previous years.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6414 - 11235 - Dronfield - None

6420 Object **Respondent: Deborah Young & Phillip Crookes [10625]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concern overL. impact on local wildlife/trees/plants, increase in pollution, impact on health, increase in congestion, parking, increase in litter,

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6420 - 10625 - Dronfield - None

6423 Object **Respondent: Cllr Philip E Wright [11242]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of six areas of greenbelt land and for the proposed plan for 860 house in Dronfield. Concern over: impact of proposals on existing infrastructure, lack of parking in the town centre, urban sprawl, increase in congestion, road safety, lack of infrastructure plans before proposals, impact on Dronfield's cemetery, planned electrification of Dronfield's railway line, impact on Dronfield's character, loss of GB land, the Local Plan's lack of cohesion with Dronfield's 2035 Vision plan, scale of proposed developments. Suggestion for underground parking in Dronfield.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6423 - 11242 - Dronfield - None

6424 Object **Respondent: D Bullers [11241]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the housing development plans for Dronfield without a plan to improve infrastructure. Concerns are for loss of countryside and green space, urban sprawl, traffic, pollution, aging population of Dronfield which will eventually free up family homes, use of already empty properties, loss of recreational facilities, old coal mining activity and subsidence, water contamination, loss of farm land, visual intrusion, impact on wildlife, parking at rail station, plan to improve transportation, pipelines, location to buildings, use of brownfield sites, viewing options for the Local Plan, use of Green belt land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6424 - 11241 - Dronfield - None

6429 Object **Respondent: Mr Jonathan Moore [11243]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of Dronfield's green belt land and the proposed housing allocations on the released land. Concern over: loss of GB land, impact on local services and infrastructure, impact on character and quality of life for existing and potential residents, precedent for future GB release, urban sprawl, against aims of GB policy, impact on heritage, justification of exceptional circumstances, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, lack of green spaces in Dronfield, impact on health and wellbeing, increase in traffic and pollution, impact on wildlife, increase in flood risk, land stability issues, Railway station not sustainable, lack of parking. Statement that GB Land survey 2017 states that proposed sites are not suitable for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6429 - 11243 - Dronfield - None

6431 Object **Respondent: Helen Hanrahan [11236]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing allocation on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land and green open space, infrastructure, traffic, congestion, pollution, school places, loss of land for recreation, strain on medical services, use of brownfield sites first, impact on wildlife, urban sprawl, impact on health, employment opportunities, history of mining in the area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6431 - 11236 - Dronfield - None

- 6432 Object** **Respondent: Mr Andrew Brighton [10861]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concerned about plans for Dronfield. Bought their house because it backed onto Green Belt and had views of green open space. Objection due to no clear consequences to the proposals. Concerned about traffic, loss of a view, access, impact on current residents. Although supportive of new housing concerned about plans for the infrastructure.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6432 - 10861 - Dronfield - None
- 6433 Object** **Respondent: Christina & Paul Davies [11245]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development plans in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for urban sprawl, impact on health and well-being on existing residents, traffic, pollution, school places, road safety, impact on general services such as GP appointments.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6433 - 11245 - Dronfield - None
- 6434 Object** **Respondent: Mark Goddard [11246]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns are for use of other land before Green Belt, use of Gold Course, use of empty houses, over population, impact on infrastructure schools doctors traffic, road safety.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6434 - 11246 - Dronfield - None
- 6435 Object** **Respondent: Mr Craig Swift [10879]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for the impact on infrastructure, additional traffic causing congestion, change in Dronfields character, impact on education, medical facilities, shopping, using recreation land for housing impacting on health and wellbeing, loss of historical buildings, impact on wildlife, urban sprawl, use of prime development land in a desirable place to live for social housing.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6435 - 10879 - Dronfield - None
- 6436 Object** **Respondent: Shaun Burns [11247]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concerned for using Green Belt land for housing in Dronfield. Main concerns are for changing Dronfield from a semi rural location, increase in population impacting school places, doctors appointments, road safety, impact on wildlife, traffic, pollution, flood risk.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6436 - 11247 - Dronfield - None
- 6438 Object** **Respondent: Jackie Clayton [11248]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development plans in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land, urban sprawl, future plans for infrastructure, schools, health, facilities, roads, traffic at Callywhite Land extension.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6438 - 11248 - Dronfield - None

- 6447 Object** **Respondent: Lucy Ramage [11249]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development on Green Belt land in Dronfield. Main concerns are for increase in population putting strain on infrastructure and services, setting a precedent for further development in the future, changing the character of Dronfield, urban sprawl, use of brownfield sites and empty houses first, losing access to green spaces, traffic, pollution, mental health, impact on wildlife, flood risk, school places, GP appointments, use of rail station, use of Green Belt land, evidence of "exceptional circumstances"
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6447 - 11249 - Dronfield - None
- 6455 Object** **Respondent: Andy Boulton [11250]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Concerns are for online response system, use of Green Belt land, location of sites for affordable housing, employment opportunities near the proposed locations, use of brownfield sites and empty houses before Green Belt land, road safety, future plans for infrastructure.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6455 - 11250 - Dronfield - None
- 6472 Object** **Respondent: Melanie Hudson [11259]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the release of green belt land for housing in Dronfield. Concern over: lack of brownfield sites used in Dronfield and other neighbouring Districts, justification of exceptional circumstances, precedent for more GB release, encroachment on countryside, impact on; environment, wildlife and health and wellbeing. Concern over: potential urban sprawl, increase in pollution, loss of trees, impact on infrastructure, and services. Suggestion to use disused land near Callywhite Lane for housing. Not as many houses as proposed need to be built in Dronfield.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6472 - 11259 - Dronfield - None
- 6479 Object** **Respondent: Paul Morris [11260]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: lack of brownfield land and empty homes in Dronfield being used, historic growth in Dronfield, brownfield land available elsewhere in the District, impact on services and infrastructure, increase in traffic, justification of exceptional circumstances, Green Belt Land survey 2017 states that ALL the proposed sites surrounding Dronfield should not be removed and are not suitable for development. Questions why the Padley & Veneables site was rejected.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6479 - 11260 - Dronfield - None
- 6480 Object** **Respondent: Suzan Abrahams [11261]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: lack of brownfield land and empty homes in Dronfield being used, historic growth in Dronfield, brownfield land available elsewhere in the District, impact on services and infrastructure, increase in traffic, justification of exceptional circumstances, Green Belt Land survey 2017 states that ALL the proposed sites surrounding Dronfield should not be removed and are not suitable for development. Questions why the Padley & Veneables site was rejected.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6480 - 11261 - Dronfield - None

6517 Object**Respondent: Lorna Wynne [11263]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons: change of character, pressure on local services and infrastructure, urban sprawl, no demonstration that there are exceptional circumstances to remove greenbelt, underuse of brownfield sites and empty houses, impacts on physical and mental health, loss of recreation space, increase in traffic, congestion, loss of habitat, impact on wildlife, pollution, flood risk, impact on infrastructure, parking at the railway station, loss of heritage, risk from previous coal mining activity, no clear employment provision, unsustainable. Objection to proposals for High Street, Dronfield. Reasons: a heavy usage, narrow road, road safety, parking around civic centre.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6517 - 11263 - Dronfield - None

6520 Object**Respondent: Mrs Abigail Kaye [11264]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for Dronfield already struggling increase in population growth, loss of Green Belt land, strain on schools, doctors appointments, bus & train services, traffic, road network, severe increase in population, setting a precedent for the future, impact on health of existing residents, impact on environment and wildlife.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6520 - 11264 - Dronfield - None

6523 Object**Respondent: Anna Stark [11265]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to housing development plans on Green Belt land in Dronfield. Reason are for justification of exceptional circumstances, loss of Green Belt sites for farming, recreation, conservation and use of a gold course, following NPPF, use of brownfield sites & empty houses first, land from neighbouring districts, urban sprawl, setting a precedent for the future, lack of plans for developing infrastructure, employment opportunities, use of railway station and parking.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6523 - 11265 - Dronfield - None

6524 Object**Respondent: Mr Roger Moore [10346]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for use of Green Belt, making Dronfield a less desirable place to live, strain on infrastructure and services, setting a precedent for the future, changing character of Dronfield, urban sprawl, proven exceptional circumstances, use of brownfield sites and empty houses, impact on health, traffic, pollution, impact on wildlife, flood risk, school places, medical services, gold course maybe high risk for developing, rail station.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6524 - 10346 - Dronfield - None

6526 Object**Respondent: Nick Barker [11267]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objections to the proposed developments around Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: pressure on local services and infrastructure, change of character, reduction in quality of life for residents, urban sprawl, the proposals contravene the aims of green belt policy, underuse of brownfield sites, threat to further green belt removal in the future, loss of recreation space, pollution, traffic, congestion, impact on physical and mental health, impact on wildlife, flood risk, road safety, lack of parking at railway station, impact on heritage, no clear employment provision, unsustainable, underuse of empty houses.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6526 - 11267 - Dronfield - None

- 6537 Object** **Respondent: Ellen Laider [11271]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: pressure on roads, impact on infrastructure, closing of service (police station), loss of identity, urban sprawl, underuse of empty houses.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6537 - 11271 - Dronfield - None
- 6558 Object** **Respondent: Mr G Sharpe [11274]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Dronfield. Concerns are for impact on education, medical services, road network, road safety, parking at the train station, traffic, pollution, lack of banking facilities, use of Green Belt land, impacting mental health, recreational facilities, wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6558 - 11274 - Dronfield - None
- 6753 Object** **Respondent: Rachel Staniforth [11296]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed re-designation of Green Belt land in Dronfield. Concerns over: justification of exceptional circumstances, scale of proposed housing development in Dronfield, impact on Dronfield character, urban sprawl, impact on local wildlife, potential increase in pollution, impact on health, lack of brownfield sites and vacant homes used, impact on existing infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6753 - 11296 - Dronfield - None
- 6779 Object** **Respondent: Mr David Harrison [11315]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: impact on character, loss of green space, over-congestion, urban sprawl, impact on wildlife and recreation space, impact on health, road safety, lack of parking, impact on infrastructure. Statement that there is extensive brownfield sites (Old Boat Yard, garden centre). Questions why the old football fields derelict land near Coal Aston is not being developed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6779 - 11315 - Dronfield - None
- 4556 Support** **Respondent: Joyce Rutherford [10221]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I will perhaps be in a minority here as I do not oppose new housing as we desperately need more houses, particularly affordable homes yet everyone keeps saying "Don't build them here in my back yard".
 I am assuming here that you have looked at infrastructure re roads etc and there are plenty of schools in the area to take on new pupils. Perhaps if plans for this as well as proposed building were shown, people may not be so opposed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4556 - 10221 - Dronfield - None
- 4639 Support** **Respondent: Kate Dymond [10299]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support for building more houses in Dronfield. It is vital as building sufficient housing, will bring employment to our communities and will ensure we deal with our ageing population. I'm also delighted to see that the plan includes social housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4639 - 10299 - Dronfield - None

- 4710 Support** **Respondent: Tony Long [10355]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: You may receive many complaints about your proposals, but as a Dronfield resident of 53 years, I write to say I am fully supportive of your proposals and the crying need for additional housing.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 4710 - 10355 - Dronfield - None
- 4787 Support** **Respondent: Andrea Dickson [10407]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Comment made over how Burns Drive in Dronfield would not be appropriate as a through road if proposed housing allocations went ahead in Dronfield. Concern has been raised over how existing infrastructure and services may not be able to accommodate proposed housing. Further concern raised over urban sprawl in the south of Dronfield.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 4787 - 10407 - Dronfield - None
- 4879 Support** **Respondent: J Whitham [10491]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I am writing to offer my support for extra housing in the Dronfield-Coal Aston area, I am especially pleased at the intention for 40% of the housing to be social housing, I feel this is important for young people and vulnerable adults (disabled people) on low wages or benefits who are unable to afford the astronomical house prices in this area.

I live in Coal Aston and the price of houses on our street are now obscene.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 4879 - 10491 - Dronfield - None
- 4626 Comment** **Respondent: Colin Batty [10287]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Extra amenities would be necessary in order to meet the need of proposed housing in Dronfield. Suggestion for these amenities being created on the Chesterfield side of Unstone.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4626 - 10287 - Dronfield - None
- 4660 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Barry Gray [10320]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Questions over how residents will gain access to site g. Questions over whether or not future residents of proposed site h and I would use existing road infrastructure. Questions over what infrastructure provision will be put in place to deal with proposed population increase.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4660 - 10320 - Dronfield - None
- 4667 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs S Grayson [10324]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concerns raised over number of houses proposed. Further concerns over whether existing infrastructure can accommodate proposed housing. Supports new housing but thinks that not as many should be proposed as have been.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4667 - 10324 - Dronfield - None

- 4784 Comment** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs G Younge [10400]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over impact on infrastructure and services in Dronfield.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4784 - 10400 - Dronfield - None
- 4786 Comment** **Respondent: Abby Constantine [10405]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield and potential loss of green belt land. Further concern shown over potential impact on wildlife, pollution, local amenities, services and infrastructure. Questions whether brownfield land has been considered.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4786 - 10405 - Dronfield - None
- 4791 Comment** **Respondent: Kathryn Emblen [10411]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concerns raised over whether existing infrastructure and services can accommodate proposed housing allocations. Concern over loss of community.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4791 - 10411 - Dronfield - None
- 4792 Comment** **Respondent: R.S. Gilbert [10412]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern raised over whether or not existing services and facilities can accommodate the proposed housing. Concern over loss of green belt land and potential urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4792 - 10412 - Dronfield - None
- 4794 Comment** **Respondent: Audrey Atkinson [10413]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over whether existing infrastructure and services can accommodate proposed housing in Dronfield.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4794 - 10413 - Dronfield - None
- 4796 Comment** **Respondent: Kirsten Millican-Hunt [10417]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern over loss of green belt in Dronfield. Need for new housing understood, but questions raised over why brown field sites or empty housing can't be used instead of green belt land? Concern raised over urban sprawl and request to find other alternatives to using green belt land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4796 - 10417 - Dronfield - None

- 4803 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Victoria Wood [10370]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over potential impact on infrastructure and services in Dronfield which could be caused by proposed housing. Question raised over why there is no 'settlement gap' between Dronfield and Sheffield.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4803 - 10370 - Dronfield - None
- 4817 Comment** **Respondent: Mr David R BURROWS [8483]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over the proposed 'estate type' housing which is proposed in Dronfield. Concern raised over infrastructure and services. Suggestion made to investigate other brownfield sites.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4817 - 8483 - Dronfield - None
- 4818 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs H L Burrows [10438]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern over proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over existing infrastructure and services.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4818 - 10438 - Dronfield - None
- 4819 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Nick Pawley [10439]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over existing infrastructure and services.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4819 - 10439 - Dronfield - None
- 4823 Comment** **Respondent: Margaret Wightman [10442]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Acceptance of need for new housing in Dronfield and need to use parts of the green belt to accommodate housing. Suggestion that site J be reduced in size by two thirds. site G, H and L bite hard into the 'green belt'. I would like to see site G reduced by one third, site H by one half and site L by two-thirds to continue the 'natural' surroundings well beyond the confines of golf club land. Site k seems a sensible way to extend housing provision. Concern raised over existing infrastructure and services.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4823 - 10442 - Dronfield - None
- 4848 Comment** **Respondent: Carol Clarke [10465]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern over potential loss of green belt and urban sprawl due to housing. Suggestion that brownfield sites are used instead for housing. Concerns over impact on infrastructure.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4848 - 10465 - Dronfield - None

- 4864 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Philip Brightmore [10318]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over infrastructure. Concern over urban sprawl. Questions over why no brownfield site have been designated for development in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4864 - 10318 - Dronfield - None
- 4884 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Michael Wilson [10484]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern raised over the proposed housing allocations around Dronfield. Statement made that Green belt land should not be built on. Concerns over infrastructure. Concern over urban sprawl. Concern over the proportion of social housing proposed. Suggestion to use brownfield sites instead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4884 - 10484 - Dronfield - None
- 4894 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Anne Greenan [10504]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over impact proposed housing in Dronfield could have on infrastructure and traffic on the roads.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4894 - 10504 - Dronfield - None
- 4896 Comment** **Respondent: Mr David Murray [10507]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns raised over the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. concern raised over loss of green belt land. Suggestion made that the sites are scaled down to reduce potential impact.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4896 - 10507 - Dronfield - None
- 4911 Comment** **Respondent: Ms Patricia Anderson [10444]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Accept that progress is acceptable when handled correctly. Concerns raised over how Dronfield's railway service could become overcrowded and cars might have difficulty parking. Concern raised over whether schools can accommodate new students and maintain standards. Concern over access to the proposed sites in the south of the District.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4911 - 10444 - Dronfield - None
- 4913 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Ros Jackson [10523]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Questions whether there are exceptional circumstances that justify the release of green belt land. Concern over the lack of explanation for why land is being released. Questions over how the document also refers to changing the status of additional land that may be held back for additional building in the future. Which land? Suggestion that due to the demographics of Dronfield, many houses will become vacant when the "baby boomers" die out.
 Concern over loss of heritage due to loss of green belt land. Suggestion that brownfield sites are considered.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4913 - 10523 - Dronfield - None

- 4916 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Edward Throp [10272]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over Dronfield's infrastructure. Issues raised over parking for the train station. Questions over why Callywhite land can't be used for housing. Suggestion to use land in Chesterfield Borough Council for Dronfield's housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4916 - 10272 - Dronfield - None
- 4917 Comment** **Respondent: Ms Lisa Goldthorpe [10520]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns over infrastructure in Dronfield and whether they can accommodate the proposed housing. Concerns over increase in traffic from proposed developments in Dronfield. Concern over parking for the railway station.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4917 - 10520 - Dronfield - None
- 4937 Comment** **Respondent: Joyce Scaife [10539]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over loss of green belt land, worry over potential precedent this could set. No objections raised over development in Dronfield's brownfield sites. Concern over negative impact that could come from urbanisation of the green belt. Questions raised over the exceptional circumstances involved.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4937 - 10539 - Dronfield - None
- 4946 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Dianna Layton [10545]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over impact on infrastructure. Concern over viability of sites 'h' and 'i'. Two areas on the plan suggested which may be could be considered further. Site K. 25 houses is stated to be a possibility Site G 235 houses is identified as being the least disruptive.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4946 - 10545 - Dronfield - None
- 4948 Comment** **Respondent: North East Derbyshire Liberal Democrats (Mr David Mortimer) [9063]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerned over the proposed removal of green belt land for housing, especially in the south. Questions over why the land is being considered to be removed. Further concerns over potential impact on infrastructure from the proposed housing. Statement made that due to the lack of employment opportunities in Dronfield, proposed housing would not be sustainable. Statement that a falling population does not suggest a need for new housing on anything like the scale proposed in the consultation papers.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4948 - 9063 - Dronfield - None
- 4958 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Debbie Dronfield [10552]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns raised over proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns over impact on existing infrastructure and road safety. Concern over impact on environment and wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4958 - 10552 - Dronfield - None

- 4993 Comment** Respondent: **Joanne Taylor [10586]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: Concerns raised over how existing infrastructure in Dronfield will accommodate the proposed housing.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4993 - 10586 - Dronfield - None
- 5185 Comment** Respondent: **Anne Taylor [10657]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: Comments made over how Dronfield is already congested. Additional need for housing understood, concern however over whether the existing infrastructure can accommodate proposed housing. Concern over urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5185 - 10657 - Dronfield - None
- 5229 Comment** Respondent: **Angela and Neil Terry [10669]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: Comments raised on proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns: infrastructure and traffic.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5229 - 10669 - Dronfield - None
- 5235 Comment** Respondent: **Nick Draper [10675]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: Concern over potential precedent set for green belt release in Dronfield. Concern over urban sprawl, concern over loss of green space, concern over impact on health. Further concern over impact on existing infrastructure, increase in pollution level, traffic and congestion.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5235 - 10675 - Dronfield - None
- 5237 Comment** Respondent: **Mr John Skelton [10642]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: Concern over, increase in pollution, loss of green space, increase in traffic and impact on road safety, impact on existing infrastructure and impact on the wellbeing of residents.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5237 - 10642 - Dronfield - None
- 5266 Comment** Respondent: **C Watson [10693]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: Concerns raised over proposed housing on Dronfield's greenbelt. Need for housing accepted. Concern over: loss of green belt land, infrastructure, traffic.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5266 - 10693 - Dronfield - None

- 5316 Comment** **Respondent: Dr Paul Gadsden [10687]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Comments on proposed housing allocation on Dronfield greenbelt. Concern over: impact on infrastructure, congestion, road safety, topography. Smaller number of houses suggested, with higher affordable and social housing being required, which should be proposed on a re-designated Callywhite Lane. Statement that affordable housing is needed, but concern over developers lowering that.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5316 - 10687 - Dronfield - None
- 5371 Comment** **Respondent: Robert Throssell [10760]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over proposed housing on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: loss of GB land, impact on infrastructures.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5371 - 10760 - Dronfield - None
- 5688 Comment** **Respondent: Paul & Christine Markwell & Casey [10890]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns over increase in proposed development in the Dronfield Plan. Concerns over: impact on infrastructure, impact on traffic and parking, urban sprawl. Would be grateful if these concerns were taken into account and a revised Plan created that mitigated all of these issues to a satisfactory level.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5688 - 10890 - Dronfield - None
- 6277 Comment** **Respondent: Marcus Read [11184]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerned about the proposal for housing development in Dronfield, reasons: loss of Green Belt land, increase in population, strain on infrastructure, traffic, road safety, pollution, school places, medical services, quality of life.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6277 - 11184 - Dronfield - None
- 6303 Comment** **Respondent: Adrian Williams [11199]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerned about housing proposal in Dronfield on Green Belt land, concerned about negative impacts on residents, to built up instead of out, Dronfield lacking in green space, strain on infrastructure, medical series, schools, roads, pollution, flood risk, harm to the environment.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6303 - 11199 - Dronfield - None
- 6367 Comment** **Respondent: Mr John Reedman [11222]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I agree with the well researched objections published by Dronfield Town Council despite it having come to the council in March even though some parts of the plan that directly affect Dronfield have been under consideration as potential plans since May 2016.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6367 - 11222 - Dronfield - None

6474 Comment**Respondent: Mr David Wilson [10756]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Dronfield is already a relatively prosperous settlement and is located close to Sheffield and other local authority areas. In addition, 100% of the total number of new homes proposed for Dronfield (860) are planned to be built on greenbelt land. Developing greenbelt land should only be considered as a last resort, where there are no other suitable alternative options.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6474 - 10756 - Dronfield - None

6484 Comment**Respondent: Paul Wilson [11262]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Dronfield is already a relatively prosperous settlement and is located close to Sheffield and other local authority areas. In addition, 100% of the total number of new homes proposed for Dronfield (860) are planned to be built on greenbelt land. Developing greenbelt land should only be considered as a last resort, where there are no other suitable alternative options.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6484 - 11262 - Dronfield - None

6576 Comment**Respondent: Messrs FS, FJ & WV Rodgers [11276]****Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**

Summary: Messrs Rodgers emphasize that the site between the A61 and Jordanthorpe Parkway would play an important role in focusing on the sustainable northern sub-area. Compared to housing allocation site j the site would be clearly contained by the Dronfield by-pass which is a visual and physical boundary. The respondent concludes that the site would have significantly less impact on the Green Belt than site j. It is argued that the subject site must be given more careful positive consideration to achieve consistency. General deliverability of some of the strategic sites in the south are also questioned.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6576 - 11276 - Dronfield - None

- 4577 Object** **Respondent: Mr Oliver Hewitt [10177]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I completely disagree with the release of greenbelt in the Dronfield area. There are enough brownfield sites in the district to leave our greenbelt alone. Talking more specifically the Shakespeare site is performing the exact function that greenbelt was created for by separating Dronfield and Unstone and preventing urban sprawl. It would completely change the aesthetic of Dronfield south if this site were lost to development. Add to that the suggested site is good quality greenbelt which is farmed, I do not see any of the exceptional circumstances required to release this site from greenbelt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4577 - 10177 - Dronfield, g. Land off Shakespeare Crescent & Sheffield Road, Dronfield - None
- 4669 Object** **Respondent: Louise Parker [10325]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection made against proposed housing allocations on green belt land.
 The reasons for complaints are -
 -Negative impacts on existing roads; safety, traffic, parking.
 -Effects on current house prices in the area.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4669 - 10325 - Dronfield, g. Land off Shakespeare Crescent & Sheffield Road, Dronfield - None
- 4677 Object** **Respondent: Mr Michael Daley [10333]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: this scale of development would have an unacceptable impact on the existing infrastructure and would require, as a minimum, a new access directly onto the Dronfield Bypass to take the additional vehicular traffic away from the already overcrowded roads via Bowshaw and Unstone (which is likely to be significantly impacted by the recently started Peak Leisure development)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4677 - 10333 - Dronfield, g. Land off Shakespeare Crescent & Sheffield Road, Dronfield - None
- 4866 Object** **Respondent: Alexandra Pollard [10478]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Shakespeare Crescent in Dronfield. Concerns over urban sprawl, congestion, pollution and infrastructure. Concern over loss of green belt land and impact on wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4866 - 10478 - Dronfield, g. Land off Shakespeare Crescent & Sheffield Road, Dronfield - None
- 5084 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: the land here plays an important role in providing a 'gap' between Dronfield and Unstone. The Redmiles proposal for development already shows a low density estate - which will undoubtedly command high house prices. Dronfield is a very desirable area and houses on the edge of the green belt are even more expensive.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5084 - 10593 - Dronfield, g. Land off Shakespeare Crescent & Sheffield Road, Dronfield - None

5496 Object **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**

Summary: Object to its inclusion on grounds of green belt and the constraints of the site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5496 - 10724 - Dronfield, g. Land off Shakespeare Crescent & Sheffield Road, Dronfield - None

5631 Object **Respondent: W Redmile & Sons Ltd [10859]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Michael Edgar) [4355]**

Summary: Alternative wording necessary and site area should be extended to include field adjacent Unstone Farm.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5631 - 10859 - Dronfield, g. Land off Shakespeare Crescent & Sheffield Road, Dronfield - None

6399 Object **Respondent: Jean Machin [10581]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed developments around Shakespeare Crescent, Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: location provides vital separation between Unstone and Dronfield, currently farm land, impact on visual landscape, increase in traffic, pollution, impact on wildlife. Questions how the current parking and access problem would be resolved around Burns Drive, road is congested due to parking on either side of the road, similar problem on Shakespeare Crescent.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6399 - 10581 - Dronfield, g. Land off Shakespeare Crescent & Sheffield Road, Dronfield - None

- 4575 Object** **Respondent: Steve Fisher [8824]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection against the proposal to allocate the land surrounding Hallows for housing. Questions have been raised over why these areas have been chosen above many more suitable brownfield sites and other parts of the town that would benefit from development.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4575 - 8824 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None
- 4576 Object** **Respondent: Helen Tasker [10242]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection against the building on green belt land around Dronfield. The green belt is well used and enjoyed for recreation purposes and should not be built on.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4576 - 10242 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None
- 4627 Object** **Respondent: Mr David Gibb [10289]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I OPPOSE THE PLANNING APPLICATION DUE TO THE ROAD SYSTEM AROUND THE AREA WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO COPE. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT IT IS CLASSED AS GREEN BELT LAND USED BY A LOT OF PEOPLE WHO LIKE TO WALK. there IS ALSO THE NOISE ISSUE OF FIRSTLY THE BUILDING OF THE DWELLINGS THEN THE DWELLINGS THEMSELVES INCLUDING THE ADDED NOISE OF MORE MOTOR VEHICLES USING THE INFRASTRUCTURE AROUND THE AREA.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4627 - 10289 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None
- 4678 Object** **Respondent: Mr Michael Daley [10333]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: this scale of development would have an unacceptable impact on the existing infrastructure and would require, as a minimum, a new access directly onto the Dronfield Bypass to take the additional vehicular traffic away from the already overcrowded roads via Bowshaw and Unstone (which is likely to be significantly impacted by the recently started Peak Leisure development)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4678 - 10333 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None
- 4805 Object** **Respondent: G Landman [10422]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing on Hallows Lane. Concerns raised over infrastructure and services. Suggestion to use brownfield sites instead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4805 - 10422 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None
- 4806 Object** **Respondent: P Hacker [10423]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing on Hallows Lane. Concerns raised over infrastructure and services. Suggestion to use brownfield sites instead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4806 - 10423 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None

- 4831 Object** **Respondent: mr peter hopkinson [10451]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Hallowes Lane is already a dangerous road for pedestrians. Any increase in traffic will increase that danger. There are parts of the road without any pavement for pedestrians. Hallowes Lane is too narrow for bus transport
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4831 - 10451 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None
- 4862 Object** **Respondent: Mrs P Noyland [10476]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation on Hallowes Road. Concern over loss of infrastructure, access to the site. Objection to the increase in Dronfield's population.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4862 - 10476 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None
- 4973 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Julie Henderson [10573]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation near Hallowes golf club. Concern over impact on existing infrastructure, public services. Concern over impact the removal of green belt land could have on residents.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4973 - 10573 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None
- 4979 Object** **Respondent: Mr D Holmes [8923]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations at Hallowes. Concern raised over loss of greenbelt, impact on existing infrastructure. Suggestion made that brownfield sites were not mention but that they should have been considered first.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4979 - 8923 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None
- 5085 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The land here will command the highest prices in the area. Houses currently on the market neighbouring this area are in excess of £300k. Access to this area is already dangerous -Hallowes lane is a single carriageway in parts and already a bus route - and a busy pedestrian route for the town's larges schools Fanshaws and Dronfield Infant and Juniors. There are blind bends and only limited foot path. This land also includes the Grade II listed golf club house - a site of local heritage.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5085 - 10593 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None
- 5088 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: This area of town is easily isolated in poor weather - a 4x4 is essential in snow. The plan suggests a housing need for the ageing population yet this is not walking distance to the station and centre - it is a very steep, poorly pathed walk uphill.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5088 - 10593 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None

- 5090 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: This is proposing to build on recreation land. The wildlife in this area is in abundance - foxes, many species of birds, bats and more....
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5090 - 10593 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None
- 5109 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The turning from Links Road into Hallowes Lane is already extremely hazardous with the current levels of traffic. This could become a key accident zone with further levels of development.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5109 - 10593 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None
- 5112 Object** **Respondent: mr craig mason [10621]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Dear ne-derbyshire council i strongly oppose the building of housing on greenbelt land at hallowes lane chesterfield road hilltop in dronfield these are all important green spaces for residents to get out and about enjoy the countryside walk play sports exercise there dogs hallowes lane is also very narrow and can barely manage the traffic using it now these is no footpath on hallowes lane so will be made more dangerous if 800 homes are built here with all the construction vehicles and extra vehicles using it
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5112 - 10621 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None
- 5146 Object** **Respondent: Mr Alan Catchpole [10632]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation on Hallowes Lane. Concern over impact on heritage, environment, infrastructure and local residents.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5146 - 10632 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None
- 5497 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
 Summary: Objection on the grounds that the site is greenbelt , that there are constraints in terms of highways and coal mining risk.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5497 - 10724 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None
- 5921 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Dorothy May Makinson [11080]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the use of Hallowes Golf Course for housing in Dronfield. Concerned for losing the land for exercise and company, impact on house prices.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5921 - 11080 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None

- 6135 Object** **Respondent: Gareth Barber [11129]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to proposed development around Hallows Lane in Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: congestion cause by parked cars would be increased, little pavement use for pedestrians, safety of pedestrian especially school students.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6135 - 11129 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None
- 6256 Object** **Respondent: Eric Catchpole [10862]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing allocation on Hallows Golf Course. Concern over: subsidence, impact on heritage, pollution, access and impact on local infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6256 - 10862 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None
- 6300 Object** **Respondent: Mr Tim Stubbs [11197]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing on Hallows Golf Club land. Concern over: lack of infrastructure in the area, increase in traffic.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6300 - 11197 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None
- 6475 Object** **Respondent: Melanie Hudson [11259]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing allocations on Hallows Golf Club. Concerns over: former mining on the site, danger of land subsidence, impact on heritage assets, access to site, impact on resident safety, increase in pollution, loss of GB land, impact on the environment.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6475 - 11259 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None
- 6755 Object** **Respondent: Currently Unknown [11298]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed removal of green belt for development in Dronfield, especially around the Hallows Golf Course. Reasons given for objection: loss of green space in the area, impact on struggling infrastructure, pressure on roads. impact on local residents, no mention of brownfield sites which should be considered first.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6755 - 11298 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None
- 4546 Support** **Respondent: Mr Peter Thornber [10213]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I am writing with regard to the District Council draft plan for housing development in the Hallows/Hilltop area of Dronfield. I would like to set on record my support for these proposals and how delighted I am that this much needed expansion of provision in this area is finally being seriously considered. My only regret is this did not happen 20 years ago!
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4546 - 10213 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallows Lane, Dronfield - None

4850 Comment **Respondent: Grace Whiting [10467]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over proposed housing on Hallowes Golf Course. Concern over infrastructure, wildlife, loss of green belt land and urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4850 - 10467 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None

5095 Comment **Respondent: Michelle Chaplain [10616]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern over impact on wildlife at Hallowes Golf Course.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5095 - 10616 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None

5133 Comment **Respondent: Amy Nolan [10630]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern over former coal mining on the Hallowes site, that could make mortgages difficult for the new residents.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5133 - 10630 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None

5686 Comment **Respondent: Mr Edward throp [10272]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern over access to the site and increase in traffic in the area and effect on the quality of life.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5686 - 10272 - Dronfield, h. Land at Hallowes Lane, Dronfield - None

4547 Object**Respondent: Mr Mick Harrison [10214]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We strongly object to the outline planning to the proposed We strongly object to the outline planning to the proposed developments on the green belt areas of Dronfield. There has been no thought to the residents who have paid a premium to live next to a green belt site. which should never be built on. No thought has gone into the effect the houses will have on the infrastructure of Dronfield. for example the traffic on narrow roads around the hilltop area, the impact it will have on the doctors surgeries around Dronfield which are quite full and it is so difficult to get an appointment. The impact it would have on our schools, which are full. The impact it would have on the environment mainly the wildlife, we regularly have nuthatches, goldfinches, woodpeckers also newts in our garden as well as other more common garden birds ,what is going to happen to these? It would be an absolute disgrace if this act was passed, this is green belt land which is supposed to conserve the countryside!!!

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4547 - 10214 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None

4679 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Daley [10333]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: this scale of development would have an unacceptable impact on the existing infrastructure and would require, as a minimum, a new access directly onto the Dronfield Bypass to take the additional vehicular traffic away from the already overcrowded roads via Bowshaw and Unstone (which is likely to be significantly impacted by the recently started Peak Leisure development)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4679 - 10333 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None

4779 Object**Respondent: Mrs M Clarke [10398]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation in Dronfield. Accepts that more houses are needed, but thinks they should be on a smaller scale. Concerns raised over potential impact on roads and the environment, that could be brought about by the proposed housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4779 - 10398 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None

4893 Object**Respondent: Mr & Mrs M. S. Dickerson [10311]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Concerns raised over potential impact on air quality due to the proposed housing allocation at Hilltop.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4893 - 10311 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None

4967 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rachael Toogood [10566]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are other options than to use green belt land for new homes, such as brown field sites or redevelopment of derelict buildings. The building of new homes on green belt land will in the area of hill top in Dronfield put too much pressure on the roads, which are narrow and difficult to handle in bad weather, and the local schools, such as dronfield infants and juniors and DHFS, which would not be able to cope with the extra admissions due to their size and resources.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4967 - 10566 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None

- 5108 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Access to this area is severely limited and is by narrow roads. This area is popular for walkers, horse riding, etc. It provides a key gap between the town and the bypass and an area of importance for wildlife. This part of town is easily isolated in bad weather and is not within easy walking distance of the town's services as it is up a very long, steep hill.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5108 - 10593 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None
- 5498 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
 Summary: Site is in greenbelt and should not be released. There are highway and coal mining legacy issues
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5498 - 10724 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None
- 6134 Object** **Respondent: Gareth Barber [11129]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed development around Hilltop Road Dronfield. Reasons given for objection: not shown that the highway network in Dronfield could cope with higher car use, change of character, congestion from parked cars on the road will become worse, no direct access to the site.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6134 - 11129 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None
- 6400 Object** **Respondent: Amy Nolan [10630]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Hilltop Road is currently classified as an adopted non-classified highway. Statement that this is misleading as it is a single lane farm track for much of the road, and cannot sustain any vehicles larger than cars, small horseboxes and some caravans. Statement that the road is congested already.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6400 - 10630 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None
- 6425 Support** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]** **Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**
 Summary: Hallam Land supports this proposed housing allocation and argues that the removal of the site from the Green Belt would be logical. The respondent points out that Dronfield is the largest settlement in the district with the greatest concentration of services, very good levels of public transport accessibility and has an important role in serving the day to day shopping. The site itself would be well located for access to local services and does not have any major constraints. Residential development of the site would significantly assist with housing delivery in a sustainable and logical extension to the settlement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6425 - 11228 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None
- 5096 Comment** **Respondent: Michelle Chaplain [10616]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over impact on infrastructure and traffic on Hilltop Road.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5096 - 10616 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None

5685 Comment

Respondent: Mr Edward Throp [10272]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Concern over access to the site. Questions over where the exact planned access point to this development site would be?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5685 - 10272 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None

6182 Comment

Respondent: Mr Simon Farmer [10806]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed development at Hill Top, next to the A61, will directly affect the run off for several septic tanks that service a number of houses adjacent to the field.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6182 - 10806 - Dronfield, i. Land off Hilltop, Dronfield - None

4543 Object **Respondent: Mr David Hallam [8024]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to proposed removal of Green Belt status for the following reasons:
 - Maintaining separation between Dronfield and Sheffield is of vital importance.

- There are other sites which haven't been considered: Old Padley and Venables site and the Alma site.

- The proposals make no allowance for the effect on existing infrastructure, in particular sewerage capacity, transport and schools.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4543 - 8024 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

4544 Object **Respondent: Mr Steve O'Rourke [10208]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plans for housing on your plan (j) north of Eckington road are totally obscene, Coal Aston is struggling as it is to maintain itself as a village, soon it will become a town, keep off the villages, plenty of other places to build also the fields and green belt should be left well

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4544 - 10208 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

4549 Object **Respondent: Mr Phil Higginbotham [10215]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: I read this morning of the plans to build 180 houses on Eckington Road, Coal Aston. This is surely a flawed plan as the local infrastructure simply will not be able to cope with another estate in the village. There are issues raised over traffic in the area. Also concerns are raised over potential fracking tests to the east of Coal Aston. It is believed that this proposal will cause untold damage to the village and its residents.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4549 - 10215 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

4583 Object **Respondent: Mrs Marjorie Nicholson [10246]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objections have been raised to the housing allocation on green belt land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston. Concern has been raised that potential release of small parcels of green belt land could lead to further release in the future. Concerns that Sheffield might spread to Dronfield. Concerns raised over potential impacts housing could have on school, doctors surgeries and social care. Further concerns have been raised over how Coal Aston could become overpopulated, and how further development could take place.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4583 - 10246 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

4584 Object **Respondent: Glenys Beaumont [10248]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to housing allocation on Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield. Concern raised over impact on schools and doctors surgeries. Concern over increased traffic on Eckington Road and Dyche Lane junction. Concern over potential increase of flooding risk on the bottom of Dyche Lane.

Reference made to how the housing allocation could erode the boundary between Sheffield and Derbyshire.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4584 - 10248 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

- 4586 Object** **Respondent: Mr David Haigh [10249]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: As a resident in Hallowes I would like to express my wish for the Council to consider withdrawing Hallowes Golf club land from the proposed Local plan. This valuable landscaped open green space, is a well known local amenity enjoyed by ramblers, dog walkers, golfers from Dronfield and afar. This open green space is part of Dronfield's Heritage, and brings not only prestige to the area, but employment and income to Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4586 - 10249 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4604 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Maxine White [10269]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed building on the green belt area off Eckington Road. Concern over whether existing infrastructure can cope.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4604 - 10269 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4649 Object** **Respondent: Jill Bristow [10305]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocations on land at Eckington Road, Coal Aston. Concern over whether release of green belt land could cause surrounding settlements to merge. Concern over potential increase in traffic more housing in this area could cause.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4649 - 10305 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4764 Object** **Respondent: Janet Booth [10385]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation on Eckington Road. Concern over potential problems which could occur on the surrounding roads. Concerns over existing infrastructure. Concern over potential urban sprawl. Concern over potential threat on recreation in the area.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4764 - 10385 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4766 Object** **Respondent: Olga Wynne [10388]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation in Coal Aston. Concern over roads and infrastructure and whether they can accommodate the proposed increase. Concern over how the recreation site in Coal Aston is going to be lost.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4766 - 10388 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4771 Object** **Respondent: Mr and Mrs R. P Cowley [10392]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation on Eckington Road. Concern over potential loss of bowling green on the site. Concern over potential impact on Dronfield's infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4771 - 10392 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

- 4778 Object** **Respondent: John & Barbara Egginton [10397]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Eckington Road, Coal Aston. Concern raised over loss of green belt land. Concerns over infrastructure, amenities and services. Concern raised over social problems that could come from more housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4778 - 10397 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4798 Object** **Respondent: Mrs S Robinson [10419]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: objection to the proposed plan to build houses on the green belt site on Eckington Road Coal Aston.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4798 - 10419 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4799 Object** **Respondent: G I Robinson [10420]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: objection to the proposed plan to build houses on the green belt site on Eckington Road Coal Aston.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4799 - 10420 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4857 Object** **Respondent: Adrian Edwards [10472]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection raised over proposed housing allocation in Coal Aston. Concern over potential urban sprawl and loss of recreation facilities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4857 - 10472 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4867 Object** **Respondent: Mr John R Fisher [10479]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing allocation on Eckington Road, Coal Aston. Concern over loss of farm land, well being of residents, traffic, infrastructure and services. Suggestion to use brownfield sites instead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4867 - 10479 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4869 Object** **Respondent: Ms Jan Gibbons [8081]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Statement that the District's housing need is not a special circumstance. Objection to proposed housing allocations on Eckington Road, Dronfield. Questions whether proposed use of green belt goes against the plans vision and objective. Concern over proposed housing in conservation area. Concern raised over impact on infrastructure, and how there is no impact assessment report in site showing what impact the proposed housing might have in local infrastructure. Concern over potential flooding.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4869 - 8081 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

- 4870 Object Respondent: Mr John Gibbons [10481] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Questions raised over the exceptional circumstances justifying the release of green belt land. Concerns over environment, infrastructure, loss of green space and urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4870 - 10481 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4890 Object Respondent: Judith French [10500] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation on Eckington Road. Statement that the bowling club present is well used. Concern raised over where recreation would go if it was relocated. Concern raised over potential impact development could have on infrastructure. Concern over potential fracking at Marsh Lane and the impact on roads from that. Parking at Dronfield station is almost impossible.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4890 - 10500 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4922 Object Respondent: Mike French [10527] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation on Eckington Road. Concern raised over loss of bowling green and potential impact on existing infrastructure and services.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4922 - 10527 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4929 Object Respondent: Philip and Jill Andrews [10534] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed allocation of housing on green belt land. Concern over urban sprawl, impact on traffic particularly at the junction of Green Lane and Chesterfield Road and on Green Lane itself. Questions raised over why there is a need for housing in Dronfield. Suggestion that brownfield sites in Dronfield are used instead.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4929 - 10534 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4961 Object Respondent: mr Geoffrey Stringer [10458] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Proposed housing on present green belt land at Eckington Road Coal Aston is in total contradiction of the Councils own policy to promote and provide leisure facilities for its residents. The football pitches and the bowling green are extensively used all year round. The scheme also shows that the access road to the allotment gardens will also be lost making them virtually unusable. The loss of the carpark and bowling green will also have serious repercussions on the annual Coal Aston gala.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4961 - 10458 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 4994 Object Respondent: Cllr C A Smith [6497] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation north of Eckington Road in Coal Aston. Concern raised over loss of green belt land and potential urban sprawl. Further concern over impact on Moss Valley Conservation Area. Alma site and Sheffield football club in Dronfield have been proposed for housing instead of the site in Coal Aston.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4994 - 6497 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

- 5089 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: This is building on recreation facilities. The area already looks set to be hit with large amounts of traffic due to fracking exploration. The roads are not built for this type of expansion and development.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5089 - 10593 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 5152 Object** **Respondent: MR ANDREW WORDSWORTH [8062]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I feel the proposed housing site j which is situated off Eckington road coal aston is far too large and inappropriate,will cause significant extra congestion on Eckington road and will remove the amenity of the well used football playing fields.It will also have a detrimental effect on the local wildlife therefore should not be considered a suitable location for building .
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5152 - 8062 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 5264 Object** **Respondent: Mr F. C. Phillipson [10689]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocation on Eckington Road, Coal Aston. Concern over: impact on Moss Valley and wildlife, urban sprawl, traffic, infrastructure, pollution, loss of recreation space. Statement that it would be more considerate and socially acceptable to pursue the development of Brown Field sites and the release of land held in Land Banks held by developers.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5264 - 10689 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 5306 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Kim Evans [10718]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Coal Aston. Concern over: health, pollution, loss of green space, loss of recreation space, impact on infrastructure, urban sprawl.
 Suggestions for brownfield sites: Gladys Buxton school and brownfield area in Unstone near the boatyard.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5306 - 10718 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None
- 5499 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
 Summary: This site is in greenbelt, it is also in a conservation area and there is a risk to existing open space. Coupled with coal mining legacy issues this site is completely inappropriate and should not go forward the loss
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5499 - 10724 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

6451 Object **Respondent: Denzil Barton [11251]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to the proposed housing on Eckington Road, Coal Aston. Concern over: loss of GB land, lack of brownfield land used, impact on environment, impact on infrastructure and services, impact on; access, parking, traffic and pollution, impact on wildlife, loss of recreation facilities, increase in crime potential. Statement that there is thousands of acres of brownfield land available so why not use that.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6451 - 11251 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

6599 Object **Respondent: Mary Gray [11210]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Area is part of Moss Valley Conservation area, classed by English Nature as of special scientific interest. Building will cause further decline to many wildlife species that are already suffering pressure from urban sprawl.
Currently these fields allow a corridor for the passage of wildlife. Without these 'corridors' viable populations of wildlife are limited.

Concerned about impact of fragmentation, light pollution, noise, vegetarian clearance, recruitment of non-native plants and chemical effects through additional vehicles

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6599 - 11210 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

4820 Comment **Respondent: Mr John Bennett [10440]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern raised over proposed housing allocation on Eckington Road, Coal Aston. Concern over whether existing infrastructure and services can accommodate proposed housing in the area. Further concern over potential impact on green belt land and recreational areas in Coal Aston.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4820 - 10440 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

5441 Comment **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield
We note that this proposed allocation for 180 houses is in close proximity to the Moss Valley Woods SSSI and ancient woodland. We would wish to ensure that any future development proposals can demonstrate that there will be no adverse effect on the interest features of this nationally designated area in terms of increased recreational disturbance and air or water pollution. We note that the potential impact of this site has been mentioned within the Sustainability Appraisal

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5441 - 4469 - Dronfield, j. Land north of Eckington Road, Coal Aston, Dronfield - None

4680 Object

Respondent: Mr Michael Daley [10333]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Stubley Hollow is already significantly impacted by its use as an HGV access road for Gunstones Bakery on Stubley Lane, a use for which it was never originally intended and for which no road improvements have been made. Adding additional housing with its associated vehicular movements could only make an already unacceptable situation worse.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4680 - 10333 - Dronfield, k. Land at Stubley Drive,Stubley Hollow, Dronfield - None

5500 Object

Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]

Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]

Summary: The site has not been properly assessed. There is no ecological assessment and highways have not bene agreed. The loss of greenbelt is a key consideration and the site should not go forward.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5500 - 10724 - Dronfield, k. Land at Stubley Drive,Stubley Hollow, Dronfield - None

6254 Support

Respondent: Messrs S & K Whittam & Grayson [8368]

Agent: IBA Planning Limited (Mr Nick Baseley) [4560]

Summary: S Whittam and K Grayson support the allocation of Land at Stubley Drive, Stubley Hollow, for housing under Policy LC1. It constitutes an extremely logical infilling and creates a new long-term defensible boundary. The respondents are the sole owners of the site which is in close proximity of local services and amenities. The site is considered suitable for residential development, has no known development constraints and could be delivered during the very early stages of the plan period.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6254 - 8368 - Dronfield, k. Land at Stubley Drive,Stubley Hollow, Dronfield - None

- 5850 Object** **Respondent: Mr David Owen [10650]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for protecting the Green Belt, urban sprawl, traffic and safety on the roads, over population, affects on school place and public services, affects on wildlife, risk of flooding, impact on health and wellbeing of current residents as well as spoiling their views.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5850 - 10650 - Eckington - None
- 5851 Object** **Respondent: Mandy Brown [11038]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the housing development plans on Green Belt land in Eckington, Chesterfield Road South. Concerns are for being over populated, school places, health care services, spoiling the countryside, possible devalue of housing.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5851 - 11038 - Eckington - None
- 5852 Object** **Respondent: Peter Jones [10933]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington. Concerned about using Green Belt land, fracking, dangerous access, removing countryside where residents currently walk.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5852 - 10933 - Eckington - None
- 5860 Object** **Respondent: Mrs A Ballington [11041]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Eckington. Concerns over traffic, possible two story dwellings, building on old mining shafts, wildlife, flood risk, school places, public services.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5860 - 11041 - Eckington - None
- 5866 Object** **Respondent: Steven & Rosemary Mitchell [11048]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Eckington. Concerns are for road safety, pollution, wildlife, access to countryside, infrastructure, congestion, property profile, decrease in property value, use of Green Belt for housing, urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5866 - 11048 - Eckington - None
- 5867 Object** **Respondent: Mark & Sarah Dickson [11049]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land for housing in Eckington. Concerns are for road safety, pollution, wildlife, access to countryside, infrastructure, congestion, property profile, decrease in property value, use of Green Belt for housing, urban sprawl.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5867 - 11049 - Eckington - None

6044 Object **Respondent:** Liz Salt [11117] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Eckington. Reasons for objection: impact on infrastructure, roads and traffic, urban sprawl
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6044 - 11117 - Eckington - None

6317 Object **Respondent:** Mr Adam Hancock [11201] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: Objections to the proposed developments and loss of greenbelt land in Eckington. Reasons given for objection: urban sprawl, loss of character, loss of countryside, change from farming land around Chesterfield Road, impact on wildlife, impact on roads, congestion, impact on infrastructure, underuse of surrounding brownfield sites, questions whether better locations could have been chosen, implications of fracking site at Marsh Lane due to coal mining history.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6317 - 11201 - Eckington - None

6476 Comment **Respondent:** Mr David Wilson [10756] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: Although probably slightly less prosperous than Dronfield, Eckington is also located relatively close to Sheffield and other local authority areas. In addition, 435 out of the proposed 553 new homes (i.e. 79%) are planned to be built on greenbelt land. Developing greenbelt land should only be considered as a last resort, where there are no other suitable alternative options.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6476 - 10756 - Eckington - None

6485 Comment **Respondent:** Paul Wilson [11262] **Agent:** N/A
Summary: Although probably slightly less prosperous than Dronfield, Eckington is also located relatively close to Sheffield and other local authority areas. In addition, 435 out of the proposed 553 new homes (i.e. 79%) are planned to be built on greenbelt land. Developing greenbelt land should only be considered as a last resort, where there are no other suitable alternative options.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6485 - 11262 - Eckington - None

- 5300 Object** **Respondent: Donna & Alan Slater [10557]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Statement that advertisement of local plan was not good enough. Concern over: green belt land being used, a lack of brownfield land being allocated, infrastructure, traffic and road safety, wildlife, land stability, property prices being reduced, impact on existing residents, lack of existing services.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5300 - 10557 - Eckington, I. Eckington South - None
- 5501 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
 Summary: This is a large site which is greenbelt. A full assessment has not been completed and the site should not come forward as to do so would be contrary to the NPPF and national planning policy
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5501 - 10724 - Eckington, I. Eckington South - None
- 5621 Object** **Respondent: Mr John Prestwich [10858]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Michael Edgar) [4355]**
 Summary: Please refer to the attached.
 Please note that Appendix 2 is not included due to file size limits.
 Appendix 2 has been received by the Council and is now available for viewing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5621 - 10858 - Eckington, I. Eckington South - None
- 6294 Object** **Respondent: Michelle Woods [11191]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing Allocations south in the south of Eckington. Concern over: loss of view, noise, dust and disruption from the construction, impact on health of residents, devaluation of house price, impact on infrastructure. Concern over lack of advertising.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6294 - 11191 - Eckington, I. Eckington South - None
- 6531 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Susan Nicholas [11039]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Eckington South:
 the overall effect to the infrastructure of Eckington would be considerable when taking into account the proposal to build a further 400 swellings on the land at Eckington South marked 'L' on the plan - an increase in traffic, pollution and the effect on local schools, the health centre, dentist etc. The road through Eckington is already severely congested at peak times.
 Also the properties adjoining the Bolehill land are all bungalows so any swellings built other than bungalows would be an intrusion on existing properties and the outlook generally.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6531 - 11039 - Eckington, I. Eckington South - None

5923 Support **Respondent: Eckington Management Company Limited [8090]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Ben Mitchell) [10149]**

Summary: The site (land at Eckington Road) is identified as part of a wider proposed housing allocation under reference I. The representations support the removal of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for housing. The site represents a sustainable extension to Eckington and is available, suitable and achievable within the plan period. The representation also seeks to re-evaluate the scoring of the site against the sustainability appraisal

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5923 - 8090 - Eckington, I. Eckington South - None

4634 Comment **Respondent: Mr David Walpole [6401]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Page 75, Para 5.24; Improved highway access is crucial for this development.

Page 75, Para 5.25; Need for buffer area is a must - re. ecological features and rare species. Also, this is a very high risk area for housing - re. previous industrial usage and historical contaminants.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4634 - 6401 - Eckington, I. Eckington South - None

6510 Comment **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]** **Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**

Summary: Hallam Land supports housing allocation site I (Eckington South), although points out that there is potential for a much larger development encompassing all land proposed by their amended 'safeguarded land' designation (Plan A). This would allow to develop up to 1500 to 1800 dwellings in total and could deliver between 880 to 1110 dwellings within the plan period. Significant benefits to increase the size of the allocation site are as follows:

- Meeting NED Objectively Assessed Housing Need
- Meeting unmet need from Sheffield
- Creation of a southern Eckington Bypass
- Town Centre improvements

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6510 - 11228 - Eckington, I. Eckington South - None

6645 Comment **Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Whilst there are no recognised nature conservation designations within the allocation marked (I), the removal of land from the greenbelt for development raises the possibility of impacts on the marshland and woodland to the south and possible impacts on protected species present immediately to the south. The allocated area extends right up to the stream and areas of woodland. Any policy on the development of this area needs to recognise the need to protect, buffer and enhance the habitats along the southern boundary in order to avoid biodiversity impacts.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6645 - 2607 - Eckington, I. Eckington South - None

- 5502 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
- Summary: The site is greenbelt and its development would be contrary to the NPPF and national planning guidance
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5502 - 10724 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5736 Object** **Respondent: Mrs K Marples [10927]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5736 - 10927 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5738 Object** **Respondent: J Conley [10929]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5738 - 10929 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5739 Object** **Respondent: Trevor Fleming [10930]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5739 - 10930 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5740 Object** **Respondent: Linda Fleming [10931]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5740 - 10931 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5741 Object** **Respondent: Kathryn State [10932]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5741 - 10932 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5742 Object** **Respondent: Peter Jones [10933]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5742 - 10933 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5743 Object** **Respondent: C Brown [10934]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5743 - 10934 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5744 Object** **Respondent: James King [10935]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5744 - 10935 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5745 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Downs [10936]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5745 - 10936 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5746 Object** **Respondent: Paul Calpin [10937]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5746 - 10937 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5747 Object** **Respondent: K Thompson [10938]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5747 - 10938 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5748 Object** **Respondent: Sally Simms [10939]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5748 - 10939 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5749 Object** **Respondent: J Bridges [10940]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5749 - 10940 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5750 Object** **Respondent: Mr W Bridges [10941]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5750 - 10941 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5751 Object** **Respondent: Mr P H Whiteley [10913]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns over: issues with access, impacts on wildlife, impacts on infrastructure, ground conditions, impact on existing property profiles, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5751 - 10913 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5752 Object** **Respondent: Graham Hoskins [10942]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5752 - 10942 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5753 Object** **Respondent: Andrew Owen [10943]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5753 - 10943 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5754 Object** **Respondent: Jane Marsh [10944]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5754 - 10944 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5755 Object** **Respondent: Mr T Ballington [10945]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5755 - 10945 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5756 Object** **Respondent: Terence Graves [10946]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5756 - 10946 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5757 Object** **Respondent: Ben Buckley [10947]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5757 - 10947 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5758 Object** **Respondent: MP & CE Gilbert [10948]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5758 - 10948 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5759 Object** **Respondent: Mrs M Owen [10949]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5759 - 10949 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5760 Object** **Respondent: Mr J R Pearson [10950]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5760 - 10950 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5761 Object** **Respondent: Maureen Musson [10951]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5761 - 10951 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5762 Object** **Respondent: Leon Dodd [10952]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5762 - 10952 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5763 Object** **Respondent: Mrs D Dodd [10953]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5763 - 10953 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5764 Object** **Respondent: Craig Downs [10954]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5764 - 10954 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5765 Object** **Respondent: Mark Downs [10955]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5765 - 10955 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5766 Object** **Respondent: Arthur B Parkin [10956]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5766 - 10956 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5767 Object** **Respondent: A Gaton [10957]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5767 - 10957 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5768 Object** **Respondent: Timothy Oldfield [10958]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5768 - 10958 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5769 Object** **Respondent: Rob Hurst [10959]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5769 - 10959 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5770 Object** **Respondent: John Loftus [10960]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5770 - 10960 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5771 Object** **Respondent: Mrs S Hoskins [10961]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5771 - 10961 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5772 Object** **Respondent: Mrs B Ballington [10962]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5772 - 10962 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5773 Object** **Respondent: Jenny Smith [10963]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5773 - 10963 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5774 Object** **Respondent: Wendy Wood [10964]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5774 - 10964 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5775 Object** **Respondent: Kathleen Brown [10965]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5775 - 10965 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5776 Object** **Respondent: Grahame French [10966]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5776 - 10966 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5777 Object** **Respondent: Alex West [10967]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5777 - 10967 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5778 Object** **Respondent: S & D Armstrong [10968]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5778 - 10968 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5779 Object** **Respondent: Rosalind Davey [10969]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5779 - 10969 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5780 Object** **Respondent: Christine Rippe [10970]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5780 - 10970 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5781 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Shirley Self [10971]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5781 - 10971 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5782 Object** **Respondent: Ian Beckett [10972]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5782 - 10972 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5783 Object** **Respondent: Nathan Musselwhite [10973]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5783 - 10973 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5784 Object** **Respondent: Liam Musselwhite [10974]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5784 - 10974 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5785 Object** **Respondent: C Marples [10975]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5785 - 10975 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5786 Object** **Respondent: Tom Dawson [10976]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5786 - 10976 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5787 Object** **Respondent: Peter Williams [10977]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5787 - 10977 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5788 Object** **Respondent: Kirk McGuinness [10978]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5788 - 10978 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5789 Object** **Respondent: M Marshall [10979]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5789 - 10979 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5790 Object** **Respondent: Mr J Boardman [10980]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5790 - 10980 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5791 Object** **Respondent: Beverley Seymour [10981]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5791 - 10981 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5792 Object** **Respondent: Scott James [10982]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5792 - 10982 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5793 Object** **Respondent: Mr L Storey [10983]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5793 - 10983 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5794 Object** **Respondent: Mrs K Storey [10984]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5794 - 10984 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5795 Object** **Respondent: Stephen Oldfield [10985]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5795 - 10985 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5796 Object** **Respondent: Nigel Livesey [10986]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5796 - 10986 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5797 Object** **Respondent: Mr ET Roome [10987]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5797 - 10987 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5798 Object** **Respondent: Gary Askwith [10988]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5798 - 10988 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5799 Object** **Respondent: N Thomson [10989]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5799 - 10989 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5800 Object** **Respondent: S Clayton [10990]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5800 - 10990 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5801 Object** **Respondent: Stuart Connell [10991]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5801 - 10991 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5802 Object** **Respondent: Gareth Gardner [10992]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5802 - 10992 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5803 Object** **Respondent: Craig A Parkin [10993]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5803 - 10993 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5804 Object** **Respondent: Mr E Wilks [10994]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5804 - 10994 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5805 Object** **Respondent: Shayne Hodkiw [10995]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5805 - 10995 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5806 Object** **Respondent: Adam Mills [10996]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5806 - 10996 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5807 Object** **Respondent: DR Stephanie Dunn [10997]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5807 - 10997 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5808 Object** **Respondent: Jeffrey & Sharon Hague [10998]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5808 - 10998 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5809 Object** **Respondent: Craig Siddall [10999]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5809 - 10999 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5810 Object** **Respondent: Katy Brindley [11000]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5810 - 11000 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5811 Object** **Respondent: D Greaves [11001]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5811 - 11001 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5812 Object** **Respondent: J Davies [11002]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5812 - 11002 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5813 Object** **Respondent: Mr Andrew White [11003]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5813 - 11003 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5814 Object** **Respondent: Tony Marsden [11004]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5814 - 11004 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5815 Object** **Respondent: Amanda Watson [11005]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5815 - 11005 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5816 Object** **Respondent: Hayley Moore [11006]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5816 - 11006 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5817 Object** **Respondent: Nicola Cresswell [11007]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5817 - 11007 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5818 Object** **Respondent: Kevin Cresswell [11008]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5818 - 11008 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5819 Object** **Respondent: Claire Short [11009]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5819 - 11009 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5820 Object** **Respondent: Samantha Hartley [11010]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5820 - 11010 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5821 Object** **Respondent: Jayne Nettleton [11011]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5821 - 11011 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5822 Object** **Respondent: Mrs C Bowdman [11012]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5822 - 11012 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5823 Object** **Respondent: Mrs G Boardman [11013]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5823 - 11013 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5824 Object** **Respondent: Mrs L Ashmore [11014]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5824 - 11014 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5825 Object** **Respondent: Raymond Marples [11015]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5825 - 11015 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5826 Object** **Respondent: Joe Phillips [11016]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5826 - 11016 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5827 Object** **Respondent: Chris Todley [11017]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5827 - 11017 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5828 Object** **Respondent: Aidan Sheehan [11018]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5828 - 11018 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5829 Object** **Respondent: Kevin Timms [11019]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5829 - 11019 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5830 Object** **Respondent: Anne Siddall [11020]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5830 - 11020 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5831 Object** **Respondent: Mrs J Hagin [11021]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5831 - 11021 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5832 Object** **Respondent: Cheryl Reader [11022]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5832 - 11022 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5833 Object** **Respondent: J Abdy [11023]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5833 - 11023 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5834 Object** **Respondent: P B & S Goodwin [11024]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5834 - 11024 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5835 Object** **Respondent: H Shore [11025]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5835 - 11025 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5836 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Nicola Causer [11026]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5836 - 11026 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5837 Object** **Respondent: Graham Nunn [11027]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5837 - 11027 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5838 Object** **Respondent: Hazel Basford [11028]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5838 - 11028 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5839 Object** **Respondent: D Brown [11029]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5839 - 11029 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5840 Object** **Respondent: K L & R J Downs [11030]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5840 - 11030 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5841 Object** **Respondent: J Ward [11031]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5841 - 11031 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5842 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Tammy Shirtcliffe [11032]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5842 - 11032 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5843 Object** **Respondent: C.T M.R Booth [11033]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5843 - 11033 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5844 Object** **Respondent: M Darby [8761]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5844 - 8761 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5845 Object** **Respondent: Sylvia Everitt [11034]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5845 - 11034 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5846 Object** **Respondent: Mrs B.J Siddall [11035]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5846 - 11035 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5847 Object** **Respondent: Janet Beckett [11036]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5847 - 11036 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5848 Object** **Respondent: Sarah Beckett [11037]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape, crime.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5848 - 11037 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5853 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Susan Nicholas [11039]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: My objections are as follows:-
Access would be onto the already very busy B6052 into Eckington the point of entry being virtually on the brow of a hill and close to the entrance of Birk Hill infant school. Birkhill Lane is a bridleway, an area abundant with wildlife including badger setts, bats and grass snakes and is used frequently by horseriders, children and walkers. Is the land suitable to build on? It is naturally marsh land and surface water drainage could present a problem. Also there is a likelihood of old mineshafts beneath the land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5853 - 11039 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

- 5854 Object** **Respondent: Mr John Brodie [11040]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing in Eckington on site N Bolehill Lane. Concerns for infrastructure, wildlife, flooding, mineral extraction, access, possibility of an invasive view, affects on health care and school places.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5854 - 11040 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5865 Object** **Respondent: Craig Gregory [11047]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane. Main concerns are for issues with access, affects on wildlife and conservation, affects on the community without the green space, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, changing the view of the landscape.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5865 - 11047 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 5868 Object** **Respondent: Mr Andrew Ford [10881]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Green Belt land in Eckington, Bolehill. Concerns are for road safety, traffic and congestion, impact on the loss of land used for recreational purposes, wildlife, infrastructure, doctors appointments, legislation.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5868 - 10881 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 6187 Object** **Respondent: Ms Laura Mitchell [10648]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Eckington on Bolehill Lane using Green Belt land. Main concerns are for impact of views, potentially dangerous access route, impact on wildlife, water drainage, subsidence, strain on infrastructure and public services, traffic, impact on current views from back garden.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6187 - 10648 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None
- 6751 Object** **Respondent: Currently Unknown [11294]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed developments on Bolehill Lane in Eckington. Reasons given for objection: unsafe access to the site, pressure on roads, driver safety, congestion, impact on local wildlife, impact on recreation activities, impact on infrastructure, flood risk, impact from previous mining in the area, impact on surrounding dwellings, change of character and image of the village.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6751 - 11294 - Eckington, n. Land at Bolehill Lane, Eckington - None

4902 Object Respondent: Debra Fowler [10510] Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Killamarsh green belt land. Concern over infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4902 - 10510 - Killamarsh - None

5242 Object Respondent: Mr Alan Weaver [9454] Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to proposed housing in Killamarsh. Concern over: Infrastructure, increase in traffic and pollution, lack of benefit for locals, loss of green belt land, lack of parking. Suggestion that a 'new town' should be built with easy access to the motorway, and planned for the future and not taking the short term easy way out by simply expanding Killamarsh by 20%.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5242 - 9454 - Killamarsh - None

5459 Object Respondent: Ms Diane Weaver [9455] Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to housing allocations in Killamarsh: Reasons: health and safety, pollution, impact on infrastructure, traffic, loss of GB land, parking.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5459 - 9455 - Killamarsh - None

5926 Object Respondent: Mr George Thompson [11083] Agent: A & D Architecture Ltd. (Mr Andy Cooper) [9524]

Summary: This response objects to the fact that the Land to the west of Barber's Lane, Killamarsh is not removed from the Green Belt and allocated as housing land. It is argued that

- allocation of this site as a housing site would promote sustainable development where it is needed;
- the site is demonstrably one of the least effective parcels of Green Belt land;
- the site must be allocated as housing land for the sake of the soundness of the Local Plan;
- housing growth is needed in Killamarsh

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5926 - 11083 - Killamarsh - None

5935 Object Respondent: Anthony Cross [8336] Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to proposed housing developments in Killamarsh. Concerns are for infrastructure, traffic, lack of public transport, changing the character of the town, urban sprawl.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5935 - 8336 - Killamarsh - None

- 6188 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Christine E Johnson [11151]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Killamarsh. Concerns are for impact on current residents, urban sprawl, impact on the road network from surrounding areas, location of proposed housing compared to previous allocations, traffic, road safety, parking, placing of Killamarsh as Level 2 settlement, GP appointments, dentist appointments, threat of fracking, subsidence, pollution.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6188 - 11151 - Killamarsh - None
- 6204 Object** **Respondent: Mr Christopher Curzon [10873]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection over proposed housing allocations in Killamarsh. Concern over: congestion, impact on infrastructure, lack of amenities, impact on roads, lack of public transport, loss of GB land and green field.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6204 - 10873 - Killamarsh - None
- 6452 Object** **Respondent: Ben Weaver [11252]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing in Killamarsh. Concern over: impact on health and road safety, increase in congestion, impact on the environment, impact on infrastructure, lack of existing parking, loss of GB land.
 Statement that if more homes are needed in the North East Derbyshire area these should be built further into the county as to benefit Derbyshire and not South Yorkshire.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6452 - 11252 - Killamarsh - None
- 6454 Object** **Respondent: Mr Paul Johnson [6884]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the 330 dwellings proposed to be built at Westthorpe Fields, and the 100 proposed for the site to the rear and side of Manor Road. Concerns also about all the sites allocated to Killamarsh, due to release from Green Belt. Concerns over: allocations being contrary to NPPF and the LP, scale of proposals, impact on; heritage, infrastructure, services, road safety, pollution, air quality. Concern over: Justification of Exceptional Circumstances, impact on character, access to the sites, impact on wildlife and the environment, precedent for GB release, GB review not reliable.
 Request that the allocation LC1(p) be removed from the plan's site allocations prior to the submission draft being finalised, and that the other sites be considered for removal due to the overwhelmingly negative impact they will have on the existing population of Killamarsh. (see full submission for more.)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6454 - 6884 - Killamarsh - None
- 6456 Object** **Respondent: mrs eva thompson [10883]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing allocations in Killamarsh. Concerns are for air pollution, traffic from Gulliver's Theme Park travelling through Killamarsh, noise pollution, road safety, impact on Policing in the area, does Killamarsh have a good infrastructure, parking, school places, medical services, employment opportunities, loss of environment and wildlife, old mining consequences.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6456 - 10883 - Killamarsh - None

6525 Object Respondent: Gracie Fidler [11266]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Opposition to green belt killamarsh

I have just moved into my beautiful new house. Me and my dog love to go for walks but I don't think we will be able to go long walks because of the new houses that are getting built. I really hope that it will not affect me loads. I have loads of friends where I live and we all love to play together, but I am not sure we will be able to because of the building work!

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6525 - 11266 - Killamarsh - None

6608 Object Respondent: Mr J White [11282]

Agent: JVH Town Planning Consultants (Janet Hodson) [1990]

Summary: We object to the overall level of housing provision in the Plan which we consider is too low. There is no evidence of the Plan dealing with part of the requirement from the Sheffield Area when it is a direct neighbour of the Authority. The SHMA is being updated to take account of recent information, any such update should inform a strategy that maximises the potential of the northern area and the relationship with Sheffield.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6608 - 11282 - Killamarsh - None

5874 Support Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Aldous [6663]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support for the housing developments in Killamarsh. Comments based on immediate housing shortage, future housing shortages, possible upgrades of infrastructure and amenities, improving Killamarsh as a desirable place to live.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5874 - 6663 - Killamarsh - None

5384 Comment Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Planning Advisor) [4266]

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]

Summary: Planning permission 07/00865/FL has been granted for the residential development of the site of the Old Station at Killamarsh and we believe that it should be shown as a housing allocation in the Local Plan. We have a letter dated 22 May 2015 from Adrian Kirkham which confirms that this permission remains extant.

I confirm that this site is now available and deliverable. We therefore request that the site covered by 07/00865/FL be allocated for residential development. The development of this site is in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy and could reduce pressure on the Green Belt surrounding Killamarsh.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5384 - 4266 - Killamarsh - None

5705 Comment Respondent: Barry Stenton [10901]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Concern over impact on Killamarsh's road network following the proposed housing developments in Killamarsh. Main concerns are for the increase in the volume of traffic, noise pollution and pollution. Suggests a new road network for the new housing developments.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5705 - 10901 - Killamarsh - None

6477 Comment**Respondent: Mr David Wilson [10756]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Killamarsh is located extremely close to several other local authority areas. 560 out of the proposed 618 new homes (i.e. 91%) are planned to be built on greenbelt land. Adjacent local authority areas are planning to build about 3000 new homes around the areas bordering with Killamarsh. The road network is old and inadequate, and that it is unlikely to be able to cope with the increased demands caused by these massive house building plans, without significant and proportionate infrastructure enhancements. The vast majority of the homes are proposed to be built 'high-risk' land because of former coal mining workings.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6477 - 10756 - Killamarsh - None

6486 Comment**Respondent: Paul Wilson [11262]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Killamarsh is located extremely close to several other local authority areas. 560 out of the proposed 618 new homes (i.e. 91%) are planned to be built on greenbelt land. Adjacent local authority areas are planning to build about 3000 new homes around the areas bordering with Killamarsh. The road network is old and inadequate, and that it is unlikely to be able to cope with the increased demands caused by these massive house building plans, without significant and proportionate infrastructure enhancements. The vast majority of the homes are proposed to be built 'high-risk' land because of former coal mining workings.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6486 - 11262 - Killamarsh - None

- 5030 Object** **Respondent: Mr Liam Fidler [10598]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the plan due to:
 Roads / Nature & Green Belt erosion / Town infrastructure / Impact on the community
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5030 - 10598 - Killamarsh, p. Land at Westthorpe, Killamarsh - None
- 5031 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Kerri Fidler [10597]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I object to the planning on the grounds of ecological disruption of habitat, village boundaries, green belt removal and personal and community impact.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5031 - 10597 - Killamarsh, p. Land at Westthorpe, Killamarsh - None
- 5156 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Deborah Shepherd [10646]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The road network around this location is not sufficient enough to cope with 330+ extra cars. It is already a very busy road, on a bus route with many agricultural vehicles going up and down frequently.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5156 - 10646 - Killamarsh, p. Land at Westthorpe, Killamarsh - None
- 5519 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Charlotte Farr [10826]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Green lane which lies adjacent to this site struggles to carry the current level of traffic and is used by large vehicles accessing the business park below. There are already considerable delays getting down this road at peak times, due to high numbers of parked cars rendering the road a single lane road. This road is also dangerous with bends and dips, particularly at the junction with Spinkhill road where numerous accidents are caused from the sharp bend, and the steep hill on spinkhill road from which you cannot visualise the junction.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5519 - 10826 - Killamarsh, p. Land at Westthorpe, Killamarsh - None
- 5521 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Julie Walker [8334]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The infrastructure is inadequate to build so many new homes in the area, The doctors and other healthcare is already overstretched. The roads are too narrow and winding with many existing houses lacking any off road parking making parking on the street inevitable. Killamarsh is likely to lose its identity and become part of an urban sprawl. Existing developments such as the theme park in Rother Valley are likely to impact unfavorably on residents in killamarsh. Wildlife needs the green corridors in order to survive, many hundreds of birds, flowers etc will be lost
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5521 - 8334 - Killamarsh, p. Land at Westthorpe, Killamarsh - None

5523 Object**Respondent: malcolm veale [10829]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to the proposed development because the roads around the site are too narrow, there are old mines within the site, a development of this size would drastically change the character of the locality, with increased pollution noise and traffic, a wide variety of local flora and fauna would lose habitat. Health services, schools, sewerage, and other resources would need to be increased.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5523 - 10829 - Killamarsh, p. Land at Westthorpe, Killamarsh - None

6563 Comment**Respondent: Harworth Estates (Mr T Love) [4431]****Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**

Summary: Harworth Estates comments that the housing allocation site p (Land at Westthorpe) would be capable of playing a central role in this increased focus on the sustainable northern settlements. The site would also be overall suitable for residential development with low ecological value, secured appropriate access and unlike ground conditions and contamination risks. The site would be situated where the district's highest housing demand exists and this housing allocations site should include a higher density of housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6563 - 4431 - Killamarsh, p. Land at Westthorpe, Killamarsh - None

- 5157 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Deborah Shepherd [10646]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The road network here is not sufficient enough to cater for 100+ more vehicles. There are many agricultural vehicles already on this road and it can at times be busy. Plus it leads to the main high street which is already extremely busy at peak times.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5157 - 10646 - Killamarsh, q. Land at Uppertorpe Road, Killamarsh - None
- 5504 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
 Summary: The site is greenbelt, the site is constrained and should not be released for housing. To do so would be contrary to the NPPF and to Planning Practice Guidance
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5504 - 10724 - Killamarsh, q. Land at Uppertorpe Road, Killamarsh - None
- 5520 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Charlotte Farr [10826]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: This road into Killamarsh is already heavily used, and the road leads down to the High Street which for the majority of the day remains a single lane road due to a large number of parked cars. Traffic has to take turns to use the space available as it is not possible to fit two cars side by side down this road, which already leads to long delays. Adding further housing will only worsen this situation.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5520 - 10826 - Killamarsh, q. Land at Uppertorpe Road, Killamarsh - None
- 6198 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Noble [10823]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development on Uppertorpe Road, Killamarsh. Concerns are for the access, increase in cars and traffic, school places, lack of good public transport, GP appointments.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6198 - 10823 - Killamarsh, q. Land at Uppertorpe Road, Killamarsh - None
- 5114 Support** **Respondent: Persimmon Homes (Mr George Breed) [8035]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Ben Mitchell) [10149]**
 Summary: Support given for the proposed allocation (q) of land at Manor Farm, Uppertorpe Road, Killamarsh for housing in the Local Plan. Statement made that redevelopment of the site for housing has following benefits: sustainable location with good access to public transport and local services and facilities, efficient use of available land and relates well to existing development, contributes to housing supply and will deliver a good mix of housing to meet needs of the community, create a high quality residential environment that takes into account the character and appearance of the area and create appropriate landscaping and open space.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5114 - 8035 - Killamarsh, q. Land at Uppertorpe Road, Killamarsh - None

6203 Comment **Respondent: Mr Karl Noble [11162]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Comments on Uppertorpe Road plans in Killamarsh. Concerns for the increase in traffic and access in the area, added strain on infrastructure and public services.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6203 - 11162 - Killamarsh, q. Land at Uppertorpe Road, Killamarsh - None
CHAPTER: 5: Living Communities Killamarsh, r. Land off Rotherham Road, Killamarsh

5505 Object **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
Summary: Object to the inclusion of this site which is constrained and is Green Belt. Development would be contrary to the NPPF and to Planning Practice Guidance
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5505 - 10724 - Killamarsh, r. Land off Rotherham Road, Killamarsh - None

6613 Object **Respondent: Mr J White [11282]** **Agent: JVH Town Planning Consultants (Janet Hodson) [1990]**
Summary: We do not support the proposed boundary of site r which is located east of the Rotherham Road and is proposed for 70 dwellings. There is no adequate means of access into the site as currently defined. Peatfield Road is narrow and cars parked on the road limit access. Access to Rotherham Road is via Cross street and Norwood Crescent and this is an inadequate route for 70 new dwellings
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6613 - 11282 - Killamarsh, r. Land off Rotherham Road, Killamarsh - None

6617 Comment **Respondent: Mr J White [11282]** **Agent: JVH Town Planning Consultants (Janet Hodson) [1990]**
Summary: The Boundary of site r should be extended to the north to include the adjoining land and where there is direct access via an established access onto the Rotherham Road. The development Boundary proposed by the objector would not compromise any of the Green belt objectives: it would not lead to sprawl of a large built up area, there is no issue with coalescence, the proposed site has been previously developed in part, no impact on the area's character, there is no threat to an regeneration initiatives in the area.
Para 5.32 of the Plan acknowledged that access is constrained and that proper highway access needs to be achieved.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6617 - 11282 - Killamarsh, r. Land off Rotherham Road, Killamarsh - None

5507 Object**Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]****Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**

Summary: The site is constrained and is in Green Belt. To develop this site would be contrary to the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5507 - 10724 - Killamarsh, s.Land to the East of Barber's Lane, Killamarsh - None

5925 Support**Respondent: Mr George Thompson [11083]****Agent: A & D Architecture Ltd. (Mr Andy Cooper) [9524]**

Summary: Support for removal of Land to the East of Barber's Lane, Killamarsh from the Green Belt and its allocation as housing land in the Local Plan. It is argued that this site is the most appropriate housing site of those indicated on the Killamarsh Policies Map due to its impact on the Green Belt and the existing settlement and would accommodate optimally-placed and much-needed sustainable development in Killamarsh.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5925 - 11083 - Killamarsh, s.Land to the East of Barber's Lane, Killamarsh - None

5330 Comment**Respondent: 654 Group Ltd (Mr Nigel Egginton) [10738]****Agent: John Church Planning Consultancy Limited (Ms Charlotte Stainton) [10737]**

Summary: Wish to promote the site shown on attached plan, for residential development.

This site is not shown with any constraint or allocation on the draft plan. It is available and deliverable (with a developer identified). We therefore request that this site be allocated for residential development.

Planning permission was previously granted (reference 11/00421/OL) on the adjoining draft allocation site and we believe that it would be more efficient if the whole site were to be developed in order to deliver a comprehensive development of these two sites together and to avoid 'land locking' the former allotment site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5330 - 10738 - Calow - None

6627 Comment**Respondent: Mr T Gaskill [11284]****Agent: JVH Town Planning Consultants (Janet Hodson) [1990]**

Summary: The site of Duckmanton Lodge and the adjoining areas should also be allocated for housing. The site comprises some 0.6 hectares and would comprise an attractive small residential site, for around 10 dwellings.

The redevelopment of the existing buildings and surrounding areas would improve the character and appearance of the area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6627 - 11284 - Calow - None

6642 Comment

Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Noted that housing is proposed on a site identified as a Local Wildlife Site. The site has a long history of applications and the biodiversity interest has been a source of discussion throughout the process. The current interest at the site is not known and it may have declined as a result of more intensive management practices. However, we consider that it is important to ensure that the loss of this site to housing is accompanied by suitable measures to mitigate and/or compensate for impacts and that these impacts will still need to be determined if not already.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6642 - 2607 - Calow, w. Land at Churchmeadows, Calow - None

5329 Support

Respondent: 654 Group Ltd (Mr Nigel Egginton) [10738]

Agent: John Church Planning Consultancy Limited (Ms Charlotte Stainton) [10737]

Summary: Support the allocation

We confirm the site is available for development. The owner has commissioned the preparation of a revised planning application which will be submitted in the near future. The owner intends to develop the site themselves.

The site can confidently be included as available and deliverable within 5 years.

It is important that the viability issues relating to the provision of affordable housing and developer contributions are recognised for this site which is in a relatively average value area.

We therefore request that draft housing site allocation y is carried forward to future drafts of the Local Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5329 - 10738 - Calow, y. Land at Post Office, Top Road, Calow - None

5558 Object

Respondent: Woodall Homes Ltd [10799]

Agent: Peacock and Smith Ltd (Ms Katrina Hulse) [9603]

Summary: Please see attached statement, which includes details of the deliverability and developability of site GRA/1601 (land east of B6038 North Wingfield Road, Grassmoor

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5558 - 10799 - Grassmoor - None

5546 Comment

Respondent: S&G Dore [11308]

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]

Summary: Planning permission for Land West of Chesterfield Road, has been granted for the mixed use development of the site to the west of Chesterfield Road, Holmewood and we firmly believe that it should be shown as a housing allocation in the Local Plan.

We request that this site be allocated for residential development and as such that the Local Settlement Gap designated is removed from this site. The development of this site is in accordance with the Council Local Plan Strategy and would reduce pressure on the Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5546 - 11308 - Holmewood - None

5386 Comment

Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Planning Advisor) [4266]

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]

Summary: Support the allocation. The site has planning permission under reference 14/00312/OL.

We confirm that this site which has planning permission is available for development and discussions are ongoing with potential developers and the landowner.

The site can confidently be included as available and deliverable within 5 years.

It is important however that the viability issues relating to the provision of affordable housing and developer contributions are recognised for this site which is in a relatively low value area.

We therefore request that draft housing site allocation ab is carried forward to future drafts of the Local Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5386 - 4266 - Holmewood, ab. Land to the South of, 205 Chesterfield Road, Holmewood - None

5503 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rosemary Taylor [10817]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I am writing as a householder in the village of Morton. We have seen much house building here and I feel it is unfair to be proposing even more building.

1. The School is full.
 2. We have a Post Office but no other shops.
 3. We have no Doctor's Surgery.
 4. We have a very poor bus service through the village.
 5. The houses that are being built here are not affordable houses for first time buyers and those on low incomes.
- Sincerely,
Rosemary Taylor

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5503 - 10817 - Morton - None

5918 Object**Respondent: Mr & Mrs PK & ER McCullough [8356]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to housing development in Morton. Main concerns are for public transport, school places, facilities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5918 - 8356 - Morton - None

5324 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Dean [10732]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 5. Living Communities Ref 5.44 - The area identified for development has been categorized by the Coal Authority as high risk, as the land contains potential hazards from former coal mining, making it potentially costly and unsuitable for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5324 - 10732 - Morton, ac. Land North of Stretton Road, Morton - None

5352 Support**Respondent: AAH Planning Consultants (Mr Alex Cowling) [10744]****Agent: AAH Planning Consultants (Mr Alex Cowling) [10744]**

Summary: Please find attached a letter on behalf of my client outlining our support for the allocation of the site within the local plan for approximately 100 dwellings.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5352 - 10744 - Morton, ac. Land North of Stretton Road, Morton - None

5172 Comment**Respondent: Morton Parish Council (Ms Tina Frost Morris) [7882]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Ref 5.44 - The area identified for development has been categorized by the Coal Authority as high risk, as the land contains potential hazards from former coal mining, making it potentially costly and unsuitable for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5172 - 7882 - Morton, ac. Land North of Stretton Road, Morton - None

4930 Comment

Respondent: P Stevenson [9367]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site submission in Pilsley - see representation for further details.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4930 - 9367 - Pilsley - None

5649 Object

Respondent: Ms Carol Barnett [10871]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Read my representation

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5649 - 10871 - Pilsley, ah. Land at Station Road, Pilsley - None

5295 Support

Respondent: Mr and Mrs Grant and Sara Evans [8809]

Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]

Summary: We support the housing allocation. We note that the site boundaries extend wider than the permission granted under 11/00511/OL and welcome this.

The site which previously had planning permission is available for development and discussions are ongoing with potential developers.

The site can confidently be included as available and deliverable within 5 years.

It is important however that viability issues relating to the provision of affordable housing and developer contributions are recognised for this site which is in a relatively low value area.

We request that the allocation is carried forward to future Local Plan drafts .

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5295 - 8809 - Pilsley, ah. Land at Station Road, Pilsley - None

- 5914 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs M & J A White [11074]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Renishaw on green belt land. Main concerns are for access to the site causing congestion, traffic, school places, impact on doctors surgeries, subsidence, flood risk.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5914 - 11074 - Renishaw - None
- 5946 Object** **Respondent: Mr J K Allsopp [11094]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to Renishaw housing plan. Main concerns are for the conservation area, infrastructure, traffic and parking, social housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5946 - 11094 - Renishaw - None
- 5947 Object** **Respondent: Miss A I Joule [11097]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Renishaw. Main concerns are for road conditions, parking, traffic, impact on school places, doctors, pharmacies, shops and post office.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5947 - 11097 - Renishaw - None
- 5949 Object** **Respondent: Mrs I H Whaitty [11100]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Renishaw. Concerned for school places, traffic, doctors appointments, sewage.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5949 - 11100 - Renishaw - None
- 6105 Object** **Respondent: Derrick Rose [11132]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Proposed Local Plan @ ne-Derbyshire.gov.uk

 I write in respect of the above and the possibility of residential development in Renishaw. The land shown on the proposed plan is I believe included in the greenbelt and should be removed from the plan..

 Any residential development in Ranishaw would no doubt result in increasing traffic movements on Hague Lane (LANE) being an appropriate name, therefore I am of the opinion that no development in Renishaw should be considered until substantial improvements have been completed to Hague Lane.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6105 - 11132 - Renishaw - None

- 6297 Object** **Respondent: Lisa Holland [11192]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Renishaw adjoining Carrwood Road on Green Belt land. Main concerns are for loss of Green Belt land, congestion, pollution, road safety, Strain on GP appointments, school places.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6297 - 11192 - Renishaw - None
- 6415 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Y L Jacques [11237]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land in Renishaw for re-designation. Concern over: congestion on Hague Lane, lack of satisfactory and safe access to the proposed site, impact on local amenities/ facilities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6415 - 11237 - Renishaw - None
- 6416 Object** **Respondent: Mr M D Jacques [11238]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land in Renishaw for re-designation. Concern over: congestion on Hague Lane, lack of satisfactory and safe access to the proposed site, impact on local amenities/ facilities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6416 - 11238 - Renishaw - None
- 6417 Object** **Respondent: Andrew and Susan Oliver [11239]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for development in Renishaw. Concern over: increase in congestion and air pollution, impact on wildlife, impact on local infrastructure. Questions over whether all local brownfield sites have been considered.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6417 - 11239 - Renishaw - None
- 6418 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs D Joule [11240]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing on green belt land in Renishaw.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6418 - 11240 - Renishaw - None
- 6453 Object** **Respondent: Kenneth Dronfield [11253]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concerns for housing allocation in Renishaw, reasons are for lack of communication from the council regarding the consultation, access, road safety, infrastructure, changing character of the village, highway network.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6453 - 11253 - Renishaw - None

- 6459 Object** **Respondent: Miss Angela Hinchcliffe [11254]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to housing development in Renishaw, concerned about current infrastructure meaning roads are congested, road safety, strain on GP appointments, impact on wildlife.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6459 - 11254 - Renishaw - None
- 6462 Object** **Respondent: Greg Ward [11256]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6462 - 11256 - Renishaw - None
- 6463 Object** **Respondent: Brett Fletcher [11255]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6463 - 11255 - Renishaw - None
- 6464 Object** **Respondent: Joanne Ward [11257]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6464 - 11257 - Renishaw - None
- 6465 Object** **Respondent: Stephen Fidler [11258]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6465 - 11258 - Renishaw - None
- 6532 Object** **Respondent: M Holland [11268]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character and community, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6532 - 11268 - Renishaw - None

- 6534 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs G & S Clayton [11270]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character and community, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6534 - 11270 - Renishaw - None
- 6550 Object** **Respondent: Craig Hardy [11273]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to building on Green Belt land in Renishaw. Reasons are for strain on nursery and school places, traffic, congestion, parking, road safety, GP appointments, flood risk.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6550 - 11273 - Renishaw - None
- 6611 Object** **Respondent: Diana. C Fothergill [11283]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to building on Green Belt land in Renishaw. Reasons are for strain on nursery and school places, traffic, congestion, parking, road safety, GP appointments, flood risk.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6611 - 11283 - Renishaw - None
- 6676 Object** **Respondent: Mr S Bignan [11289]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character and community, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6676 - 11289 - Renishaw - None
- 6680 Object** **Respondent: Mr Milner [11290]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character and community, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6680 - 11290 - Renishaw - None
- 6752 Object** **Respondent: Currently Unknown [11295]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Renishaw. Reasons given for objection: impact on local infrastructure, increase in traffic, congestion, safety of pedestrians and drivers, pressure on roads, impact on local infrastructure and services, severe impact on the water table.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6752 - 11295 - Renishaw - None

- 6771 Object** **Respondent: T Hobson [11305]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character and community, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6771 - 11305 - Renishaw - None
- 6772 Object** **Respondent: Joshua Holland [11306]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character and community, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6772 - 11306 - Renishaw - None
- 6773 Object** **Respondent: Bradley Jones [11307]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing in Renishaw. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character and community, loss of countryside, loss of farm land, impact on landscape and visual amenities, increase in congestion and pollution, impact on road safety, impact on infrastructure, GB land is not surplus to local requirements.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6773 - 11307 - Renishaw - None
- 6776 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs D Marsh [11312]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to building on Green Belt land in Renishaw. Reasons are for strain on nursery and school places, traffic, congestion, parking, road safety, GP appointments, flood risk.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6776 - 11312 - Renishaw - None
- 6778 Object** **Respondent: Iris Ward [11314]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to building on Green Belt land in Renishaw. Reasons are for strain on nursery and school places, traffic, congestion, parking, road safety, GP appointments, flood risk.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6778 - 11314 - Renishaw - None
- 6478 Comment** **Respondent: Mr David Wilson [10756]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Renishaw is also located extremely close to several other local authority areas. In addition, 100% of the proposed 270 new homes are planned to be built on greenbelt land. Developing greenbelt land should only be considered as a last resort, where there are no other suitable alternative options.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6478 - 10756 - Renishaw - None

6487 Comment**Respondent: Paul Wilson [11262]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Renishaw is also located extremely close to several other local authority areas. In addition, 100% of the proposed 270 new homes are planned to be built on greenbelt land. Developing greenbelt land should only be considered as a last resort, where there are no other suitable alternative options.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6487 - 11262 - Renishaw - None

- 5977 Object** **Respondent: Green Piling Ltd (Green Piling Ltd) [11104]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: Green Piling strongly objects to the allocation of site ai (Land to the North East of Hague Lane) because their own site would be available instead within the short or medium term and is already served by an established highway network. Allocation of their site for residential use would also result in the ability to reduce Green Belt loss.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5977 - 11104 - Renishaw, ai. Land to the North East of Hague Lane, Renishaw - None
- 6095 Object** **Respondent: Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
 Summary: Panache Lingerie strongly objects to the proposed housing allocation of site ai (Land to the North East of Hague Lane) and its release from the Green Belt. Conversely, the respondents' site would be available within the short to medium term and is already served by an established highway network.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6095 - 11096 - Renishaw, ai. Land to the North East of Hague Lane, Renishaw - None
- 6535 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Roys [11269]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objections to the proposed developments in Renishaw. Reasons given for objection: previous development have already strained local services and infrastructure this will be made worse, congestion and traffic increase, road safety, lack of existing facilities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6535 - 11269 - Renishaw, ai. Land to the North East of Hague Lane, Renishaw - None
- 6540 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Weatherstone [11272]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed developments in Renishaw. Reasons given for objection: green belt land being removed is arable farm land, land has high value landscape and visual amenity, congestion, pollution, pedestrian and driver safety, pressure on surrounding narrow roads, unsustainable roads surrounding development location, impact on infrastructure, no evidence that there are exceptional circumstances to remove green belt land, impact on wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6540 - 11272 - Renishaw, ai. Land to the North East of Hague Lane, Renishaw - None
- 6749 Object** **Respondent: Harron Homes Ltd. (Mr Mark Beevers) [11293]** **Agent: ID Planning (Mr Jonathan Dunbavin) [11292]**
 Summary: Harron Homes objects to the proposed housing allocation of site ai. Due to the fact that it is situated within the Green Belt the Council has not identified the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the release of the site and has not demonstrated that it has fully examined all other reasonable options. The respondent questions why Renishaw has the second highest amount of proposed distribution of all the Level 2 settlements and proposes to redistribute the dwellings proposed at Renishaw to other non-Green Belt sites/settlements within Level 2 like Morton and North Wingfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6749 - 11293 - Renishaw, ai. Land to the North East of Hague Lane, Renishaw - None

6754 Object

Respondent: Currently Unknown [11297]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to the proposed developments in Renishaw. Reasons given for objection: land taken from the green belt, impact on infrastructure, lack of existing facilities, increase in traffic, congestion.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6754 - 11297 - Renishaw, ai. Land to the North East of Hague Lane, Renishaw - None

5331 Object**Respondent: Mr Noel Parkin [10735]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Reference S & H/1703 which would provide 49 houses. Looking to be reconsidered for inclusion in plan for following reasons

1. Aesthetics - As you come up from Alfreton the road bears left by the petrol station and with an attractive housing mix would enhance the look of the area
2. Highways - Vehicles currently enter the village from Alfreton at high speed. A small roundabout for access onto the site near the Petrol station would slow traffic down on entering the village reducing potential accidents
3. Alternatively considering 100% affordable housing but feel a mix would be better

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5331 - 10735 - Shirland - None

6192 Object**Respondent: John Church Planning Consultancy Limited (Mr John Church) [4417]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Resume of the historic background of 'LAND AT HALLFIELDGATE, SHIRLAND' provided in full submission.

Statement that future housing should be considered against amount of affordable housing and public space that could be provided that meets the needs of both the existing community and those of a new development.

Statement that allocating greenfield sites alongside Park Lane merely provides housing development in an area that, whilst adjacent to the new school, has always been seen as an "outlier" of the physical framework of the village. The objection site is at least equally accessible to all village amenities and public transport routes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6192 - 4417 - Shirland - None

6782 Object**Respondent: Mr Derek Sellors [11353]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to building more houses in Shirland. Concern over loss of Countryside in the area, impact on the existing sewer network, water network and gas and electric facilities and these facilities with be upgraded to cope. Concern over the impact on the road and potential increase in traffic going through Shirland.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6782 - 11353 - Shirland - None

5334 Comment**Respondent: Mrs K Goodwin [10739]****Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**

Summary: Wish to promote site shown on the attached plan, for residential development.

The total area of this site is approximately 4.2 hectares although the owners would be very open to discussing allocation of only part of this area (possibly the northern section and/or the site frontage). Even if the whole site were to be developed for housing this would still leave a significant area of the proposed Local Settlement Gap if the Council concluded this was justified.

Request that this site be allocated for residential development and as such that the Local Settlement Gap designation is removed from this site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5334 - 10739 - Shirland - None

- 4968 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Julie Bacon [10565]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I would like to object with material consideration the local plan for Stonebroom namely s&h1605 , 36 houses to be built off pasture lane . The high street is extremely busy with double parking , bus stop and a very busy lane with at least 17 cars going up and down many times a day to equestrian properties and two farms . The council objected to the children's centre car park for 7 cars and now we could have potentially 70 extra cars on a busy lane . The doctors and school cannot keep taking on more people .
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4968 - 10565 - Stonebroom - None
- 5182 Object** **Respondent: MRS JULIA SMITH [8082]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: S&h1605 Increase in traffic on High Street would be very detrimental to what is already a very busy road with restricted visibility. Highway safety would be greatly impaired with vehicular access off Pasture Lane. Detrimental impact on the doctors and school. Loss of outlook to the detriment of residential properties. I believe Japanese knotweed is present and an underground stream. The ground gets waterlogged. Loss of green space. Capacity of drainage and water systems. Adverse effect on abundant wildlife. Should not be earmarked for housing. Could be overlooked, with loss of privacy with noise and disturbance.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5182 - 8082 - Stonebroom - None
- 5350 Object** **Respondent: Catherine Morris [10748]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed allocation in Stonebroom. Concern over: access, traffic, infrastructure, impact on wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5350 - 10748 - Stonebroom - None
- 5392 Object** **Respondent: Mrs A Cooper [10767]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to development in Stonebroom based on concerns for safety of current residents, narrow road space, wildlife, infrastructure. Previously had their planning permission declined, expressed concerns of double standards. Engaged with a solicitors regarding ownership of Pasture Lane.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5392 - 10767 - Stonebroom - None
- 5557 Object** **Respondent: Keith Greaves [10839]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to planned development in Stonebroom based on concerns for increased traffic being dangerous for motorists and pedestrians, strain on public services doctors, school places and recreational facilities. Concern for increased flood risk.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5557 - 10839 - Stonebroom - None

- 5619 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Margaret Kimber [10855]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Stonebroom, Pasture Lane. Main concerns, traffic (there will be 5 accesses all within a short distance of each other. Kingsley cres. Quarry lane, The Sure start centre. Then we will have the new road and Pasture lane all within a short distance. The recommended stagger distances for large scale developments usually require a minimum of 45m between accesses), parking, strain on doctors and school places, disruption to wildlife.
 Presence of Japanese Knotweed has been mentioned.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5619 - 10855 - Stonebroom - None
- 5627 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Lynda Murphy [10860]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Stonebroom. Main concerns are: impact on quality of life, public safety, parking and traffic, getting appointments at the doctors, disruption to wildlife, spread of Japanese Knotweed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5627 - 10860 - Stonebroom - None
- 5884 Object** **Respondent: Louise Wilmott [11063]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to using Pasture Lane in Stonebroom as access to new housing development in Stonebroom. Concerns are for increase of traffic affecting the day to day running of the farm, road safety, disruption to wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5884 - 11063 - Stonebroom - None
- 5919 Object** **Respondent: D.S & W Watson [11078]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development close to Pastures Lane, Stonebroom. Main concerns are for congestion, road safety, traffic, school places, doctors appointments, impact on wildlife.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5919 - 11078 - Stonebroom - None
- 6373 Object** **Respondent: L Smith [11227]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing proposals in Stonebroom. Main concerns are for road safety, impact on schools and doctors, loss of current view, privacy, disturbance, noise pollution, flood risk, wildlife, access.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6373 - 11227 - Stonebroom - None
- 5318 Comment** **Respondent: Kevin Fielding [10636]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Loss of light. Loss of Privacy. Increased traffic congestion. Increased noise. Hazardous Japanese Knot Weed. Loss of trees. Loss of habitat. Interference of drainage. Effect on broadband speed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5318 - 10636 - Stonebroom - None

- 4572 Object** **Respondent: mr peter bunting [8116]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Not to extend Pond Lane from the top as potential access point to the proposed development.
 Loss of privacy and noise.
 Loss of green space, disruption to wildlife.
 Concerns have been raised over Tupton's infrastructure and whether it can handle more housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4572 - 8116 - Tupton, an. Land at Ankerbold Road, Tupton - None
- 4755 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Kirsty Morley [10371]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The privacy breaches to the properties situated on the borders of the proposed site including blocking of light and over shadowing of these houses
 The nature in the area will be detrimentally affected by the amount of proposed builds
 The preservation orders on the trees
 The overcrowding of the last cal village and stress on local amenities to be able to cope with the large influx of people it will bring to the area
 Traffic increase in the village and local area
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4755 - 10371 - Tupton, an. Land at Ankerbold Road, Tupton - None
- 5456 Object** **Respondent: Dennis Fry [10794]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over the planning development at Ankerbold Road in Tupton. Lack of information provided to residents, suitability of old industrial locals instead of green land.
 Generally requesting more information.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5456 - 10794 - Tupton, an. Land at Ankerbold Road, Tupton - None
- 6207 Object** **Respondent: S & J RAWSON & HIRST [10733]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Tupton on Ankerbold Road. Concerns are for increase in traffic, road conditions, safety, loss of wildlife, strain on GP appointments.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6207 - 10733 - Tupton, an. Land at Ankerbold Road, Tupton - None
- 6246 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jennifer Roby [8187]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing development in Tupton on Ankerbold Road. Concerns are for use of brownfield sites before green belt fields, infrastructure, traffic, road safety, increase in crime and anti-social behaviour if affordable housing is built, impact on wildlife, GP appointments, school places.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6246 - 8187 - Tupton, an. Land at Ankerbold Road, Tupton - None

5455 Comment**Respondent: Ursula Fry [10792]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. All brownfield sites considered first; 2. main access from Ankerbold, not Pond Lane - impact of parked cars, curved road and low sun to be considered; 3 + 4. impact on schools and other infrastructure; 5. removal of hedgerows affecting wildlife- would like to suggest to replace these with a green corridor for wildlife reasons; 6. interests of neighbouring homes to be considered when more detailed planning is developed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5455 - 10792 - Tupton, an. Land at Ankerbold Road, Tupton - None

CHAPTER: 5: Living Communities

Wingerworth

5387 Comment**Respondent: Ackroyd & Abbott Homes Ltd. (Planning Advisor) [4266]****Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**

Summary: Planning permissions 14/00763/OL and 16/00656/OL have been granted for the residential development of the Hanging Banks site and we firmly believe that it should be shown as a housing allocation in the Local Plan.

We request that this site be allocated for residential development and as such that the Local Settlement Gap designated is removed from this site. The development of this site is in accordance with the Council Local Plan Strategy and would reduce pressure on the Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5387 - 4266 - Wingerworth - None

5548 Comment**Respondent: Mr David Burton [11309]****Agent: Charlotte Stainton [8395]**

Summary: Planning application 17/00227/OL is under consideration by the Council and we firmly believe that it should be shown as a housing allocation in the Local Plan.

We request that this site be allocated for residential development and as such that the Local Settlement Gap designated is removed from this site. The development of this site is in accordance with the Council Local Plan Strategy and would reduce pressure on the Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5548 - 11309 - Wingerworth - None

6693 Comment**Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]****Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: Site Submission: Rippon's entire landholding at Deerlands Road/Hockley Lane, Wingerworth totals 19ha, and the entire landholding was identified in the 2012 SHLAA under Site Reference WW1609 as being available, achievable and suitable, subject to overcoming localised flood risk issues. The area of the site proposed as a residential allocation is currently the subject of an outline planning application for up to 180 dwellings. The clear advantage of the site at Deerlands Road is that it is located outside of the Green Belt and immediately adjacent to the acknowledged sustainable settlement of Wingerworth.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6693 - 11287 - Wingerworth - None

5394 Comment**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The statement that many households in North East Derbyshire who lack their own housing or live in unsuitable housing cannot afford to buy or rent housing at market rates is ambiguous without defining "many".
It appears contrary to paragraph 2.15 where the council implies that just over 75% of [all] households can afford market housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5394 - 9166 - Affordable Housing - None

6101 Comment**Respondent: Tetlow King Planning (Elaine Elstone) [9590]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: In addition to allowing market housing to cross-subsidise rural exception site schemes, the policy should also enable other affordable tenures to be included where this would support delivery of affordable housing to meet local needs.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6101 - 9590 - Affordable Housing - None

6533 Comment**Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is noted that the Council's proposed affordable housing targets are 40% for the West Sub Area and 30% for the North, South and East Sub Areas. Any such requirement should be based on up to-date evidence of whole plan viability that has been undertaken in line with the requirements of paragraphs 173 and 174 of the Framework. Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and it is therefore vital that these issues are considered when developing an appropriate strategy for development within a local plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6533 - 10071 - Affordable Housing - None

- 5091 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: This is cart before horse. The proposal is to take away the green belt status of land in Dronfield and then look at the housing need at the planning stage. It is clear that the pockets of land identified in Dronfield WILL NOT provide affordable housing, or be appropriate for an ageing population due to the inaccessibility or be attractive for young people...
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5091 - 10593 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 5638 Object** **Respondent: W Redmile & Sons Ltd [10859]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Michael Edgar) [4355]**
 Summary: Policy requires viability testing and to be demonstrably in accordance with national planning policy.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5638 - 10859 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 6293 Object** **Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy LC2
 Statement that it is abundantly clear that if genuine housing need were to be addressed then the majority of new homes should be in affordable tenures.

 Recommended an overall housing target of 5,400, of which 26%, or 70 homes per year, should be in alternative tenures other than conventional open market dwellings. Our key point here is that, whilst open market schemes may or may not deliver the proportional target, our proposed target of 70 homes per year operates independently of the proportional delivery by S106.

 Suggestion amendments to Policy LC2 in full submission.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6293 - 7581 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 6421 Object** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]** **Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**
 Summary: Hallam Land objects to Policy LC2 and points out that the affordable housing provision appears to be derived from the Housing Needs, Market and Availability Study in 2011 which is now out of date. The proposed level of affordable housing would be unrealistic and would have a detrimental impact on delivering houses. The policy should be based on up to date viability information to ensure that the requirements are realistic and deliverable.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6421 - 11228 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 6427 Object** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]** **Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**
 Summary: Hallam Land objects to Policy LC2 and points out that the affordable housing provision appears to be derived from the Housing Needs, Market and Availability Study in 2011 which is now out of date. The proposed level of affordable housing would be unrealistic and would have a detrimental impact on delivering houses. The policy should be based on up to date viability information to ensure that the requirements are realistic and deliverable.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6427 - 11228 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None

- 6513 Object** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]** **Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**
 Summary: Hallam Land objects to Policy LC2 and points out that the affordable housing provision appears to be derived from the Housing Needs, Market and Availability Study in 2011. The proposed level of affordable housing would be unrealistic and would have a detrimental impact on delivering houses. The policy should be based on up to date viability information to ensure that the requirements are realistic and deliverable.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6513 - 11228 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 6629 Object** **Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy LC2 requires on sites of 10 or more dwellings 40% affordable housing provision in the West sub area and 30% affordable housing provision elsewhere subject to viability. However it is noted that the Council's viability assessment is dated 2011 which pre dates the NPPF requirement for whole plan viability testing (paras 173 & 174). It is confirmed that an up dated whole plan viability assessment will be commissioned (para 5.70).
 If the LP must satisfy the requirements of the NPPF whereby development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that viability is threatened.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6629 - 4414 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 6705 Object** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management [7114]** **Agent: Pegasus Group (East Midlands Office) (Ian Deverell) [11291]**
 Summary: Question over the robustness of the affordable housing requirements which subject to the viability assessment may change. Statement that the HNMA report is out of date.
 40% affordable housing is unlikely to be supported by the updated viability work, and also in respect of LC2, that further financial burdens as proposed in this policy will result in an even lower percentage of Affordable housing being viable.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6705 - 7114 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 6023 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The proposed approach to affordable housing is fully supported and based on an extensive range of evidence.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6023 - 10098 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 6099 Support** **Respondent: Tetlow King Planning (Elaine Elstone) [9590]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy LC2: Affordable Housing is supported, however it may be beneficial for the policy to also consider different affordable housing tenure mixes where there are viability concerns; the delivery of social rented homes may be supported by a higher quantity of intermediate affordable homes, or rent to buy which does not require grant funding.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6099 - 9590 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None

- 6653 Support** **Respondent: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd [11285]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Bob Woollard) [10128]**
 Summary: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd welcomes the inclusion within Policy LC2 of a provision that would allow the normally required level of affordable housing to be varied should issues including viability direct that full compliance with the policy can be achieved, and that as an alternative off-site provision or a financial contribution may be agreed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6653 - 11285 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 6669 Support** **Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**
 Summary: Policy LC2 Affordable Housing: support for variation of level of affordable housing to be required as appropriated
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6669 - 692 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 5992 Comment** **Respondent: Advance Land & Planning Limited (Mr Andy Williams) [9755]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We note that the Council does not have an up-to-date Housing Needs, Market and Affordable Housing Study (the previous one is 2011). Given that delivery has previously fallen below the required trajectory and acknowledging that viability is crucial to delivery, we consider that this should be undertaken prior to settling on proposed percentage requirements. We respectfully suggest that if anything, the two requirements indicated in the table to this policy should be reduced to 30% and 20% respectively.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5992 - 9755 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 6038 Comment** **Respondent: Mr W Smith [11115]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
 Summary: W Smith argues that this policy sets a high target and a low threshold in sites of 10 dwellings and over which may result in a number of proposals proving unviable as a result. No viability information is given for sites between 10 and 20 dwellings. However, the policy may deliver more affordable homes if it would have greater flexibility. It is therefore suggested to include
 - lower percentage provision for smaller site to improve viability and retain some provision.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6038 - 11115 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None
- 6332 Comment** **Respondent: Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
 Summary: Strata Homes argues that this policy sets a high target and a low threshold in sites of 10 dwellings and over which may result in a number of proposals proving unviable as a result. No viability information is given for sites between 10 and 20 dwellings. However, the policy may deliver more affordable homes if it would have greater flexibility. It is therefore suggested to include
 - lower percentage provision for smaller site to improve viability and retain some provision.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6332 - 10158 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None

6356 Comment **Respondent: Mr Martin Speed [11212]** **Agent: WYG (Harrogate office) (Mr John Dickinson) [11213]**

Summary: Policy LC2

It is vital that any affordable housing policy takes full account of its impacts on development viability. It has already been acknowledged that North Derbyshire District has a significant need for affordable housing, which far outstrips the overall level of housing proposed for the District as a whole, concern that current evidence on viability pre-dates the publication of the NPPF.

As such, the requirements of the policy must ensure that demands on development are not so onerous as to render it unviable, particularly in the West sub-area which we note is proposed to be subject to a higher requirement for affordable housing than the rest of the District.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6356 - 11212 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None

6604 Comment **Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Noted that the Council's proposed affordable housing targets are 40% for the West Sub Area and 30% for the North, South and East Sub Areas. Any such requirement should be based on up-to-date evidence of whole plan viability that has been undertaken in line with the requirements of paragraphs 173 and 174 of the Framework. Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and it is therefore vital that these issues are considered when developing an appropriate strategy for development within a local plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6604 - 10071 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None

6694 Comment **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: It is clear that the evidence base viability assessment to support this affordable housing policy is out of date and is currently in the process of being updated. RPS would request that the updated evidence base should be made available when it is complete and this should be issued for consultation alongside other evidence base documents.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6694 - 11287 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None

6741 Comment **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: It is clear that the evidence base viability assessment to support this affordable housing policy is out of date and is currently in the process of being updated. RPS would request that the updated evidence base should be made available when it is complete and this should be issued for consultation alongside other evidence base documents.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6741 - 8407 - Policy LC2: Affordable Housing - None

- 5092 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The areas identified in Dronfield will not be suitable for affordable housing. Other areas such as Callywhite Lane could provide much high density housing and apartments and become a vibrant area for young people.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5092 - 10593 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5312 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Christine Brocksopp [10716]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: 5.74 Exception sites,
 Comment: I seek removal of para 5.74 of the plan which potentially allows some market housing to be built in the open countryside and replace it with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement limits from the outset.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5312 - 10716 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 4842 Comment** **Respondent: Mr A Petrie [6413]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over Para. 5.74 which states that it may be appropriate to allow a small element of market housing on exception sites. This seems wholly unsatisfactory for a number of reasons. (see submission)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4842 - 6413 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5118 Comment** **Respondent: Mr C Pratt [6423]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I would seek the removal of paragraph 5.74 of the plan which potentially allows some market housing to be built in open countryside and replace it with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5118 - 6423 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5122 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Muriel Pratt [8331]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I think paragraph 5.74 should be removed as this potentially allows some market housing to be built in open countryside. It should be replaced with adequate provision to build affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5122 - 8331 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5181 Comment** **Respondent: Clare and Ian Blaskey [10654]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We seek removal of paragraph 5.74 of the plan which allows market housing to be built in the open countryside and replace it with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5181 - 10654 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None

- 5191 Comment** **Respondent: Helen Boffy [10661]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Seek removal of Paragraph 5.74 of the plan which potentially allows some market housing to be built in the open countryside, and replace it with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5191 - 10661 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5194 Comment** **Respondent: Mr David Boffy [10662]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Seek removal of Paragraph 5.74 of the plan which potentially allows some market housing to be built in the open countryside, and replace it with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5194 - 10662 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5263 Comment** **Respondent: Johanne Boulding [8047]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Comment for Paragraph 5.74 of the plan removed as this potentially allows some market housing to be built in the open countryside. I think it would be more appropriate to replace it with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5263 - 8047 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5271 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Sally Skinner [8285]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Suggestion for the removal of Paragraph 5.74 of the plan which potentially allows some market housing to be built in the open countryside, and replace it with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5271 - 8285 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5315 Comment** **Respondent: JK Marsden [8305]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Suggested removal of Paragraph 5.74 of the plan which potentially allows some market housing to be built in the open countryside and replacing it with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5315 - 8305 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5345 Comment** **Respondent: Paul Eastwood [8278]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Comment to amend Para. 5.74 of the Plan which potentially allows market housing development where associated with affordable housing on 'Exception Sites'.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5345 - 8278 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None

- 5354 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Thelma Childs [8335]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Suggestion that Paragraph 5.74 should be removed from the plan which potentially allows some market housing to be built in the open countryside, and for it to be replaced with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5354 - 8335 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5357 Comment** **Respondent: Gemma Childs [10750]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Comment that Paragraph 5.74 should be removed from the plan which potentially allows some market housing to be built in the open countryside, and for it to be replaced with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5357 - 10750 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5383 Comment** **Respondent: Jill Broadhead [10766]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Request for removal of Paragraph 5.74 of the plan which potentially allows some market housing to be built in the open countryside and replace it with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5383 - 10766 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5582 Comment** **Respondent: Peter Maskrey [10842]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Note that Para 5.74 of the Plan apparently retains the possibility of some market housing to be built in the open countryside. Para 5.74 should be removed in its entirety. An element of affordable housing lost by the removal of Para 5.74 could be accommodated within the settlement development limits.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5582 - 10842 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5886 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Isobel Clark [8068]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: seek the removal of paragraph 5.74 of the plan which potentially allows some market housing to be built in the open countryside and replace it with adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5886 - 8068 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5887 Comment** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs David & Margaret Wombwell [11062]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: We are though, concerned that Paragraph 5.74 might allow market housing to be built on green fields. We strongly hope that this paragraph will be amended, so that affordable housing can be planned for initially and that it will be planned for it to be built within the existing settlement area.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5887 - 11062 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None

- 6015 Comment** **Respondent: Janet E Bradley [8342]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I want the section Paragraph 5.74 removed. This paragraph allows some housing to be built in the open countryside. I should like this paragraph to be replaced by one which states that adequate provision of housing be within settlement limits. This should apply not just to Ashover but other settlements in the rural west as well.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6015 - 8342 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 6202 Comment** **Respondent: Chris Scott [11161]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I would ask that Paragraph 5.74 is amended as I feel that this is likely to encourage developers to make speculative applications on green field sites, when it would be better if adequate provision for low cost housing sited within the existing settlement development limits, was included in the plan from the start. This approach would offer a better protection to the special landscape area and close a potential loophole in the local plan.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6202 - 11161 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 6228 Comment** **Respondent: Patricia Scott [8283]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I would ask that Paragraph 5.74 is amended as I feel that this is likely to encourage developers to make speculative applications on green field sites, when it would be better if adequate provision for low cost housing sited within the existing settlement development limits, was included in the plan from the start. This approach would offer a better protection to the special landscape area and close a potential loophole in the local plan.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6228 - 8283 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 6468 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Anne Eastwood [8059]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concerns over Para. 5.74 of the Plan which potentially allows market housing development where associated with affordable housing on 'Exception Sites'. Recommendation that the Council removes Para 5.74. Or makes the amendment that the adequate provision for affordable housing within the settlement development limits from the outset so that green field sites cannot be vulnerable to such treatment.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6468 - 8059 - Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None

- 5395 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The proposal to develop Green Belt land around Dronfield does not meet the definition of exceptions in the NPPF; it is of a scale beyond "limited infilling in villages" or other specific exceptions. (7.4)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5395 - 9166 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 5138 Comment** **Respondent: Mr A Hardwick [8085]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy LC3 gives me some great concern at paragraphs f) and g) in that there are some loopholes here which could so very easily be abused by unscrupulous developers, who also might promise a certain mix of housing at outline planning stage, but then when reality strikes be compelled to change that mix towards more market houses at the final planning stage. I feel that paragraphs f) and g) should be removed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5138 - 8085 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 6032 Comment** **Respondent: Mr W Smith [11115]** **Agent: DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]**
 Summary: W Smith points out that point e) of the policy (proposals should not have an unacceptable impact on the openness of the Green Belt) is too restrictive and would result in any proposal being refused on the grounds it impacts on the openness of the Green Belt. It therefore suggests to remove point e) from the policy.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6032 - 11115 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 6100 Comment** **Respondent: Tetlow King Planning (Elaine Elstone) [9590]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Point a) of Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing should be amended to remove reference to "that would not be met by a market housing proposal". Market housing proposals would not be acceptable in these areas as this would be contrary to Policy SS14. As the purpose of rural exception site schemes is to provide affordable housing in rural areas where development would otherwise be restricted, this element of the policy is unnecessary and confusing and should be removed.
 The final paragraph of this policy should be removed and set out as a separate policy; it is not appropriate to include policy on specialist housing for the elderly as part of an affordable housing policy as this does not give due weight nor does it reflect the specialist nature of such proposals.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6100 - 9590 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 6309 Comment** **Respondent: Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy LC3:
 The limitations in this policy are too restrictive. Smarter homes and homes to provide employee accommodation, linked to established rural based employers should qualify as "affordable housing."
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6309 - 11116 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None

- 6330 Comment** **Respondent:** Strata Homes Limited (Miss Gemma Close) [10158] **Agent:** DLP Planning Ltd (mr Graham Northern) [10267]
- Summary: Strata Homes wishes that point e) from Policy LC3 is removed and argues that this point would be too restrictive because it would result in any proposal being refused on grounds it impacts on the openness of the Green Belt.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6330 - 10158 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 6388 Comment** **Respondent:** Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171] **Agent:** Caroline McIntyre [8482]
- Summary: The continuation of an Exception Site policy is welcomed. However the reference to an element of market housing only being allowed on sites outside of the Green Belt is disappointing. The financial impetus from an element of market housing in order to deliver an affordable housing scheme on sites within the Green Belt is no different to the requirement on sites outside of the Green Belt.
- Other policies within the NPPF and within the Local Plan could be used to constrain the extent of any such proposals on the GB as these would need to meet an identified local need and be assessed in terms of the acceptability of any impact on the GB.
- It is considered that as an exception Green Belt land is often well located to deliver such accommodation, and again any such proposals would be considered against the other policies within the Plan.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6388 - 8171 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 6445 Comment** **Respondent:** Mr & Mrs N Beecroft [11244] **Agent:** Caroline McIntyre [8482]
- Summary: Policy LC3: the continuation of an Exception Site policy is welcomed. reference to an element of market housing only being allowed on sites outside of the Green Belt is disappointing. It's considered that other policies within the NPPF and draft LP could be used to constrain the extent of proposals on GB as these would need to meet an identified local need and be assessed in terms of the acceptability of any impact on the GB.
- LC3 should be clarified as to how proposals for specialist housing would be considered within the GB. It's considered that as an exception GB land is often well located to deliver such accommodation, and again any such proposals would be considered against the other policies within the Plan.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6445 - 11244 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 6555 Comment** **Respondent:** Ashover Parish Council (Mrs S Atkinson) [7554] **Agent:** N/A
- Summary: Policy LC3 Exception sites for Affordable Housing: While we generally support the introduction of an exception sites policy, we are concerned with Policy as currently worded. Especially Para. 5.74 which states that it may be appropriate to allow a small element of market housing on exception sites. This may have unintended consequences and is contrary to the spirit and intent of the Policy. This clause should be removed.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6555 - 7554 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None
- 6582 Comment** **Respondent:** Mr & Mrs Brailsford [11278] **Agent:** Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]
- Summary: Mr & Mrs Brailsford state that the limitations in this policy are too restrictive. Starter homes should qualify as "affordable housing."
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6582 - 11278 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None

6588 Comment **Respondent: Mr Neil Mowatt [11279]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**

Summary: Mr Mowatt points out that the limitations in this policy are too restrictive. Starter homes and homes to provide employee accommodation, linked to established rural based employers should qualify as "affordable housing."

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6588 - 11279 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None

6595 Comment **Respondent: Mr Grey [11280]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**

Summary: Mr Grey argues that the limitations in this policy are too restrictive. Starter homes and homes to provide employee accommodation, linked to established rural based employers should qualify as "affordable housing."

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6595 - 11280 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None

6659 Comment **Respondent: Mr Matt Slack [11286]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**

Summary: M Slack points out that the limitations in Policy LC3 are too restrictive. Starter homes should qualify as "affordable housing."

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6659 - 11286 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None

6682 Comment **Respondent: Mr Perez [11288]** **Agent: Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd (Mr Roger Yarwood) [5231]**

Summary: Mr Perez emphasises that the limitations in this policy are too restrictive. Starter homes and homes to provide employee accommodation, linked to established rural based employers should qualify as "affordable housing."

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6682 - 11288 - Policy LC3: Exception Sites for Affordable Housing - None

- 4608 Object** **Respondent: Mr Edward Throp [10272]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Whilst I generally support the delivery of affordable housing, it should be targeted at areas where appropriate jobs are available. For this reason I do not see that a high proportion of social housing is the right mix for the Dronfield area, where whilst there are some local employers of significant size the majority of the population are commuters to Sheffield or Chesterfield
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4608 - 10272 - Type and Mix of Housing - None
- 4635 Comment** **Respondent: Mr David Walpole [6401]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Page 89, Para 5.80; The percentage levels in Table 5.3 must be adhered to
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4635 - 6401 - Type and Mix of Housing - None
- 5396 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: It is unclear how the Council will seek to meet the housing needs of certain groups, or encourage developers to provide certain types of dwellings. The Council (Rykneld Homes) has not used an opportunity at Manor Farm, Dronfield to provide housing for older people.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5396 - 9166 - Type and Mix of Housing - None
- 5665 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: If the council do not intend to implement measures to ensure Access to high speed broadband & thus emerging online healthcare initiatives, any statement about it is irrelevant.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5665 - 9166 - Type and Mix of Housing - None
- 5666 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: It is impossible to encourage a dwelling to do anything. (5.87)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5666 - 9166 - Type and Mix of Housing - None

5397 Object**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan should incorporate an unambiguous commitment by the council to mandate developers to provide a specified proportion of dwellings suitable for older people of the types listed. (5.86)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5397 - 9166 - Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing - None

5667 Object**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: With the use of words 'will support' and "should" are optional and of no value without a definition; as a result the council has not made any quantifiable commitment to ensure the housing needs of older people or those with special needs will be met.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5667 - 9166 - Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing - None

6605 Object**Respondent: Gladman Developments (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [10071]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support for the Council's intention within this policy to support the delivery of housing for older people and specialist housing provision. It is however necessary to raise concerns regarding the intention to introduce national space standards; and, higher optional standards for accessible & adaptable homes. The approach that is suggested is not considered to be in line with the guidance given in the NPPG.

Council does not appear to have published such justification in its evidence base and therefore this policy approach is considered to be unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6605 - 10071 - Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing - None

6630 Object**Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: If the Council wishes to adopt the nationally described space standard the Council should only do so by applying the criteria set out in the NPPG.

It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for NED which justifies the inclusion of the nationally described space standard in a LP policy.

Viability should be considered in particular an assessment of the cumulative impact of policy burdens. The Council cannot simply expect home buyers to absorb extra costs in an area where there exists severe affordability pressures.

The Council should undertake an assessment of these impacts. The Council should take into consideration any adverse effects on delivery rates of sites included in the housing trajectory.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6630 - 4414 - Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing - None

- 6706 Object** **Respondent: Hallam Land Management [7114]** **Agent: Pegasus Group (East Midlands Office) (Ian Deverell) [11291]**
- Summary: Policy LC4 refers to potentially requiring development proposals to meet technical housing standards and also for 20% lifetime homes. These policies can only be taken into account at the same time as undertaking the viability evidence to support the affordable housing requirement.
- Potentially a need for local circumstances to justify a requirement for technical housing standards presently lacking. Therefore we object to Policy LC4.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 6706 - 7114 - Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing - None
- 6069 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: LC4 Type and Mix of Housing - SUPPORT the policy approach to require a proportion of accessible and adaptable dwellings to reflect demographic projections within the HMA.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 6069 - 8156 - Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing - None
- 6103 Support** **Respondent: Tetlow King Planning (Elaine Elstone) [9590]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing is appropriate, and supported. Though specialist housing for the elderly(including extra care)should be set out separately in another policy.
- Suggestion that the Council acts now to adopt an innovative approach to meeting local housing needs by incorporating the new definitions of affordable housing, including rent to buy.
- Would welcome any opportunity to meet with members of the planning policy and housing teams to discuss rent to buy.
- See attachment for more.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 6103 - 9590 - Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing - None
- 6357 Support** **Respondent: Mr Martin Speed [11212]** **Agent: WYG (Harrogate office) (Mr John Dickinson) [11213]**
- Summary: We support the recognition in Policy LC4 of the impacts that requirements on housing mix can have on viability, and look forward to the publication of an up to date viability assessment of the whole plan, but are concerned that there is not sufficient evidence in place to fully justify the proposed imposition of national space standards. Such standards have major impacts on build costs, which may both hamper delivery and serve to increase the cost of new dwellings. In an area which has such acute issues of affordability, great care must be taken to ensure that general housing needs can be met.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 6357 - 11212 - Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing - None
- 6695 Comment** **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
- Summary: RPS note at footnote 10 that the Council is currently investigating whether there is a need for this requirement and if not, it will be deleted from the Policy. If the Council wishes to adopt the higher optional technical standards then they must demonstrate a clear evidenced need and consider the impact on viability. The requirement for higher space standards will have an impact on plotting efficiencies and therefore dwellings per hectare. If it is the Council's intention to retain the policy as drafted then this evidenced need should be issued for consultation alongside other evidence base documents. Recommendation of a new clause being included.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6695 - 11287 - Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing - None

6742 Comment**Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]****Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: Policy LC4 expects all new build market and affordable housing to meet DCLG's Technical housing standards. RPS note the Council is currently investigating whether there is a need for this requirement and if not, it will be deleted from the Policy. If the Council wishes to adopt the higher optional technical standards they must demonstrate a clear evidenced need and consider the impact on viability. RPS would recommend the inclusion of a clause (12 months following adoption of the plan). If it is the Council's intention to retain the policy, this evidence need should be issued for consultation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6742 - 8407 - Policy LC4: Type and Mix of Housing - None

- 5508 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
- Summary: Object to this policy unless there is a real and identified need in the District for this type of housing and there is no other way of achieving it. A new policy allowing self build or custom build on small sites/infill should be considered which would be more effective
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5508 - 10724 - Policy LC5: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - None
- 6655 Object** **Respondent: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd [11285]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Bob Woollard) [10128]**
- Summary: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd objects to Policy LC5. The Local Plan has not confirmed the number of people who have expressed interest in self build opportunities. To simply ascribe this limited interest in the register yet impose a significant policy requirement on the basis of it (5% of plots to be reserved) is arbitrary, unfounded in reliable evidence and unreasonable. Even if the policy was effective in securing self build plots, the supply may be below or above the actual level of demand. As drafted, this policy is unworkable and should be deleted.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 6655 - 11285 - Policy LC5: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - None
- 6670 Object** **Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**
- Summary: Policy LC5 Custom and Self Build Dwellings: Object to unworkable policy
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 6670 - 692 - Policy LC5: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - None
- 6696 Object** **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
- Summary: Imposing this requirement on major housing schemes will create viability and uncertainty of deliver issues for developers and the sites. There is insufficient evidence provided to justify the inclusion of this onerous requirement in a market with viability concerns.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 6696 - 11287 - Policy LC5: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - None
- 6743 Object** **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
- Summary: Imposing this requirement on major housing schemes will create viability and uncertainty of deliver issues for developers and the sites. There is insufficient evidence provided to justify the inclusion of this onerous requirement in a market with viability concerns.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 6743 - 8407 - Policy LC5: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - None

6358 Comment **Respondent: Mr Martin Speed [11212]** **Agent: WYG (Harrogate office) (Mr John Dickinson) [11213]**

Summary: The imposition of a requirement for self-build plots as part of larger sites will not lead to net increases in delivery compared to a site which is not subject to such criteria, and may in fact serve to delay development.

It's considered that small-scale self-build developments would be more appropriately directed towards small-scale, stand-alone windfall sites, and explicit text could be incorporated into policies SS12, SS13 and/or SS14 to facilitate such developments in these areas. This would lead to a genuine increase in supply, whilst also facilitating a new form of delivery.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6358 - 11212 - Policy LC5: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - None

6631 Comment **Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy LC5 proposes 5% self-build plots on sites of more than 20 dwellings to be marketed for 12 months before reverting back to the original house builder for delivery. If the Council continues to pursue Policy LC5 then the definition of self-build/custom build should be set out in the glossary.

HBF is supportive of self-build for its additionality to housing supply. The HBF is less supportive of a housing mix approach whereby a requirement to provide self-build plots is imposed on sites of a certain size.

If the Council wishes to promote custom build it should do so on the basis of evidence of such need identified in its SHMA work as set out in the NPPG(ID 2a-021-20140306). Any proposed self-build policy should also be viability tested.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6631 - 4414 - Policy LC5: Custom and Self Build Dwellings - None

CHAPTER: 5: Living Communities Policy LC7: Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings in the Countryside

6310 Object **Respondent: Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy LC7:

Although this policy is intended to include for "other occupational dwellings in the countryside" there is no such provision in the text. The policy only refers to dwellings for agriculture and forestry. This is a serious omission and requires correction. Mount St Mary's College is a rural based employer which will require employee's dwellings to be allowed for in this policy. In its present form this policy is inconsistent with Policy SS14 (b).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6310 - 11116 - Policy LC7: Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings in the Countryside - None

CHAPTER: 5: Living Communities Gypsies & Travellers

6027 Support **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: is welcomed that paragraph 5.103 makes appropriate reference to the Derby, Derbyshire, Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) and East Staffordshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). The GTAA recommended that there was a requirement is set out in para 5.1033 which is welcomed.

The indication in paragraph 5.106 that although to date, no sites have come forward which allow the District Council to propose site allocation in the LPCD but that work on identifying potential allocations is continuing by the District Council, is welcomed and supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6027 - 10098 - Gypsies & Travellers - None

6340 Object **Respondent: National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr Alan Roger Yarwood) [4485]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The statement in criterion (a) of Policy LC9 that permission will be granted only where there is an identified need leaves the policy non-compliant with national planning policy as set out in PPTS. Paragraph 10 of PPTS clearly states that unmet need cannot be used as a test of acceptability. All applications must be judged against their merits. An acceptable site must be approved irrespective of unmet need. Paragraph 10 of PPTS requires that criteria must be set out to deal with planning applications even where there is no unmet need.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6340 - 4485 - Policy LC9: Provision for Traveller Sites - None

6028 Support **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is likely that the Local Plan Inspector will require the District Council to have identified land in the Local Plan for allocation for Traveller pitches, particularly to meet the five year requirement from 2014 to 2019. In the context of this on-going work, the inclusion in the LPCD of Policy LC9 is fully supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6028 - 10098 - Policy LC9: Provision for Traveller Sites - None

6070 Comment **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Para 5.103
Acknowledge joint working on GTAA.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6070 - 8156 - Policy LC9: Provision for Traveller Sites - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Introduction
Economic Development**5669 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Statement that resident jobs relate strongly to nearby employment centres such as (6.5) confirms that building 860 new dwellings in Dronfield is environmentally unsustainable; will increase commuting to Sheffield, Chesterfield, and through Chesterfield to the strategic development sites, and is thus inconsistent with objectives 3.9 D8 and D13, and in breach of policy SS1 clauses c and g.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5669 - 9166 - Introduction - None

5670 Comment **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Callywhite Lane is not a principal employment growth site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5670 - 9166 - Introduction - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Economic Growth and Employment Land Provision
Economic Development

- 5672 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Evidence is required to support the statement that Callywhite Lane provides a significant improvement to the quality of the employment land portfolio bearing in mind the challenges of the site (6.20,6.8)
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5672 - 9166 - Economic Growth and Employment Land Provision - None
- 5671 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: If Dronfield and Killamarsh are the main focus for employment (6.13) the council should state the investment it is planning to make to resolve the difficulties with Callywhite Lane.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5671 - 9166 - Economic Growth and Employment Land Provision - None
- 5981 Comment** **Respondent: Green Piling Ltd (Green Piling Ltd) [11104]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
Summary: Green Piling intends to relocate their existing premises to a new, purpose built accommodation in the near future which means that this site would become vacant in the short to medium term. However, market interest for the underused Ravenshorn Commercial Park would be expected to be limited for industrial and employment generating uses.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5981 - 11104 - Economic Growth and Employment Land Provision - None
- 6098 Comment** **Respondent: Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096]** **Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]**
Summary: Panache Lingerie points out that their site has never been developed for industrial and employment uses. It is considered that there is a low demand for this type of use in this location and that the Council has over allocated employment land relative to demand.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6098 - 11096 - Economic Growth and Employment Land Provision - None
- CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Provision & Protection of Employment Land to Accommodate Growth
Economic Development
- 5566 Comment** **Respondent: PMW Property [10783]** **Agent: Cerda Planning Limited (Michael Robson) [10782]**
Summary: See attached
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5566 - 10783 - Provision & Protection of Employment Land to Accommodate Growth - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Employment Land Availability
Economic Development

6071 Support **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Para 6.20
SUPPORT the approach to allowing some capacity for losses of employment land over the plan period.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6071 - 8156 - Employment Land Availability - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Table 6.1 - Employment Land Availability
Economic Development

5569 Object **Respondent: PMW Property [10783]** **Agent: Cerda Planning Limited (Michael Robson) [10782]**

Summary: See attached

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5569 - 10783 - Table 6.1 - Employment Land Availability - None

5660 Comment **Respondent: Mr Robert Gilmore [10344]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: I support developing the site at Callywhite Lane for employment uses (higher skilled B1/B2), however, there are significant concerns relating to the deliverability of the site due to the funding requirements for the new link road off Chesterfield Road. The Plan should be deliverable & therefore sites which do not have evidence to suggest that they can be brought forward should be reconsidered.
Evidence of public/private funding for the link road should be given before the site is allocated in the Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5660 - 10344 - Table 6.1 - Employment Land Availability - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Economic Development Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield

- 4585 Object** **Respondent: Mr Oliver Hewitt [10177]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: It does not seem appropriate to extend Callywhite Lane for employment use when there are so many empty units on this estate currently. Use of this land for housing which would help regenerate the area would seem to make more sense than housing development in greenbelt.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4585 - 10177 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4665 Object** **Respondent: Mr IAN LIMB [10307]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I also believe the proposed extension of Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate and the new access off Sheffield Road close to the Nature Park to be extremely detrimental to the environment of Dronfield.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4665 - 10307 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4743 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Believes this is ridiculous and unrealistic.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4743 - 9167 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4827 Object** **Respondent: Pat Basford [10403]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to Callywhite Lane extension.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4827 - 10403 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 5028 Object** **Respondent: Unstone Parish Council (Mrs Jacqueline Clayton) [7600]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The proposed extension of the Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate and the new link road onto Chesterfield Road will result in a significant increase in HGV traffic travelling through Unstone Village, which will have a potential detrimental effect on air quality and noise levels, for local people living along the route.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5028 - 7600 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 5094 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: There are many unoccupied sites on Callywhite Lane - it is not attractive due to its access limitations for HGVs. Recognising that this area is in decline for large industry would be sensible and looking at developing this into a mixed use space would be of interest - affordable housing and apartments in easy reach of the station and centre. There is already a thriving park. This type of area could then attract digital industries and other types of commerce - providing the types of jobs that the people of Dronfield would benefit from.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5094 - 10593 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

- 5283 Object Respondent: Heather Brown [10265] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to extension of Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate. Concern over: traffic, impact on existing roads, road safety.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5283 - 10265 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 5291 Object Respondent: Mr and Mrs Johnson [10708] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to extension of Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate. Concern over: traffic, impact on existing roads, road safety.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5291 - 10708 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 5305 Object Respondent: Hugh Chaplain [10717] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to extension of Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate. Concern over: traffic, impact on existing roads, road safety.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5305 - 10717 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 5629 Object Respondent: Mr & Mrs William and Maralyn Dommett [8020] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the extension of the Callywhite Business Park, statement that it is unnecessary as there are many empty and derelict sites there as it is. Further HGV traffic in Dronfield should be avoided.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5629 - 8020 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 5674 Object Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The plan contains no infrastructure investment commitment to resolve the issues at the Callywhite Lane Extension.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5674 - 9166 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 6248 Object Respondent: Penny & Ken Carter [11176] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over impact of Callywhite Lane extension on: air quality, impact on roads and congestion.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6248 - 11176 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 6257 Object Respondent: E Brown [10869] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to Callywhite Lane Extension. Concern over: impact on existing infrastructure and pollution.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6257 - 10869 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

- 6274 Object** **Respondent: mrs Catherine Dixon [10830]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the extension of the industrial estate on Callywhite Lane. This will mean an increase in large commercial traffic through our towns (and we can't cope with the wear and tear to the roads now) and also an increase in pollution.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6274 - 10830 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 6285 Object** **Respondent: Mr Simon Dixon [11187]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the extension of the industrial estate on Callywhite Lane. This will mean an increase in large commercial traffic through our towns (and we can't cope with the wear and tear to the roads now) and also an increase in pollution. The high tech industry that the plan says it wishes to attract will require far better access to transport links than Dronfield can offer.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6285 - 11187 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 6346 Object** **Respondent: Paul Scott [10920]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: There is already undeveloped space in this Industrial Estate. Extending it further into green land is unnecessary and undesirable from an environmental point of view. The construction of a link road at the southern end of the estate and a flyover across the valley to the B6057 South of Dronfield will spoil the environment and create a busy intersection.
 It will encourage vehicles leaving the estate to head south along the busy and narrow roads through Unstone and Sheepbridge to join the A61 together with increased traffic from the extra housing at Dronfield and the new leisure facility at Sheepbridge.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6346 - 10920 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 6347 Object** **Respondent: Lynne Scott [10922]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: There is already undeveloped space in this Industrial Estate. Extending it further into green land is unnecessary and undesirable from an environmental point of view. The construction of a link road at the southern end of the estate and a flyover across the valley to the B6057 South of Dronfield will spoil the environment and create a busy intersection. It will encourage vehicles leaving the estate to head south along the busy and narrow roads through Unstone and Sheepbridge to join the A61 together with increased traffic from the extra housing at Dronfield and the new leisure facility at Sheepbridge.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6347 - 10922 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 6371 Object** **Respondent: Dronfield Green Belt Resident's Group (Mrs Lynne Gadsden) [10537]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed Industrial extension of Callywhite Lane. Suggestion that other opportunities to provide housing and other types of business and employment opportunities (non-industrial / non-polluting / not requiring frequent HGV movement) should be explored fully.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6371 - 10537 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

- 6591 Object** **Respondent: Mr Alex Dale [8392]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: serious concerns due to the very likely increase in HGV traffic in Dronfield. The addition of a flyover onto Chesterfield Road, will also see a significant rise in HGV traffic through the village of Unstone, where residents already see the existing vehicle movements as an issue of concern. Particularly concerned about the safety of local residents given that the two routes into the Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate from the north and south pass very close to schools. The route to the south is also planned for a dedicated cycle lane, with some sections of the road being made narrower.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6591 - 8392 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4935 Support** **Respondent: George Lee [10538]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support given to development of industrial site at Callywhite lane.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4935 - 10538 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4661 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Barry Gray [10320]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: With the proposed increase to the industrial estate at Callywhite Lane, what plans are in place to restrict heavy vehicles from the centre of town (ie Chesterfield Road).
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4661 - 10320 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4707 Comment** **Respondent: Dr Clare Freeman [10223]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Development of the Callywhite Lane site will bring welcome employment opportunities for the residents of Dronfield but it is important to recognise that expansion will cause a substantial increase in traffic through the town. The roads are narrow and the risk of air pollution is high.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4707 - 10223 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4763 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Anna Lomas 🇬🇧 [10351]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Comments made that extension of the Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate could cause traffic congestion on the roads at peak times.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4763 - 10351 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4770 Comment** **Respondent: Steve Hides [10391]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over the impacts the extension of Callywhite Lane industrial estate may have on roads in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4770 - 10391 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

- 4776 Comment Respondent: Lesley Jarvis [10396] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Comment made that the extension of Callywhite Lane could negatively impact on existing roads in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4776 - 10396 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4801 Comment Respondent: Mrs Haslam [10421] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Dronfield does not need more factories. Concerns raised over potential impact on roads.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4801 - 10421 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4825 Comment Respondent: Terry Pashley [10443] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over the impact the extension of Callywhite Lane might have on existing roads in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4825 - 10443 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4845 Comment Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over impact on roads from Callywhite lane extension.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4845 - 9167 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4885 Comment Respondent: Mr Michael Wilson [10484] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The plan also includes a 15acre extension to the Callywhite industrial estate which will means more industrial and HGV traffic, more pollution and deterioration of air quality.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4885 - 10484 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4888 Comment Respondent: Linda and Trevor Dawes [10499] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Increasing the capacity of land for industrial use at Callywhite Lane seems likely to increase the traffic problems and particularly so close to a school.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4888 - 10499 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4897 Comment Respondent: Mr David Murray [10507] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The proposal to increase the size of the industrial site at Callywhite lane must surely be dependent on being able to build a new access road. The existing access at Dronfield bottom is already inadequate and could not cope with any increase in HGV's accessing the site.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4897 - 10507 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

- 4899 Comment** **Respondent: June and Trevor Reed [10508]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Comment made that Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate is proposed to extend onto Dronfield's Nature Park.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4899 - 10508 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4925 Comment** **Respondent: Margaret Harrison [10530]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The 15 acre proposed plan to extend Callywhite Lane is also a major issue. This is an industrial estate which has factories, warehouses, buildings, engineering etc. which all add to the pollution of our town. Do we need any more industries in our residential areas. This would be better housed away from houses.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4925 - 10530 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4942 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Roger Howe [10542]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over extension of the Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate which could cause even more problems with the increased amount of heavy traffic coming
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4942 - 10542 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4944 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Susan Howe [10543]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over how the extension of the Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate could cause even more problems with the increased amount of heavy traffic coming through the town.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4944 - 10543 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4949 Comment** **Respondent: North East Derbyshire Liberal Democrats (Mr David Mortimer) [9063]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern raised over potential impact on traffic from proposed extension of Callywhite Lane. Suggestion made that a link road should be instead made from the site to Chesterfield Road.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4949 - 9063 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4954 Comment** **Respondent: Kyle Hammond [10550]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over the Callywhite Lane extensions impact on roads.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4954 - 10550 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 4956 Comment** **Respondent: Laura Hammond [10551]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over the Callywhite Lane extensions impact on roads.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4956 - 10551 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

4978 Comment Respondent: MR JOHN NAYLOR [10567] Agent: N/A

Summary: Concern over impact on roads from Callywhite Lane extension.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4978 - 10567 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

5197 Comment Respondent: Alan Tomlinson [10664] Agent: N/A

Summary: Industrial Development

o Dronfield does not have an access road from any point on the compass which is suitable for HGV's e.g. Dyche lane, Green lane, Chesterfield road from the rail under pass to Snape hill lane.

o The current junction of Callywhite lane with green lane and Chesterfield road is a disaster in waiting.

o Part of the area outlined for industrial development was developed by the council as a nature park less than 5 years ago. How can the council now declare this as prime industrial development land?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5197 - 10664 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

5199 Comment Respondent: Mrs Christine Tomlinson [10665] Agent: N/A

Summary: Industrial Development

o Dronfield does not have an access road from any point on the compass which is suitable for HGV's e.g. Dyche lane, Green lane, Chesterfield road from the rail under pass to Snape hill lane.

o The current junction of Callywhite lane with green lane and Chesterfield road is a disaster in waiting.

o Part of the area outlined for industrial development was developed by the council as a nature park less than 5 years ago. How can the council now declare this as prime industrial development land?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5199 - 10665 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

5275 Comment Respondent: Dee and John Smillie [10698] Agent: N/A

Summary: Concern over: access, impact on roads, lack of quality jobs.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5275 - 10698 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

5298 Comment Respondent: Betty Bartrim [10711] Agent: N/A

Summary: Concern over impact on roads.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5298 - 10711 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

5308 Comment Respondent: Kelly Warburton [10719] Agent: N/A

Summary: Statement that Callywhite Lane is not a key strategic site for employment. A link road connecting Chesterfield Road to the Callywhite area, would need to cut over Lee's tip and the railway line. Thus, it is likely to be too costly for what it can deliver. Suggestion that it should be redesignated as housing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5308 - 10719 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

- 5317 Comment** **Respondent: Dr Paul Gadsden [10687]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: No need for expansion of Callywhite Lane. Suggestion that this is considered for housing instead.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5317 - 10687 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 5341 Comment** **Respondent: Mr John Hinchcliffe [10701]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern over quality of jobs Callywhite Lane extension would provide and potential increase in commuting. Concern over impact on infrastructure.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5341 - 10701 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 5359 Comment** **Respondent: Ophelia Tilly [10751]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern over extending Callywhite industrial estate, there would be more risks of health issues due to the extension and the increase of lorries to our already busy roads, when there is plenty of unused land and buildings on the estate already.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5359 - 10751 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 5675 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: How does HS2 have an impact on the access to Callywhite Lane when the planned route is several miles to the East of the site? The electrification of the East Midland Main Line has been postponed.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5675 - 9166 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 5689 Comment** **Respondent: Paul & Christine Markwell & Casey [10890]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The plan also includes 15 acre extension of Callywhite Industrial Estate which will mean more HGVs and commercial traffic around the busy junction close to Dronfield School which will not be good for the air quality for the children and will increase the risks of road accidents.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5689 - 10890 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None
- 6102 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Callywhite Lane could become a fabulous, vibrant mixed-use site for low cost housing and new commerce and industries.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6102 - 10593 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

6230 Comment **Respondent: Jill & Alison Tingle & Hurndall [11170]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Questions over whether the link road from the southern end of Callywhite Lane is a realistic proposal with no evidence provided in the Plan about who will fund it. The plan does not deliver any realistic proposals for additional employment provision in Dronfield and will therefore increase levels of commuting to Sheffield by the usual route along Dronfield Bottom causing congestion and increased levels of pollution.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6230 - 11170 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

6430 Comment **Respondent: Mr Jonathan Moore [11243]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Statement that Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate has been poorly-maintained for a long time, and is unattractive to prospective businesses. Empty units are evidence of this.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6430 - 11243 - Callywhite Lane Extension, Dronfield - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Policy WC1 Employment Land Allocation
Economic Development

5571 Object **Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: In this policy plus policies SS7 and WC2, the approach to identifying employment areas does not differentiate between office and other B-class uses. This is not in accordance with the NPPF that sees offices as a town centre use. It is not clear how the approach taken will work with policy WC5 on town centre uses. Only some sites and locations would be suitable for offices.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5571 - 7769 - Policy WC1 Employment Land Allocation - None

5673 Object **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy WC1 allocation of land for B1, B2 and B8 uses at Callywhite Lane raises highways concerns at the junction of Green Lane, Callywhite Lane and Chesterfield Road in Dronfield bottom, which is wholly unsuitable for large vehicle movements. The alternative proposed access would also impact on Unstone Junior School.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5673 - 9166 - Policy WC1 Employment Land Allocation - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Policy WC2: Primary Employment Areas
Economic Development

5668 Object **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: The council should release the old Padley and Venables site on Callywhite Lane in Dronfield for housing as there is no prospect of it being brought into use, and to reduce the pressure on prime Green Belt land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5668 - 9166 - Policy WC2: Primary Employment Areas - None

5654 Comment **Respondent: Mr Robert Gilmore [10344]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: I support employment development in Dronfield, however, greater emphasis should be placed on providing employment in Town which correlates with the skill base of the area.
The 2011 census data indicates that appropriate & in general higher skilled B1/B2 uses should be promoted in the Town in order to retain & attract a younger working age population.
At present the Plan for employment development at Callywhite Lane does specifically support this.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5654 - 10344 - Policy WC2: Primary Employment Areas - None

5974 Comment **Respondent: Green Piling Ltd (Green Piling Ltd) [11104]**

Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]

Summary: Green Piling considers that the extent of the designated Ravenshorn Commercial Park employment site should be reduced, in order to allow the release of their own site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5974 - 11104 - Policy WC2: Primary Employment Areas - None

6093 Comment **Respondent: Panache Lingerie Ltd (Panache Lingerie Ltd) [11096]**

Agent: Knight Frank (Ms Megan Wilmott) [11098]

Summary: Panache Lingerie considers that the extent of the designated Ravenshorn Commercial Park employment site should be reduced to allow the release of their own site and the adjacent land to the west. This would not comprise the delivery of the 50ha employment land. Therefore, the respondents' site should be removed from the Primary Employment Site designation and allocated for residential use.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6093 - 11096 - Policy WC2: Primary Employment Areas - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Ancillary Development on Employment Sites
Economic Development

6138 Object **Respondent: Gareth Barber [11129]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objections to proposed developments around Callywhite Lane. Reasons given for objections: increase in traffic, congest from difficult to navigate roads and proximity to secondary school, safety of pedestrians from no crossing point on the lane, would be more beneficial to the community being residential land as the employment type would not be beneficial to local residents.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6138 - 11129 - Ancillary Development on Employment Sites - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Policy WC4 Ancillary Development on Employment Land
Economic Development

6312 Comment **Respondent: Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy WC4:

The requirement that "any proposal (to be determined under this policy) will need to accord with other policies in this Plan is unrealistic and unnecessary as it's purpose is allow for an exception to other restrictive policies.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6312 - 11116 - Policy WC4 Ancillary Development on Employment Land - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Retail and Town Centres
Economic Development

6072 Comment **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Para 6.32

We note the ongoing co-operation on retail study and that the results of this will need to be considered in preparing the pre-submission plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6072 - 8156 - Retail and Town Centres - None

- 6073 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: WC5 Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Uses
SUPPORT the sequential approach taken to the location of retail development. We note that in some locations, sequential assessments for planning applications for retail development may need to consider sites within Chesterfield Borough but expect this to be resolved through normal Development Control processes.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6073 - 8156 - Policy WC5: Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Uses - None
- 6496 Support** **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Retail Hierarchy and Town Centres - the references to public realm and BP c) vacant, underused or derelict buildings are welcomed since they are directly related to the historic environment.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6496 - 10819 - Policy WC5: Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Uses - None
- 6697 Comment** **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
Summary: This Policy is proposed to address retail and town centres, but the policy wording is incomplete and refers to the evidence base being updated. Therefore RPS would request that the updated evidence base should be made available when it is complete and this should be issued for consultation alongside other evidence base documents.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6697 - 11287 - Policy WC5: Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Uses - None
- 6744 Comment** **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
Summary: The policy wording is incomplete and refers to the evidence base being updated. RPS would request that the updated evidence base should be made available when it is complete and this should be issued for consultation alongside other evidence base documents.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6744 - 8407 - Policy WC5: Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Uses - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Tourism
Economic Development

4709 Comment

Respondent: Dr Clare Freeman [10223]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Tourism is clearly a significant part of the District's economy and the new holiday village at Unstone is one example of how important the visitor economy can be. However, what attracts tourists is our green spaces for recreation, and our attractive rural towns. Developing the Greenbelt around Dronfield would effectively cause the town to merge with Unstone and Chesterfield and decrease the likelihood of it being considered an attractive destination.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4709 - 10223 - Tourism - None

5097 Comment

Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Hallows golf course is of great historical value. The club house is attractive to visitors due to its age. The area is extremely attractive and plans for Dronfield look to take away this excellent attraction.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5097 - 10593 - Tourism - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Economic Development Policy WC6: Visitor Economy and Tourism

5442 Support **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Natural England generally supports the approach that this policy takes of enhancing tourism whilst protecting designated sites and landscape character and extending green infrastructure. We also welcome the restoration of the Chesterfield Canal.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5442 - 4469 - Policy WC6: Visitor Economy and Tourism - None

6074 Support **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: WC6 Visitor Economy and Tourism
SUPPORT the policy approach and specific reference to Chesterfield Canal.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6074 - 8156 - Policy WC6: Visitor Economy and Tourism - None

6165 Support **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policy WC6 Visitor Economy and Tourism is supported.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6165 - 4598 - Policy WC6: Visitor Economy and Tourism - None

6497 Support **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Visitor Economy and Tourism - the references to Chesterfield Canal, industrial heritage and under-used buildings are welcomed.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6497 - 10819 - Policy WC6: Visitor Economy and Tourism - None

CHAPTER: 6: Working Communities and Economic Development Policy WC7: Tourist Accommodation

4538 Comment **Respondent: Mr Paul Watton [6482]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Re: item d
The inclusion of the word "or" at the end of the criterion creates circular logic, given that the subsequent requirement is to meet criteria a to d

It would make more sense if the requirement was to meet criteria a to c and criterion e

Why are static caravans treated any differently to chalets? What's the material difference between the two types of structure if they aren't being permanently occupied?
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4538 - 6482 - Policy WC7: Tourist Accommodation - None

6075 Support

Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]

Agent: N/A

Summary: SUPPORT the general approach taken to identifying and planning for key settlements. Agree that the settlements identified are the correct ones for the policy approach set out.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6075 - 8156 - Introduction - None

- 4565 Object** **Respondent: Susan Hickman [10231]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The plan states that at para 7.6 'Dronfield lacking in green space' yet the plan seems to ignore this fact totally because it suggests taking more away.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4565 - 10231 - Dronfield - None
- 4744 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Believes that the surrounding Districts and authorities should address North East Derbyshire's housing needs. Asks whether there is any evidence to show the council has looked to its neighbouring authorities to address the housing need.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4744 - 9167 - Dronfield - None
- 4901 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed release of green belt for housing allocations. Concern over loss of green belt land, recreation land, infrastructure. Comment that the council is not following NPPF guidelines. Suggestion to use brownfield sites or land in other districts/boroughs. Questions over exceptional circumstances.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4901 - 9167 - Dronfield - None
- 5098 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: It is not true that housing can ONLY be accommodated on Dronfield's surrounding green belt. The district as a whole needs to be looked at to provide affordable housing and it be placed in the areas that are most likely to deliver this. Dronfield's green belt developments will provide more, low density, expensive estates. Brownfield sites should also be considered in a more innovative manner to provide mixed use development - housing and commerce.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5098 - 10593 - Dronfield - None
- 5254 Object** **Respondent: Mr Andrew Goodwin [10686]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The infrastructure of the area has not been properly reviewed. Just because we have a train station doesn't mean we can sustain 860 dwellings.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5254 - 10686 - Dronfield - None
- 5509 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
 Summary: Object to the wording of para 7.4, the issue of unmet need in housing and raised house prices has not been justified.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5509 - 10724 - Dronfield - None

- 5547 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Pamela Bagshaw [10837]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I am concerned about sports and leisure facilities especially those in the planned development area at Coal Aston and would strongly object to any plans to develop this area an existing sports facility for housing. The facilities are well-used and are necessary for the health and well-being of the population especially young people.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5547 - 10837 - Dronfield - None
- 5729 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The Plan makes no commitment to rectify Dronfield being significantly lacking in green space, outdoor sports and children's play space. The plan proposes further reduction with the planned building on sports fields at Coal Aston and a golf course. (7.4)
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5729 - 9166 - Dronfield - None
- 5123 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Sandra Herman [10624]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Full support for new houses being built in and around Dronfield but I would argue for the emphasis be put on 'social housing' and smaller homes for the elderly so that they can vacate larger properties.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5123 - 10624 - Dronfield - None
- 5127 Support** **Respondent: Mr Mike Herman [10627]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Full support for new houses being built in and around Dronfield but I would argue for the emphasis be put on 'social housing' and smaller homes for the elderly so that they can vacate larger properties.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5127 - 10627 - Dronfield - None
- 5574 Support** **Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We support the growth in Dronfield, as the largest and most sustainable settlement, and note that this has been achieved through Green Belt review due to constrained opportunities within the existing built up area.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5574 - 7769 - Dronfield - None
- 6227 Support** **Respondent: Jill & Alison Tingle & Hurndall [11170]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support given to NEDDC Local Plan plan's to builds on the recommendations of the 'Dronfield Vision for the Town' study which identifies street scene and public realm improvements to enhance the town environment particularly for pedestrians.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6227 - 11170 - Dronfield - None

4587 Comment Respondent: Mr Oliver Hewitt [10177] Agent: N/A

Summary: On one hand you say "Dronfield is significantly lacking in green space" then on the other hand you suggest removing large swathes of it for housing, this contradiction does not support an argument for reduction of limited surrounding greenbelt.

I find it worrying that you are planning changes to our town from what on the face of it is seems like an attempt to bring us in line with district averages. There are parts of the peak district I cannot afford to live in, that doesn't mean I want large housing estates built on protected land for me.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4587 - 10177 - Dronfield - None

4712 Comment Respondent: Dr Clare Freeman [10223] Agent: N/A

Summary: Point 7.6 acknowledges the fact that Dronfield is significantly lacking in green spaces, outdoor sports and children's play areas. Hence the importance of preserving the Greenbelt, used by local communities for recreation, exercise and for observing nature. The most important function of the Greenbelt is to prevent the coalescence of settlements, this preserving the character of each individual town.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4712 - 10223 - Dronfield - None

4745 Comment Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167] Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan makes the statement that Dronfield is significantly lacking in green spaces within the settlement development limit and that its parks need to be protected. All the more reason also to retain the easily accessed Green Belt land which has a public footpaths directly from Shakespeare Crescent onto it which then leads onto the millennium Dronfield Round Walk.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4745 - 9167 - Dronfield - None

4872 Comment Respondent: Mrs Valerie Struggles [10483] Agent: N/A

Summary: Land should not be released from Green Belt to provide building land - only to enhance recreational facilities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4872 - 10483 - Dronfield - None

5550 Comment Respondent: Mrs Pamela Bagshaw [10837] Agent: N/A

Summary: Dronfield has an ageing population and needs more smaller properties to buy or rent in order to provide accommodation for:
a) young people who have grown up in the town and those who would like to move here but cannot afford to due to high property prices.
b) older residents at present living in large houses they no longer need but due to the lack of affordable smaller houses and/or apartments to downsize into are taking up living space which could accommodate a younger family.
This would create greater movement and a better balance within the housing market.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5550 - 10837 - Dronfield - None

5676 Comment**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: What is the purpose of a historical description of Dronfield (7.2)?
The Green Belt to the south is to prevent Dronfield from merging with Unstone, not Chesterfield.
The reference to passing trade on the B6158 (Green Lane) is in error the Plan may mean the B6057, the old Chesterfield to Sheffield Road.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5676 - 9166 - Dronfield - None

5904 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Pamela Bagshaw [10837]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Transport links between Coal Aston and Dronfield should be improved. One bus every 2 hours to Dronfield Civic Centre is not acceptable. An ageing population in Coal Aston means that many residents are now totally reliant on public transport. Another 180 homes in Coal Aston may result in more people being isolated.

I object to the proposal to move the post office from Chesterfield Road to the Civic Centre for the reasons given in the above. At present there is a half hourly bus service to the post office on Chesterfield Road.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5904 - 10837 - Dronfield - None

- 4746 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: It is recognised in this plan that car parking is an issue in Dronfield but it offers no solution to the problem. With an additional 1760 cars from the 860 households parking will be a bigger issue.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4746 - 9167 - Dronfield Town Centre - None
- 4835 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Maralyn Dommert [10326]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The Green Belt is essential to ensure our town is not "swallowed up" by surrounding settlements. It enhances a healthy lifestyle and is part of Dronfield's special character. Extensive housing developments will result in our infrastructure being stretched. There will be an unacceptable increase in traffic and therefore pollution. Brownfield sites should be used for a small number of affordable homes. This will encourage the continuation of the family-orientated atmosphere of Dronfield. The extension of Callywhite is unnecessary as there are many empty and derelict sites there as it is. Further HGV traffic should be avoided.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4835 - 10326 - Dronfield Town Centre - None
- 5730 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: This statement "the town centre is performing well" does not reflect the situation in the civic centre. The Plan contains no commitment to fund its regeneration.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5730 - 9166 - Dronfield Town Centre - None
- 4588 Support** **Respondent: Mr Oliver Hewitt [10177]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I agree that recent heritage developments have really enhanced the town, but also that the condition of the civic centre seems to be deteriorating.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4588 - 10177 - Dronfield Town Centre - None
- 5099 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Dronfield has an excellent independent set of shops and the local businesses are well supported. Traffic and parking however is a big issue hampering many of these businesses and their customers - as recognised here. The plan to add a further 860 homes in the area is only going to make this problem worse.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5099 - 10593 - Dronfield Town Centre - None
- 4873 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Valerie Struggles [10483]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: It would have been preferable to be invited to comment on up to date evidence rather than old data. The planned significant increase in housing will only increase the current pressure on car parking, including facilities for disabled and add to the sprawling nature of the town which in turn will not enhance the vitality and viability of the current centre.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4873 - 10483 - Dronfield Town Centre - None

5731 Comment

Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Development outside the settlement development limits will increase the spread of the town which the Plan says need addressing in order to maintain the vitality and viability of the town centre. (7.8)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5731 - 9166 - Dronfield Town Centre - None

- 4837 Object** **Respondent: Mr Graham Blakey [10462]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: the suggested 'improvements' to the town centre will not provide any improvement because the space can not be extended or made bigger yet is expected to cope with a further 860 houses. The infrastructure can not cope.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4837 - 10462 - Dronfield Regeneration Framework - None
- 5100 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: These are all great proposals and should not be undermined putting the town's infrastructure under additional pressure from the proposed level of housing development.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5100 - 10593 - Dronfield Regeneration Framework - None
- 4624 Comment** **Respondent: Cynthia Turner [10285]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Suggestion for regeneration of Sharley Park.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4624 - 10285 - Dronfield Regeneration Framework - None
- 4645 Comment** **Respondent: Mary South [10303]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Suggestion that Dronfield Civic Centre needs more regeneration, and that as it is at present it does not serve the communities needs anymore.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4645 - 10303 - Dronfield Regeneration Framework - None
- 4874 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Valerie Struggles [10483]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I agree with all the improvements which have been previously identified in the Regeneration Framework and as listed below. Any increase in the size of the township will only increase the need for these and further improvements. For example, more houses will result in a need for better transport links and car parking above what has been identified previously. The focus of attention (and available funding) should be on effecting these improvements for existing residents.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4874 - 10483 - Dronfield Regeneration Framework - None
- 5732 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Table 7.1 which reproduces themes and proposals of the adopted Dronfield Regeneration Framework contains matters of detail that are unclear.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5732 - 9166 - Dronfield Regeneration Framework - None

4567 Object**Respondent: Susan Hickman [10231]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Question whether there were other options available. States that Dronfield Town Council have indicated other sites may be available e.g. Sheffield Football Club ground and other land around this site. Such developments would allow traffic to quickly move onto the A61 bypass and reduce traffic congestion. Additionally Dronfield Town Cllrs indicate there are Brown Field sites within Dronfield that can be utilised for housing

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4567 - 10231 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4568 Object**Respondent: Susan Hickman [10231]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Additional impact of the new Peak Resource development sponsored by Derbyshire County Council and Chesterfield town council at Junction of A61 by Sheepbridge Industrial Estate. Roads suggested for access to new area in hallowes are not wide enough to allow fire and emergency services easy access. See Burns Drive and road widths and note that most residents are now two car families and some have to park on the grassed area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4568 - 10231 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4569 Object**Respondent: Mrs E Jayne Morris [10201]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I am really unhappy about the quantity and type of new houses being proposed in Dronfield.

We are based on a quiet cul-de-sac on Burns Road (S18 1NJ) and I hear our road is to be turned in to a through road to the new housing development. We currently enjoy a quiet, family-orientated road where children can play in relative safety - this will be impossible as a through road and will also effect house prices in the area. We bought this house under 2 years ago, it was chosen precisely because it was a quiet cul-de-sac.

I strongly object!

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4569 - 10201 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4611 Object**Respondent: Mr Edward Throp [10272]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Other developments where this number of properties have been planned, Biwater, the avenue, have associated improvements in infrastructure developments that will increase local jobs, school provision etc. Nothing has been planned for Dronfield. Apart from increasing the air pollution, traffic road accident risk due to more commuters where do you expect the additional people to work go to school etc.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4611 - 10272 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4629 Object**Respondent: Mr David Gibb [10289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: the road system already. 5 pm I do not use Green Lane at the bottom of Cally White lane as it is already a struggle to get out of the junction. There is also the added noise level to local residents that Cally White lane already delivers but adding further industry will deliver increase in noise levels. Another point is parking in Dronfield as again residents struggle now. I.e around Schools use of the train station etc etc and this has been brought up at many council meetings in the past. Summary. I think Dronfield will lose its local charm

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4629 - 10289 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4640 Object **Respondent: David Rawson [10300]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to plans for Dronfield.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4640 - 10300 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4742 Object **Respondent: Mr Giles Fox [10364]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: As long as Brownfield sites still exist we should never build on Green Belt land. It's the easier option, but the wrong one. Dronfield needs it Green Belt; without it, it's just another generic town.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4742 - 10364 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4788 Object **Respondent: Mr John Clarke [10406]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: My wife and I are absolutely incensed that you are even considering taking land out of green belt to build houses when there must be so many better and more suitable areas and alternatives that are not green belt. What about Unstone as an area? would this not be perfect for regeneration? We feel that little or no consideration has been given to the residents of Dronfield and how it would affect their lives in so many ways. Traffic, Parking, School places, Doctors appointments, changing Dronfield as we all know and love it, etc.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4788 - 10406 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4833 Object **Respondent: Mr James Hartley [10457]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposal overrules established Green Belt principles in terms of maintaining character and preventing urban sprawl.

Whilst the demand for additional housing is irrepressible, policy should target the development of our major towns and cities in an upwards not outwards direction.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4833 - 10457 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4838 Object **Respondent: Mr Graham Blakey [10462]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 860 houses implies we will just be a commuter town for the majority of the people to work in Sheffield or Chesterfield. This will not provide any major benefit to Dronfield other than creating a larger town without the required infrastructure. Why destroy a town for the benefit of other cities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4838 - 10462 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4882 Object **Respondent: Andrea Hirst [10494]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concerns that removing land from the green belt is a temporary solution. Concerns over infrastructure and whether they can support further development in Dronfield. Statement made that Dronfield's green belt is needed, 2014 Green Belt Functionality Study referenced. Concern over impact on Dronfield's character.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4882 - 10494 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

- 4932 Object** **Respondent: Mr Michael Kirk [10536]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: I strongly object to the expansion of Dronfield/coal Aston by development of 800 new homes on green belt land. The green belt in some areas is only 2-3 fields in width and is subject to pressure from Sheffield and Chesterfield. It is an essential space to maintain Dronfield's identity and is a wildlife corridor linking green spaces in the moss valley with Holmesfield and the Barlow area with the area around Apperknowle. ANY NIBBLING AWAY AT THE GREEN BELT WILL ONLY ALLOW ITS FUTURE EROSION AND TOTAL LOSS. There is already inadequate infrastructure for the existing population.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 4932 - 10536 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None
- 4940 Object** **Respondent: Mr Richard Alliott [10334]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Attack on greenbelt will damage character of Dronfield, damage wildlife and hurtle it towards intrusion of other urbanisations and Peak Resort. Transport problems already abound (street parking, one track roads, full car parks, many unsuitably large vehicles). Housing proposals will add 1500 plus more vehicles. Noise and air pollution from industry already too much near residents. Medical, educational and estate road provision not adequate now. Attack on south of Dronfield disproportionate. Local groups and residents very much against. Why move from 285 houses in 2015 to massive 800 plus? Change is inevitable but not this massive change. Please listen.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 4940 - 10334 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None
- 5102 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Your key evidence base cites that the Green Belt around Dronfield is very important to local people, that previously developed areas should be used for development and the plan should respect the character of the town. This proposal does not support this evidence - there are no alternative options considered.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5102 - 10593 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None
- 5405 Object** **Respondent: Glyn Harrison [10773]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Please reconsider due to impact on environment from loss of greenbelt. Consider wider Sheffield context, plus Dronfield brown site and town centre options to reduce impacts on environment.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5405 - 10773 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None
- 5511 Object** **Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]** **Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**
- Summary: Object to the allocation of 860 dwellings through the release of Green Belt land as this is contrary to the NPPF and Planning Practice guidance.
- Please note that the green belt has been instrumental in protecting the separation of Dronfield which would be eroded should the releases be confirmed.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: O - 5511 - 10724 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

- 4756 Support** **Respondent: Mr Chas Rice [10374]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Comprehensive & realistic. These proposals offer positive improvements to our area. There's a need to embrace change and maximise the benefits change can bring. Green Belt policy exists to protect against inappropriate development. Plans to develop housing, business and infrastructure are in this case most appropriate. Council should continue to educate our community to benefits and therefore allay fears which will inevitably exist. Housing must be designated for people with One Home ~ not speculators . Proposed Road improvements for Dronfield are a real plus.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4756 - 10374 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None
- 5101 Support** **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The proposals for the improvement of Dronfield are supported but the level of housing planned is not sustainable within Dronfield's infrastructure. It is a historic town with narrow roads and footpaths and its character needs to be preserved.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5101 - 10593 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None
- 6498 Support** **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Dronfield - the reference to Table 5 should be amended to Table 7.1 (the Table 7.1 S4 Heritage and Character is welcomed) BP (v) relating to unused/underused buildings is helpful in relation to the historic environment.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6498 - 10819 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None
- 4671 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Trevor Stevens [8468]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: 1. Callywhite Lane development supported only when new access road is built.
 2. Protect the golf course.
 3. Protect Coal Astons community leisure space.
 4. Take heavy vehicles off Green Lane.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4671 - 8468 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None
- 4875 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Valerie Struggles [10483]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I am strongly opposed to the creation of 860 homes on land which is currently classed as Green Belt. Any developments should be restricted to previously developed brown / green field sites and take account of the impact any increased housing will have on the town's infrastructure and the Council's ability to fulfil its obligations to make the improvements which have already been identified. Green Belt space should only be released for use as recreational / leisure space.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4875 - 10483 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4878 Comment Respondent: mr philip wigston [10490]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Disabled access, specifically the use of mobility scooters needs to be considered when refurbishing /developing footpaths around the town. my wife uses a scooter but is effectively blocked from access to the civic centre, Doctors surgery and town centre by poorly designed street furniture /barriers at road crossings. This means using the car more than we would like with added pressure on disabled parking and the environment generally. The practice of car parking on pavements presents major challenges in using her scooter on footpaths around Dronfield Woodhouse.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4878 - 10490 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4880 Comment Respondent: E M Carr [10492]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Please do not touch are green belt, don't spoil our happy hamlet by over crowding this pleasant part of england.callywhite lane extension will bring more polution. If a large estate is built where are the jobs to come from? new schools shops etc?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4880 - 10492 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

5624 Comment Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Note policy to be further informed by emerging evidence on sport.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5624 - 4563 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

5657 Comment Respondent: Mr Robert Gilmore [10344]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I object to the current level of housing proposed in the Town due to the lack of evidence provided to support this level of growth. I would also like to see more support for higher skilled B1/B2 uses in the Town in order to retain & attract a younger workforce. The level of affordable should be reconsidered in order to provide a more sustainable approach which accommodates affordable housing needs, housing for elderly couples (bungalows), housing for younger families & viability for developers. At present the emphasis on affordable housing through a 30% requirement appears to be too high.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5657 - 10344 - Policy SP1: Dronfield - None

4610 Object**Respondent: Mr Edward Throp [10272]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Removal of the land from green belt which has been identified as important in playing an important role in creating the attractive community Dronfield. Scale of the development is far beyond what the current infrastructure can cope with. Suggested development areas are far from shops, schools doctors etc without using the car. Will have negative impact on the overall feel of the area which is why it is popular in the first place. Large brown field site on Callyshite Lane could be developed first.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4610 - 10272 - Figure 7.1: Dronfield Town Map - None

4754 Object**Respondent: Mrs Louise Dawson [10373]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Don't want more housing as it is already a struggle to get kids into the school you want. With even more houses it puts strain on schools train station, doctors. Don't want Callywhite Lane to expand. It is a quiet town, more big lorries etc coming through will disrupt that. We live in Dronfield because it is small, out of the way, quiet. With new developments it would drive me away not encourage me to stay. More 'affordable' housing means my house would fall in value and I have worked hard to earn enough money to afford a house here.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4754 - 10373 - Figure 7.1: Dronfield Town Map - None

4761 Object**Respondent: Dr Chris Savoury [10377]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This plan makes no consideration of the additional demands that local services such as schools, doctors and transport network will face. The proposal for additional parking spaces and a relief road seem little more than an after thought with no consideration the impact they will have.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4761 - 10377 - Figure 7.1: Dronfield Town Map - None

5652 Object**Respondent: Mr Philip Taylor [10877]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to the use of the green belt land for housing. This is unnecessary and destroys the character of the area. This decision is being proposed in advance of addressing the infrastructure issues, which is a very poor way to approach it. These should be addressed now to avoid being bounced into decisions in the future on the basis that "we need to do something though because the plan has been approved".

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5652 - 10877 - Figure 7.1: Dronfield Town Map - None

- 6632 Object** **Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy SP2 refers to Local Labour Agreements. The HBF would query if this policy requirement meets all three tests of the NPPF (para 204). It is unlikely that a Local Labour Agreement is necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms. It is suggested that this Bullet Point is deleted from Policy SP2.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6632 - 4414 - Policy SP2: Clay Cross - None
- 6499 Support** **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Clay Cross - Reference to Table 6 should be revised to Table 7.2. BP's v) and vi) are welcomed in relation to the historic environment.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6499 - 10819 - Policy SP2: Clay Cross - None
- 5611 Comment** **Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Note policy to be informed by emerging evidence re: sport.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5611 - 4563 - Policy SP2: Clay Cross - None
- 6076 Comment** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: SP2 Clay Cross
 We acknowledge the need for ongoing engagement across boundaries and with DCC regarding the impact of new development on the A61 corridor. This is already occurring under the umbrella of the A61 Growth Strategy and Investment Plan being led by Derbyshire County Council.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6076 - 8156 - Policy SP2: Clay Cross - None
- 6723 Comment** **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
 Summary: Paragraph(b)Concern that there is no flexibility that if any of the proposed allocations in Clay Cross don't come forward "at least 477 more homes" will be delivered.
 Paragraph(c-.i.)-Reuse previously land within and on the edge of Clay Cross is supported as the LP should support the regeneration of Clay Cross.
 Paragraph(c-.iv.)-"Protect sites/land for the future provision of a railway station" should be removed. Although there is supporting text in paragraph 7.12. As explained later the Biwaters Site will not deliver a potential railway station.
 Paragraph(d)-refers to new retail development in and on the edge of the town centre, with a new neighbourhood centre to be accommodated within the Biwaters site. Retail development has been consented on the Biwaters Site so the terms limited new provision and neighbourhood centre may need to be more appropriately worded to reflect this.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 6723 - 8407 - Policy SP2: Clay Cross - None

5399 Object**Respondent:** mr mark hadfield [10770]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: I'm concerned about land that used to be mined. I don't recall reading about your plan to confirm it's safe to build on. Shortage of green play areas already exists. To build more houses without promising green spaces for immediate use is worrying. I have concerns that the new houses will be built without a thought for existing residents to have easy walk in access to the site to use the new green areas. Also where will the access be for the new site ? ash crescent is already overrun with vehicles.
When do local residents get detailed plans ?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5399 - 10770 - Eckington - None

5512 Object**Respondent:** Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**Agent:** Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]

Summary: There is no requirement to release green belt land around Eckington. Para. 7.19 recognises that the town has a good balance in housing tenure , house prices are 30% below the national average and there is no pressure on house prices (up less that 1% in a year). The green belt land selected fulfils its role as greenbelt and its loss would be significant to the character and appearance of the village.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5512 - 10724 - Eckington - None

5576 Support**Respondent:** Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: We support the recognition of Eckington's role in serving other settlements such as Mosborough. Identifying land for Green Belt release on the south of the settlement only, may have implications for releasing land within the Green Belt on Sheffield's side of the Green Belt. Identification of Safeguarded Land to meet development needs beyond the plan period is consistent with the aim of the NPPF to ensure that Green Belt boundaries endure beyond the plan period, and also builds in additional flexibility for any subsequent review of the plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5576 - 7769 - Eckington - None

4636 Comment**Respondent:** Mr David Walpole [6401]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Page 141, Para 7.21; Safeguarded land is essential top prevent over development.

Page 141, Para 7.22; Existing green space and children's play space must be totally protected.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4636 - 6401 - Eckington - None

5248 Support

Respondent: Mrs Joan Waddell [10684]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I would like to state that I am very much against the use of green belt land for the 533 houses that would be built, and view this as the thin end of the wedge. I also have concerns about what the traffic situation would be like at peak periods, some of us moved away from Sheffield to have a more peaceful and cleaner environment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5248 - 10684 - Eckington Town Centre - None

- 5155 Object** **Respondent: Miss Hermione Salt [10645]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Great concern regarding eroding the current green belt
 Towns almost merging
 Impact on wildlife
 Concern re number of houses proposed in area (when demand does not require this?/are the proposals develop led?)
 Local amenities and roads cannot cope with number of proposed houses
 Access issues (Chesterfield Rd is a fast, windy and dangerous road)
 Proximity to historic Renishaw Hall & proposed fracking site
 Unsuitability of site (mining area)
 Alternative brownfield sites/urban alternatives are available
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5155 - 10645 - Policy SP3: Eckington - None
- 5406 Object** **Respondent: Mr Derek Midgley [10778]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I do not want these plans to go ahead, but if they do i will submit my own change of use plans for my land from green belt to brown belt!
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5406 - 10778 - Policy SP3: Eckington - None
- 6500 Support** **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Eckington - BP vii) regarding heritage assets is welcomed although it is recommended that the wording be revised to 'promote, protect and enhance heritage assets and their setting' or a similar appropriate alternative.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6500 - 10819 - Policy SP3: Eckington - None
- 5516 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Derek Midgley [10778]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: If proposed housing is sanctioned on land off Bolehill Lane, Please consider my field for future planning, extending the proposed boundary to include 4 Bolehill Lane.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5516 - 10778 - Policy SP3: Eckington - None
- 5613 Comment** **Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Emerging evidence re: sport needs to inform the policy.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5613 - 4563 - Policy SP3: Eckington - None

6077 Comment **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: SP3 Eckington & SP4 Killamarsh

We note that Yorkshire Water have previously raised concerns about the ability of the Staveley Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate additional growth in the east of Chesterfield Borough without further investment in capacity. Confirmation is sought as to whether growth in these locations would affect this plant and whether Yorkshire Water have raised any concerns on this matter.co-operation re utilities, specifically capacity of Staveley Waste Water Treatment

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6077 - 8156 - Policy SP3: Eckington - None

6511 Comment **Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]**

Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]

Summary: Hallam Land recommends that provision is made for between 1033 to 1253 dwellings in Eckington up to 2033.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6511 - 11228 - Policy SP3: Eckington - None

5158 Object**Respondent: Mrs Deborah Shepherd [10646]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 7.29 - the bus network does not serve the town well. In fact the reduction of buses and the irregularity and unreliability of them has been noted in the Derbyshire Times recently.

7.34 - as noted there is a lack of green recreational space in the town already. With the new houses taking up a large proportion of that there will be even less. This is not conducive to a healthy community who need space to exercise. Plus with 600+ extra people there will be even more limited space.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5158 - 10646 - Killamarsh - None

5513 Object**Respondent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]****Agent: Planning & Design Practice Ltd. (Mr Jonathan Jenkin) [10724]**

Summary: Object to the release of green belt sites . The green belt performs a very important function in preventing the coalescence of settlements in this area. There is a good tenure mix in the settlement, house prices are 30% below national averages and there is no pressure in terms of house price growth. There is no evidence of unmet demand. In these circumstances there is no justification to release green belt land.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5513 - 10724 - Killamarsh - None

5032 Comment**Respondent: mr david taylor [7999]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Concern raised over current lack of parking spaces in Killamarsh town centre. Statement made that there is 36 spaces for a growing town with a current population of 10,000. Statement made that other shops in the town are going into decline due to Aldi and there being no significant signage telling people there are other shops. Suggestion made to make Bridge Street a one way street so that people would see what is available to them in the town. Statement that lorries should be made to use a bypass from junction 31 of the M1 so they don't go through the town and create traffic.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5032 - 7999 - Killamarsh - None

6551 Comment**Respondent: Harworth Estates (Mr T Love) [4431]****Agent: Coda Planning Ltd (Mr Adam Murray) [7998]**

Summary: Harworth Estates points out that the explanatory text for Policy SP4 identifies the high level of demand for housing growth due to its close proximity to Sheffield and the unmet housing need that this has created. Also, the sustainability of the settlement is reaffirmed. Therefore, Killamarsh can and should be afforded a greater proportion of the overall targeted level of housing delivery.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6551 - 4431 - Killamarsh - None

5159 Object

Respondent: Mrs Deborah Shepherd [10646]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 7.36 - parking can already be tricky, with 600+ extra vehicles the town will not be able to cope.
The report has mentioned lack of green spaces a number of times, therefore building houses on what green spaces we have will reduce this even further.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5159 - 10646 - Killamarsh Town Centre - None

5160 Support

Respondent: Mrs Deborah Shepherd [10646]

Agent: N/A

Summary: More family recreational space would be welcomed. There is little as it is, let alone with the potential increase in population.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5160 - 10646 - Killamarsh Regeneration Framework - None

- 4781 Support** **Respondent: Rotherham MBC (Mr Ryan Shepherd) [9526]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Killamarsh is the area closest to Rotherham; however Rotherham Council has no comments to make regarding the specific proposed allocations or policy for this area.
 Chesterfield Canal has been identified as an issue of cross-boundary importance between the two Councils. The plan provides support for restoration of the Chesterfield Canal, which Rotherham Council is supportive of. Alongside support for the reinstatement of canals within Rotherham's Publication Sites and Policies document, this provides a complementary policy approach on this issue.
 In fulfilling its requirements under the Duty to Co-operate the Council will continue to engage with North East Derbyshire as appropriate.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4781 - 9526 - Policy SP4: Killamarsh - None
- 6501 Support** **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Killamarsh - Reference to Table 8 should be revised to Table 7.4. The reference to Chesterfield Canal and also the inclusion of BP vii) are welcomed.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6501 - 10819 - Policy SP4: Killamarsh - None
- 4673 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Elisa Chesterton [10330]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: More houses = More traffic
 More access to leisure activities = More traffic
 More traffic = More pressure on already outdated, busy and degenerated roads
 Lack of public transport
 Difficulty of obtaining doctors appointments
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4673 - 10330 - Policy SP4: Killamarsh - None
- 4980 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [10578]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Lack of public parking AND lack of disabled bays. There is only ONE disabled bay within public parking and that is in front of Doctors and that is NOT a full disabled bay. All others are within the PRIVATE parking areas.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4980 - 10578 - Policy SP4: Killamarsh - None
- 5614 Comment** **Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Emerging evidence re: sport needs to be used to inform the policy.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5614 - 4563 - Policy SP4: Killamarsh - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development Protecting & Enhancing the Environment
and Communities

5855 Object

Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed development on Green Belt and in the Drone valley which is highly valued by a large proportion of its residents will have a significant impact on the visual appearance and perception of the landscape. This is contrary to National policy which states that valued landscapes should be protected and enhanced.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5855 - 9166 - Protecting & Enhancing the Environment - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development Policy SDC1: Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt and Countryside
and Communities

6311 Object

Respondent: Mount St. Mary's College (Dr N Cuddihy) [11116]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy SDC1:
This policy is too restrictive in that it only refers to buildings. It should refer to previously developed land. In its present form it is inconsistent with Policy SS14 (a) which refers to development being allowed on "vacant derelict or previously developed land." and SS9 (f).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6311 - 11116 - Policy SDC1: Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt and Countryside - None

6671 Support

Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]

Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]

Summary: Policy SDC1 Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt and Countryside: Support for policy seeking re-use of buildings in the Green Belt and Countryside)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6671 - 692 - Policy SDC1: Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt and Countryside - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development Policy SDC2: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows and Communities

- 5443 Support** **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: SDC2 - Trees, Woodland & Hedgerows - support
Natural England welcomes this policy which offers protection to ancient woodlands and veteran trees and complies with paragraph 118 of the NPPF
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5443 - 4469 - Policy SDC2: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows - None
- 6166 Support** **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policy SDC2 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows is supported.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6166 - 4598 - Policy SDC2: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows - None
- 6634 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Support for Policy SDC2.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6634 - 2607 - Policy SDC2: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows - None
- 4843 Comment** **Respondent: Mr A Petrie [6413]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policies for the protection of Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows are very loose. Experience demonstrates that notwithstanding many abuses under TPO legislation during the life of the last Local Plan, the Authority fails (almost without exception) to pursue offenders. Policies in the plan need to address that historic weakness to ensure the Authority has the ability to protect this important natural resource.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 4843 - 6413 - Policy SDC2: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows - None
- 5589 Comment** **Respondent: The Woodland Trust (Mr Richard O'Callaghan) [10529]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Suggested policy wording to strengthen protection for ancient woods and veteran trees, and commitment to replacement tree-planting.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5589 - 10529 - Policy SDC2: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows - None
- 6266 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Jane Hardwick [8097]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policy SDC2; Concern raised that there isn't enough protection for Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows. It is too easy for developers and landowners to destroy all of these without punishment. Feels that this policy should be stronger.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6266 - 8097 - Policy SDC2: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development Landscape Character
and Communities

4985 Support

Respondent: PDNPA (Mr Ian Fullilove) [10430]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We strongly support this policy and supporting text and thank NEDDC for the consideration given to the National park landscape character.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 4985 - 10430 - Landscape Character - None

6119 Support

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The LPCD's approach to landscape and landscape character is broadly welcomed and supported. It is particularly welcomed that many of the Plan's proposed housing allocations appear to accord with the landscape and visual impact recommendations DCC's Officers made as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6119 - 10098 - Landscape Character - None

6502 Support

Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Further to our previous comments the inclusion of the Derbyshire HLC Study within the supporting text is noted and welcomed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6502 - 10819 - Landscape Character - None

4714 Comment

Respondent: Dr Clare Freeman [10223]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Beauty and diversity of the landscape is important to the quality of life of the residents and essential to attracting business and tourism opportunities. As national policy states that valued landscapes should be protected, there can be no justification for development of Dronfield's Greenbelt

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 4714 - 10223 - Landscape Character - None

5857 Comment

Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]

Agent: N/A

Summary: If the area around Dronfield is correctly classified as "Coalfield Village Farmlands" this is a grossly misleading classification of the Drone Valley where the settlements pre-date the development of the coal fields.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5857 - 9166 - Landscape Character - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development Policy SDC3: Landscape Character and Communities

- 5139 Support** **Respondent: Mr A Hardwick [8085]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I appreciate policy SDC3 and note that the Ashover Valley is an Area of Primary Sensitivity as classified by AMES.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5139 - 8085 - Policy SDC3: Landscape Character - None
- 5444 Support** **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: SDC3: Landscape Character
We welcome this policy and note that the policy draws upon the evidence set out in the Derbyshire Landscape Character Assessment. We also welcome reference to the National Character Areas at paragraph 8.12 of the accompanying text.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5444 - 4469 - Policy SDC3: Landscape Character - None
- 6167 Support** **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: National Trust supports Policy SDC3 Landscape Character.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6167 - 4598 - Policy SDC3: Landscape Character - None
- 6557 Support** **Respondent: Ashover Parish Council (Mrs S Atkinson) [7554]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policy SDC3 Landscape Character: This policy is supported. As you will be aware this is an issue of some interest and importance to the Parish.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6557 - 7554 - Policy SDC3: Landscape Character - None
- 6635 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Support for policy SDC3.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6635 - 2607 - Policy SDC3: Landscape Character - None
- 5856 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: National Policy requires Local Plans to include criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting local landscape areas will be judged.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5856 - 9166 - Policy SDC3: Landscape Character - None

6212 Comment**Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) Agent: N/A
[7581]**

Summary: SDC3 should go much further than simply guarding against 'significant harm' to landscape character. Places where landscape has already been degraded, or landscapes subjected to smaller but accumulating impacts, will not benefit from this policy, and a restorative approach, is therefore essential. A landscape action plan is needed and should be implemented via this policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6212 - 7581 - Policy SDC3: Landscape Character - None

- 5572 Support** **Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Whilst we support and welcome the principles of this policy at a strategic level, we recommend that the wording 'wherever possible' should be removed from the opening paragraph.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5572 - 10840 - Policy SDC4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity - None
- 6168 Support** **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policy SDC4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity is supported.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6168 - 4598 - Policy SDC4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity - None
- 5445 Comment** **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: SDC4: Biodiversity & Geodiversity
Natural England generally supports the approach that this policy takes and particularly welcomes the intention to provide net gains in biodiversity. However we suggest there are a couple of points that you may want to consider which would clarify and strengthen the policy wording: wording should distinguish more clearly between international, national and local sites to reflect more clearly the advice set out in paragraph 113 of the NPPF. The policy needs to set out that any proposal that causes significant harm to a SSSI will not normally be granted permission.
(see submission for more)
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5445 - 4469 - Policy SDC4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity - None
- 6639 Comment** **Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: With regard to policy SDC4 biodiversity and geodiversity Derbyshire Wildlife Trust(DWT) is concerned that the policy did not specifically refer to the mitigation hierarchy and suggest consideration is given to alternative wording. Example of wording set out in the attachment.

DWT would also advocate that the Council look at how they could incorporate the use of biodiversity metrics to help address the problem of quantifying biodiversity impacts and using this as a basis for measuring losses and gains.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6639 - 2607 - Policy SDC4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity - None

6640 Comment **Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: In relation to policy SDC4 attention drawn to section 117 of the NPPF.

There is a need to map statutory and non-statutory sites together with the wildlife corridors, stepping stones and restoration sites within a single 'Ecological Network' map covering the District.

Whether the LPA needs to include an ecological network map at this stage in the Local Plan process or whether one can be developed as a supporting document to the plan is open to interpretation. There is a need for greater clarity as to when and how the ecological network map will be developed and how it will become part of the plan and its policies.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6640 - 2607 - Policy SDC4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development The Historic Environment
and Communities

6512 Object **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Comments on Historic Sites Assessment Report Feb 2017
HE express disappointment to see that not all previous recommendations have been taken on board and there remains concern that mitigation still appears in the Green outcomes of the Red, Amber, Green approach. In addition comments made that the Red outcome criteria should not include 'major'.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6512 - 10819 - The Historic Environment - None

5140 Support **Respondent: Mr A Hardwick [8085]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policies SDC5 and SDC6 are particularly important in preserving the beauty of our area and I commend their inclusion.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5140 - 8085 - The Historic Environment - None

6503 Comment **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Historic Environment - It is recommended that the 1990 Act is included in the Key Evidence Base for Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings for completeness, since this sets out the legal duty for assessment of these heritage assets.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6503 - 10819 - The Historic Environment - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development Policy SDC5: Development within Conservation Areas
and Communities

- 6169 Support** **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: National Trust supports Policy SDC5. We request that the text 'views into or out of the area' is expanded slightly to include views 'within/across' the area.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6169 - 4598 - Policy SDC5: Development within Conservation Areas - None
- 6386 Comment** **Respondent: Tracey Marsden, Nicola Shepherdson & Mark Woodhead [8171]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**
Summary: The terminology used within this Policy does not reflect the approach set out within Section 12 of the NPPF. The wording of this policy should be amended accordingly to reflect the NPPF.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6386 - 8171 - Policy SDC5: Development within Conservation Areas - None
- 6444 Comment** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs N Beecroft [11244]** **Agent: Caroline McIntyre [8482]**
Summary: Policy SDC5 'Development within Conservation Areas': The terminology used within this Policy does not reflect the approach set out within Section 12 of the NPPF. The wording of this policy should be amended accordingly to reflect the NPPF.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6444 - 11244 - Policy SDC5: Development within Conservation Areas - None
- 6672 Comment** **Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**
Summary: Policy SDC5 Development within Conservation Areas: need to amend wording of policy in line with that of the Planning(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6672 - 692 - Policy SDC5: Development within Conservation Areas - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development and Communities Policy SDC6: Development affecting Listed Buildings

6170 Comment Respondent: **The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: Policy SDC6 is generally supported but minor rewording for clarity:
"Proposals for alterations to or changes of use of listed buildings (including its their settings) will be supported where they protect the significance of the heritage asset including impacts on the character, architectural merit or historic interest of the building.
Proposals should consider factors such as employ materials, layout, architectural features, scale and design that respond to and do not detract from the listed building.
Proposals which allow for viable uses that are compatible with the conservation of the fabric of the building and its setting will generally be supported."

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6170 - 4598 - Policy SDC6: Development affecting Listed Buildings - None

6504 Comment Respondent: **Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: It is recommended that this be amended to read '...proposal for alterations to, or changes of use of, a listed building will supported ... where they protect the significance of the heritage asset and its setting, including impacts....' or a similar appropriate alternative

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6504 - 10819 - Policy SDC6: Development affecting Listed Buildings - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development and Communities Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology

6505 Comment Respondent: **Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** Agent: **N/A**

Summary: Scheduled Monuments and Archaeology - all references to Scheduled Ancient Monuments should be revised to 'Scheduled Monuments' in line with NPPF terminology.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6505 - 10819 - Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development and Communities Policy SDC7: Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology

6506 Object Respondent: **Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: It is recommended that text be revised to include 'to be undertaken by a suitably qualified party' prior to work commencing to ensure that required work is undertaken to professional standards. It is also recommended that the 1979 Act be included within the key evidence base. In addition, for soundness, it is recommended that reference to the requirements of NPPF Para.139 are included within the 'NPPF tells us' section.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6506 - 10819 - Policy SDC7: Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology - None

5169 Support Respondent: **Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steve Baker) [7985]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: Policy SDC7: Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology Acknowledgement of the importance of the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record as an information source (8.37) is welcome. Please note that 'Scheduled Ancient Monuments' are now known as 'Scheduled Monuments': this recognises that some such monuments are of fairly recent date.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5169 - 7985 - Policy SDC7: Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology - None

6171 Support Respondent: **The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: Policy SDC7 is supported.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6171 - 4598 - Policy SDC7: Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development and Communities Policy SDC8: Registered Parks and Gardens

6172 Support Respondent: **The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: Policy SDC8 Registered Parks and Gardens is supported.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6172 - 4598 - Policy SDC8: Registered Parks and Gardens - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development and Communities Non Designated Local Heritage Assets

5087 Object Respondent: **Mrs Lisa Bell [10308]** Agent: **N/A**
Summary: It is noted that NEDDC have yet to produce and formally adopt a local list of Non-designated Heritage Assets as required by the NPPF. We would respectfully request that this list is produced, consulted on and formally adopted prior to the next stage of the Local Plan to ensure consistency with the NPPF.
It is also requested that the historic values of the Coach and Horses public house (Sheffield Road, Dronfield) are considered and included within such list when it is produced.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5087 - 10308 - Non Designated Local Heritage Assets - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development and Communities Policy SDC9: Non-designated Local Heritage Assets

6173 Comment Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598] Agent: N/A

Summary: National Trust generally supports Policy SDC9. We request minor changes to the final paragraph for clarity:
"Proposals involving full or partial demolition of, or significant harm to a local heritage asset will be resisted unless sufficient justification is provided on the proposed scheme and its and the public benefits of the proposal to outweigh the harm caused by the loss of the asset."

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6173 - 4598 - Policy SDC9: Non-designated Local Heritage Assets - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development and Communities Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change

6096 Object Respondent: Felsham Planning & Development (Mr Philip Neaves) [10109] Agent: N/A

Summary: There should be a specific policy dealing with unconventional gas and onshore hydrocarbons. We suggest the approach that the Local Plan should take is to insert a new policy SC6(A) at page 116 dealing with Onshore Hydrocarbons. This should be backed up by supporting text with appropriate inserts made to the glossary. Please see attached supporting statement for further details.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6096 - 10109 - Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development Policy SDC10: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation
and Communities

- 6698 Object** **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
Summary: Policy SDC10 primarily relates to proposals for energy generation. However its final two paragraphs state "Major new developments will be expected to connect to or be designed to connect in the future to district or community heating networks where appropriate" and "Developments along water courses will be expected to investigate the feasibility of using small scale hydro power taking into account flood risk." Imposing such requirement on major housing schemes will create viability and uncertainty of deliver issues for developers and the sites.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6698 - 11287 - Policy SDC10: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation - None
- 6745 Object** **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
Summary: The final two paragraphs state "Major new developments will be expected to connect to or be designed to connect in the future to district or community heating networks where appropriate" and "Developments along water courses will be expected to investigate the feasibility of using small scale hydro power taking into account flood risk." Imposing such requirement on major housing schemes will create viability and uncertainty of deliver issues for developers and the sites.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 6745 - 8407 - Policy SDC10: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation - None
- 5446 Support** **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Natural England generally welcomes safeguards within this policy for the ecology of the area including protected species, sites of biodiversity value, and ancient woodlands. We suggest the policy should strengthen the wording concerning landscape protection to ensure that adverse effects are addressed satisfactorily, including cumulative landscape and visual impacts.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5446 - 4469 - Policy SDC10: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation - None
- 6507 Support** **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Renewables/Low Carbon Energy et al - Further to our previous comments, the inclusion of BP d) in this iteration of the plan policy wording is welcomed.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6507 - 10819 - Policy SDC10: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation - None
- 5549 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Anne Wilkinson [8063]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: As attached
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5549 - 8063 - Policy SDC10: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation - None

6078 Comment **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: SDC10 decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy generation
We note that no sites have been identified within the district as suitable for windfarm development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6078 - 8156 - Policy SDC10: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development Policy SDC11: Zero and Low Carbon Development
and Communities

5859 Object **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The council's proposal to build on the outskirts of Dronfield without an increase in local employment and no binding commitments to provide public transport from the outer reaches of the settlement to the railway station and existing bus services to Chesterfield and Sheffield will increase commuting, CO2 emissions and pollution. (also SP1 & 9.36)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5859 - 9166 - Policy SDC11: Zero and Low Carbon Development - None

6213 Comment **Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: SDC11 should require all new developments to be zero-carbon, with only the rarest exceptions, and should extend this requirement as far as possible to change-of-use applications. Otherwise, significant progress towards a low-carbon built environment will not be achieved, which will in turn hinder NEDDC in meeting its obligations under the Climate Change Act 2008.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6213 - 7581 - Policy SDC11: Zero and Low Carbon Development - None

- 5888 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: It seems unrealistic that current run off rates from the proposed building of dwellings on current Green Belt land will not be exceeded and the plan makes no provision for managing the additional run off that will result.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5888 - 9166 - Policy SDC12: Flood Risk - None
- 5447 Support** **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: We welcome point (e) of the policy wording which makes provision for green infrastructure gains within areas set aside for surface water management. We would suggest that there could also be opportunities for biodiversity gains within these areas.

We also welcome the provision for the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) within developments to manage surface water drainage, and suggest that the policy should encourage the maximisation of biodiversity and amenity value within these areas.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5447 - 4469 - Policy SDC12: Flood Risk - None
- 5573 Support** **Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: We fully support and welcome this policy. The policy is informed by an appropriate evidence base, is clearly worded and makes reference to key areas of national guidance contained within the NPPF. We are pleased to see that flood risk avoidance is key to the policy aspirations.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5573 - 10840 - Policy SDC12: Flood Risk - None
- 6079 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: SDC12 Flood Risk
SUPPORT the policy approach, in particular as a number of watercourses in NEDDC run also run through areas of high flood risk in Chesterfield Borough. We note that interventions to reduce flood risk within Chesterfield Borough may involve works within NED; including the Avenue and the Tin Mill storage reservoir. At the time of writing these are identified on CBC's draft Local Plan IDP and within the scope of its CIL Regulation 123 list, which could enable contribution to these and similar schemes from developments within the CBC area.

We note the role of DCC as lead local flood authority and that proposed work on the Integrated Chesterfield Flood Model may also be beneficial for NEDDC too.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6079 - 8156 - Policy SDC12: Flood Risk - None
- 6658 Comment** **Respondent: Wheeldon Brothers Ltd [11285]** **Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr Bob Woollard) [10128]**
Summary: The policy should be amended as follows:
Replace 'All development proposals will be required to consider the affect of...' with 'All development proposals will be required to consider the effect of...'
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6658 - 11285 - Policy SDC12: Flood Risk - None

6674 Comment**Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]****Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**

Summary: Policy SDC12 Flood Risk: need to amend wording from "affect" to "effect"

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6674 - 692 - Policy SDC12: Flood Risk - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development High Quality Design and Place-Making
and Communities**5104 Support****Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are real opportunities to enhance previously developed areas of Dronfield to deliver high quality design and enhance the area. However, this proposal does not seek to do this, it is simply looking at removing beautiful green spaces which will inevitably lead to more low density housing estates.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5104 - 10593 - High Quality Design and Place-Making - None

- 5858 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The council's proposal to take land out of the Green Belt around Dronfield will destroy portions of this historic landscape which is in breach of National planning guidance which advises a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5858 - 9166 - Policy SDC13: High Quality Design and Place-Making - None
- 5141 Support** **Respondent: Mr A Hardwick [8085]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: It is important that SDC13 is strictly adhered to in order to prevent unsightly building taking place, and also unsympathetic modern structures which in no way fit in to the existing built environment.
Paragraph o) of SDC13 warrants further expansion.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5141 - 8085 - Policy SDC13: High Quality Design and Place-Making - None
- 5448 Support** **Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policy SDC13: High Quality Design and Place-Making
We generally welcome this policy particularly the integration of green infrastructure into developments (points g & j), opportunities for biodiversity enhancement (l) and the provision of SuDs and green and brown roofs (n).
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5448 - 4469 - Policy SDC13: High Quality Design and Place-Making - None
- 6508 Support** **Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: High Quality Design and Place Making - the general thrust of the policy and the reference to the historic environment within BP k) are welcomed
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6508 - 10819 - Policy SDC13: High Quality Design and Place-Making - None
- 5616 Comment** **Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: An extra criterion should be added to cover the principles of Sport England's Active Design Guidance:
<https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/active-design/>
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5616 - 4563 - Policy SDC13: High Quality Design and Place-Making - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development and Communities Policy SDC14: Environmental Quality

- 5891 Object** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The proposed additional dwellings in Dronfield require binding commitments to interventions that prevent a significant increase in road traffic through Unstone. There is currently no agreed plan nor any binding commitments to provide the infrastructure necessary to support the proposed expansion in housing. Para 9.6 suggests that the council has no idea how strategic infrastructure needs arising from the proposed increase in dwellings will be funded. The plan presented is incomplete and should be withdrawn and re-issued for further consultation when appropriate commitments on infrastructure provision have been secured.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5891 - 9166 - Policy SDC14: Environmental Quality - None
- 5142 Support** **Respondent: Mr A Hardwick [8085]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I applaud policy SDC14 and would encourage the use of Bylaws to strengthen paragraphs 8.73 and 8.74.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5142 - 8085 - Policy SDC14: Environmental Quality - None
- 6080 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: SDC14 Environmental Quality
SUPPORT the policy approach to requiring appropriate assessments. We note that this may involve identifying locations within CBC that will need to be assessed in relation to specific planning applications (particularly in relation to the A61/Derby Road and air quality) and expect this to be resolved through the normal Development Control processes.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6080 - 8156 - Policy SDC14: Environmental Quality - None
- 5575 Comment** **Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: We consider the wording of this policy to be very weak. Whilst it is a positive measure that developments would be expected to 'prevent unacceptable levels of water quality', there is no reference to supporting guidance or legislation. It also implies that there may be 'acceptable' levels of water pollution.

In light of this, we strongly recommend that the following policy wording should be added: 'Development proposals will be expected to contribute positively to the water environment and its ecology, and should not adversely affect surface or ground water quality, in line with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive'.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5575 - 10840 - Policy SDC14: Environmental Quality - None

5579 Comment**Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Having considered the information set out above, there appears to be an opportunity for this local plan to help deliver exceptional sustainable development that is resilient to future climate change.

We therefore recommend that the following wording should be added to a new standalone policy, or added to existing draft policy SDC14 under a new sub heading of 'protecting the water environment':

- Protecting the Water Environment

Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that water is available to support the development proposed, and that they meet the Building Regulation water efficiency standard of 110 litres per occupier per day.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5579 - 10840 - Policy SDC14: Environmental Quality - None

6215 Comment**Respondent: CPRE South Yorkshire & Friends of the Peak District (Mr Andrew Wood) [7581]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: SDC14 should require development proposals to result in a net enhancement to the environmental quality of the locality.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6215 - 7581 - Policy SDC14: Environmental Quality - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development Contaminated and Unstable Land and Communities**5681 Support****Respondent: The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Paragraph 8.82 - The Coal Authority supports the reference to North East Derbyshire's past coal mining heritage and the identification that large parts of the district have been subject to past coal mining activities which need to be considered when development proposals come forward.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5681 - 9528 - Contaminated and Unstable Land - None

5105 Comment**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Large parts of the area to be developed in this proposal are recognised in the plan as 'Development High Risk areas' - the effects of the coal mining industry already scar and threaten the stability of our ground. Add potential local fracking to this and the level of housing development suggested - the potential for destabilising homes is a real threat.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5105 - 10593 - Contaminated and Unstable Land - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development and Communities Policy SDC15: Contaminated and Unstable Land

5577 Support

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Rob Millbank) [10840]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy SDC15 - Contaminated Land and Unstable Land

We support the inclusion of this policy, and consider it highly necessary given the contamination issues associated with many of the proposed site allocations. This policy will also assist delivery of the overarching WFD objective for groundwater to achieve 'Good' status.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5577 - 10840 - Policy SDC15: Contaminated and Unstable Land - None

5682 Support

Respondent: The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support - The Coal Authority is pleased to see that this policy requires consideration of unstable land and the undertaking of necessary remedial works to ensure that any issues identified are addressed.

Reason - The Policy supports the principles set out in National Planning Policy in the NPPF.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5682 - 9528 - Policy SDC15: Contaminated and Unstable Land - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development and Communities Policy SDC16: Development near Hazardous Uses

6236 Comment

Respondent: EPC-UK Explosives Plc [540]

Agent: Leith Planning Ltd (Mrs Rebecca Booth) [8987]

Summary: It's noted through in Policy SDC16 that the Council have sought to raise awareness of EPC-UK's operations at Rough Close Works, and to protect the consultation zones from inappropriate development.

It's noted that the Council are relying on the guidance from the HSE when determining whether proposals within the zones are deemed to be acceptable. Reference to EPC-UK's operation's is appreciated, however the draft policy is not deemed to address our consistent concerns and objections with the local plan process as it fails to adequately seek to protect the future viability of our clients' business.

Suggestion that the Council could take the provisions of draft Policy SDC16 further, and include provisions to actively seek to consult with our clients on developments which fall within their consultation zones such that they can comment on the potential impact on their operation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6236 - 540 - Policy SDC16: Development near Hazardous Uses - None

CHAPTER: 8: Sustainable Development Safeguarding Mineral Resources
and Communities

5683 Support

Respondent: The Coal Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) [9528]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Supports - The Coal Authority is pleased to see that there is signposting in this Local Plan to Derbyshire County Council as Minerals Planning Authority and reference made to the policies and plans which will form the policy framework for the decision making process when planning applications are being considered.

Reason - In order to ensure that the policy is clear in respect of the requirements of the NPPF.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5683 - 9528 - Safeguarding Mineral Resources - None

6123 Support

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is welcomed that paragraphs 8.89 - 8.93 appropriately make reference to the fact that mineral resources are essential to support economic growth and are a finite resource; that there is an important need to ensure that minerals of national and local importance are not needlessly sterilised by non-minerals development; and that prior extraction of minerals is considered, if it is necessary for non-minerals development to take place.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6123 - 10098 - Safeguarding Mineral Resources - None

6124 Support

Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is particularly welcomed that reference is made to the emerging Derbyshire and Derby Minerals Local Plan (DDMLP).

Paragraph 8.92 is fully supported which indicates that within MSAs and MCAs defined in the emerging DDMLP, the presence of the mineral resource will be considered by the District Council as part of the determination of planning applications and once confirmed in the DDMLP, Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) and Mineral Consultation Areas MCAs will be illustrated on the North East Derbyshire Local Plan's Policies Map.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6124 - 10098 - Safeguarding Mineral Resources - None

5036 Object **Respondent: Mr Paul Dethick [10601]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: In summary real investment is needed in local roads, in particular the A61 before any further construction should be allowed.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5036 - 10601 - Introduction - None

5106 Object **Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: without seeing the Council's infrastructure delivery plan it is not possible to know from these proposals how Dronfield can accommodate a further 860 homes. There is nothing to suggest at present that this will be possible with the current road layout, school or medical provision.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5106 - 10593 - Introduction - None

6083 Support **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Para 9.5
SUPPORT the general approach to infrastructure provision set out. We note that there are likely to be specific instances of infrastructure provision where the Duty to Co-operate may apply, particularly in respect of the Staveley Waste Water works and the Tin Mill Flood reservoir. We note that CBC has implemented CIL and there exists the potential that some of this expenditure could support projects within North East Derbyshire to the benefit of both LPAs.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6083 - 8156 - Introduction - None

6081 Comment **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: We note that effective delivery of infrastructure may require cross boundary and multi LPA co-operation on specific schemes using mechanisms already in place through Derbyshire County Council (and the emerging Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan in particular) and the North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw Local Plan Liaison Group.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6081 - 8156 - Introduction - None

4716 Object**Respondent: Dr Clare Freeman [10223]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Dronfield Greenbelt does have significant recreational and ecological value, particularly so as the Local Plan has identified that Dronfield is lacking in green spaces. There are footpaths throughout the proposed development site which are well used by the local residents, and by school children from the secondary school on nature rambles and charity sponsored walks. The Greenbelt land is easily accessed by the town residents and allows exercise, interaction with wildlife and space for children to play.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4716 - 10223 - Policy ID1: Green Infrastructure - None

5892 Object**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed development at Dronfield with no green infrastructure provision is in breach of Policy ID1 requiring "... a compensatory amount of green infrastructure of an equivalent or better quality [...] in the local area".

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5892 - 9166 - Policy ID1: Green Infrastructure - None

5143 Support**Respondent: Mr A Hardwick [8085]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy ID1 is very important and I am in total agreement with it.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5143 - 8085 - Policy ID1: Green Infrastructure - None

5450 Support**Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Natural England welcomes this policy as it provides protection for existing Green Infrastructure (GI) and encourages the incorporation of new, high quality GI at the earliest stages of development. We are also pleased to note the intention to link to ecological networks and to protect landscape features such as trees, hedgerows and watercourses.

We welcome the reference to the Green Infrastructure Study (2012) and are pleased to note that this will be updated We are also pleased to note that this policy protects and enhances public rights of way and access.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5450 - 4469 - Policy ID1: Green Infrastructure - None

6084 Support**Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: ID1 Green Infrastructure SUPPORT the policy aim of improving and extending the network. We are committed to working jointly where links can be made across LPA boundaries.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6084 - 8156 - Policy ID1: Green Infrastructure - None

6174 Support**Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: National Trust supports Policy ID1. In part (g) we suggest that the words 'and where appropriate' are unnecessary and should be removed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6174 - 4598 - Policy ID1: Green Infrastructure - None

6636 Support**Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support for policy on green infrastructure, ID1.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6636 - 2607 - Policy ID1: Green Infrastructure - None

CHAPTER: 9: Infrastructure & Delivery Chesterfield Canal

6428 Comment**Respondent: D Bullers [11241]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The commitment to restore the Chesterfield Canal were it passes through the district and find a solution to the lost route (in part due to past planning mistakes) and the collapsed tunnel section is to be supported as it provides a tranquil green corridor for a variety of uses, and wild life. (9.14 - 9.17)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6428 - 11241 - Chesterfield Canal - None

5451 Support**Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy ID2: Chesterfield Canal

We generally support this policy as it will contribute to both the biodiversity and green infrastructure of the District.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5451 - 4469 - Policy ID2: Chesterfield Canal - None

6085 Support**Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: ID2 Chesterfield Canal -

SUPPORT policy. Believe the policy could be further enhanced by adding text to actively seek enhancement/restoration of the canal where new development is proposed/permitted on or adjacent to it.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6085 - 8156 - Policy ID2: Chesterfield Canal - None

6509 Support**Respondent: Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) [10819]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Chesterfield Canal - the individual policy on the canal is welcomed and we are aware that a similar approach to the protection of the canal route has been taken in respect of the canal by Rotherham MBC

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6509 - 10819 - Policy ID2: Chesterfield Canal - None

6675 Support**Respondent: Chatsworth Settlement Trustees [692]****Agent: Planning and Design Group (Mr David Peck) [4578]**

Summary: Policy ID2: Chesterfield Canal: support for reinstatement of canal through the district.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6675 - 692 - Policy ID2: Chesterfield Canal - None

CHAPTER: 9: Infrastructure & Delivery Existing Facilities

5253 Object Respondent: Mr Andrew Goodwin [10686] Agent: N/A

Summary: Removal of coal Aston recreational facilities

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5253 - 10686 - Existing Facilities - None

5257 Object Respondent: Mr Andrew Goodwin [10686] Agent: N/A

Summary: Removal of coal Aston recreational facilities

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5257 - 10686 - Existing Facilities - None

5894 Object Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166] Agent: N/A

Summary: As the Council is in the process of reviewing open spaces, recreation sites and facilities and preparing a Playing Pitch and an Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy to "inform the next iteration of the Local Plan" then the current plan is incomplete, contains no binding commitment to providing these facilities, and is therefore unsound. (9.19)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5894 - 9166 - Existing Facilities - None

CHAPTER: 9: Infrastructure & Delivery New Facilities

5626 Comment Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563] Agent: N/A

Summary: SPD form and content needs to be informed by emerging evidence base once available.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5626 - 4563 - New Facilities - None

5617 Object**Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The policy needs to cover all open spaces, sports and recreation facilities whether or not shown on the Policies map. (This would then allow for new provision that is created after the Policies Map is published to be covered, and also any space missed off in error.

Support requirement to meet sports needs generated by development, but this should not be limited to just major development. Emerging evidence needs to be used to inform requirements and the form and content of any related SPD as required.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5617 - 4563 - Policy ID3: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities - None

5893 Object**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan contains no assessment of the need for open space, sports and recreation facilities and proposes losses at Coal Aston, Hallows golf course and Green Belt open spaces, none of which are 'surplus to requirements'. The statement "The Council will seek to protect and enhance existing open spaces" is meaningless qithout binding commitments on the council and mandated obligations on developers.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5893 - 9166 - Policy ID3: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities - None

6519 Object**Respondent: Hallam Land Management (Mr Anthony Greaves) [11228]****Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Mark Bassett) [8137]**

Summary: Hallam Land objects to the designation of land south of Setup Lane as Allotments covered by Policy ID3. It is argued that these allotments are currently underused, in need of a complete overhaul and action would therefore be required to bring them back into use. If needed, the respondent proposes to potentially provide allotments within the wider development site to the south (as part of the proposed expanded allocation on the safeguarded land), with the current allotment site given over to housing development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6519 - 11228 - Policy ID3: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities - None

6625 Object**Respondent: Mr T Gaskill [11284]****Agent: JVH Town Planning Consultants (Janet Hodson) [1990]**

Summary: We object to Policy ID3 as drafted as this would protect open space shown on the proposal map. It is clear from para 9.22 of the Plan that the areas shown on the proposals maps have yet to be assessed as to their value as recreation facilities. Any re assessment should be aware of the history of the Duckmanton Lodge Land and that it has ceased to be used for recreational purposes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6625 - 11284 - Policy ID3: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities - None

6699 Comment**Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]****Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**

Summary: The Policy refers to major development proposals should provide or contribute towards new or upgraded open spaces, sports and recreation facilities in line with the Recreation and Open Space Supplementary Planning Document. Footnote 27 indicates the current SPD is from 2007 and will be updated to take account of new evidence once available.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6699 - 11287 - Policy ID3: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities - None

6746 Comment **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
Summary: Footnote 27 indicates the current SPD is from 2007 and will be updated to take account of new evidence once available. Therefore RPS would request that the updated evidence base should be made available when it is complete and this should be issued for consultation alongside other evidence base documents.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6746 - 8407 - Policy ID3: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities - None
CHAPTER: 9: Infrastructure & Delivery Local Green Spaces

5895 Comment **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The Local Plan states that it "does not designate Local Green Spaces, but any forthcoming Neighbourhood Plans may do so." The council must make its position clear on this matter. (9.23)
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5895 - 9166 - Local Green Spaces - None
CHAPTER: 9: Infrastructure & Delivery Policy ID4: Local Green Spaces

5663 Support **Respondent: Mr Robert Gilmore [10344]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The District should continue to support the provision of Green Space & facilities through the Plan. The Council should consider developing a Masterplanning policy (see Coventry City Council's emerging Local Plan) which will support & wide ranging & sustainable approach to planning development.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 5663 - 10344 - Policy ID4: Local Green Spaces - None

6175 Support **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Policy ID4 Local Green Spaces is supported.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6175 - 4598 - Policy ID4: Local Green Spaces - None

6637 Support **Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Support for policy on Local Green Spaces (ID4).
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: S - 6637 - 2607 - Policy ID4: Local Green Spaces - None

4931 Support **Respondent: The Theatres Trust (Mr Ross Anthony) [5222]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Theatres Trust supports the inclusion of this policy, as it reflects guidance in the NPPF regarding the protection and promotion of community and cultural facilities.

Our only suggestion is, for clarity and consistency, to use either 'social infrastructure' or 'community facilities', rather than a mix of both terms. We note only definition of 'community facilities' is provided in the Glossary.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 4931 - 5222 - Policy ID5: Social Infrastructure - None

CHAPTER: 9: Infrastructure & Delivery Sustainable Travel

4747 Object **Respondent: Mrs Jane Singleton [9167]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Concerns over the effects an increased population in Dronfield would have on infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4747 - 9167 - Sustainable Travel - None

6107 Comment **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The LPCD provides little understanding of the potential transportation implications of its land use proposals. As the Government's Transport evidence bases in plan making and decision taking advice, notes, it is important for local planning authorities to undertake an assessment of the transport implications in developing or reviewing their Local Plan so that a robust transport evidence base may be developed to support the preparation and/or review of that Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6107 - 10098 - Sustainable Travel - None

CHAPTER: 9: Infrastructure & Delivery Walking and cycling

5578 Support **Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: We support the 'pedestrian and cycle first' principle.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5578 - 7769 - Walking and cycling - None

5325 Object Respondent: Mrs Alison Dean [10732] Agent: N/A

Summary: Morton is a linear settlement in the southern part of the District. The results give 5 buses passing through Morton, only 2 pass through the village every 2 hours. 3 services run hourly but only stop at the Corner Pin which is on the outskirts of the village before travelling to Pilsley. They do not pass through the village and due to the linear nature of the village they are not accessible to most villagers. □ The proposed location for the new builds is some distance away from the bus routes and will not be serviced by these buses.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5325 - 10732 - Public Transport - None

5897 Object Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166] Agent: N/A

Summary: The Plan indicates that the council has inadequate data on how the plan for additional dwellings and the council has no obligation to assess transport requirements arising from the planned increase in dwellings. Therefore there is no basis for planning needed improvements to existing highway and public transport networks, services and facilities. The council must commit to providing public transport links from the proposed development areas on the outskirts of Dronfield to the existing transport hubs in the centre. This plan contains no such commitment and is therefore flawed. (9.36 - 9.45)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5897 - 9166 - Public Transport - None

5173 Comment Respondent: Morton Parish Council (Ms Tina Frost Morris) [7882] Agent: N/A

Summary: 9.44 - Public Transport
When allocating development sites accessibility to bus services has been a key consideration. Statement that 2016 Settlement and Hierarchy study does not take account of the route of the public transport services. Comments made that despite 5 buses passing through Morton, only two run through the village. with the other three stopping at the Corner Pin at edge of the village. The proposed location for the new builds is some distance away from the 55, 55x and SP1 bus routes and will not be serviced by these buses.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5173 - 7882 - Public Transport - None

6112 Comment Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098] Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 9.48 discusses the Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan and A61 corridor and need for partnership working. The Highway Authority in response to future cumulative impacts arising from the proposed development on the A61 corridor south of Chesterfield is developing a strategy to both influence travel behaviour and mitigate its impacts. Consideration should be given to developing a similar strategic approach to other key transport corridors in the district, for example the A6175 Clay Cross - M1, and A632 corridor(s).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6112 - 10098 - Highways - None

6113 Comment Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098] Agent: N/A

Summary: As part of Bolsover District Draft Local Plan consultation, its Evidence Base included an Interim Transport Evidence Information Note. This in turn provided a useful summary of transport conditions in the Local Plan area. DCC's Officers consider that the North East Derbyshire LPCD would benefit from a similar 'transportation paper' setting out a commentary on North East Derbyshire's transport issues.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6113 - 10098 - Highways - None

5107 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helena Gayle Boulton [10593]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposals for Dronfield are placing development on the periphery of the town where car ownership is essential. These sites become very isolated in bad weather due to their altitude. Additional housing in these areas will add to the traffic in the area in which the roads are already unsuitable for the current levels, add to the commuter traffic to Sheffield and put even more pressure on the limited parking available in the town.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5107 - 10593 - Policy ID6: Sustainable Travel - None

5728 Object**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan does not "provide the framework for more sustainable transport choices" for Dronfield. Whilst the station provides excellent links to Sheffield and Chesterfield (7.3) there is limited parking at the train station, there are no public transport links to the main housing areas so station's usefulness is limited by the lack of an integrated public transport policy and plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5728 - 9166 - Policy ID6: Sustainable Travel - None

5898 Object**Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy ID6 The council has acknowledged it does not have authority of the strategic highway network and the plan contains no binding commitments to reduce the use of the car and encourage walking, cycling the use of public transport. The Council therefore cannot implement clause (f) of this policy and appears to be relying on encouraging developers and other authorities to achieve the Policy aims. (& 9.53)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5898 - 9166 - Policy ID6: Sustainable Travel - None

4618 Support**Respondent: Mr Edward Throp [10272]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sustainable travel with consideration into minimising current and future car use should a top priority when deciding on planning consent for any significant new development, particularly ones that extend towns beyond their current boundaries.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 4618 - 10272 - Policy ID6: Sustainable Travel - None

5452 Support**Respondent: Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming) [4469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Natural England generally supports the approach that this policy takes but suggests that the provision of pedestrian and cycle routes may allow for opportunities to link to the wider GI network through green verges and natural footpaths.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5452 - 4469 - Policy ID6: Sustainable Travel - None

6176 Support **Respondent: The National Trust (Ms Kim Miller) [4598]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy ID6 Sustainable Travel is supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6176 - 4598 - Policy ID6: Sustainable Travel - None

5337 Comment **Respondent: Highways England (Mr Steve Pearce) [10741]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Highways England notes that Policy ID6: Sustainable Travel states that all major development should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment in order to better understand the impacts of development and identify potential mitigation methods. This is welcomed by Highways England as a means of ensuring that the operation of the SRN is safeguarded as part of the development management process.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5337 - 10741 - Policy ID6: Sustainable Travel - None

6106 Comment **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy ID6 discusses sustainable travel, and although DCC's Highways Officers do not disagree with the points covered in the policy, it is considered, however, that the Policy could be strengthened by the inclusion of a more hierarchical approach to the management of travel demand thereby providing a policy basis to strengthen delivery of sustainable transport networks. Possible wording that could be adopted, for example, that would seek to provide necessary interventions is set out in the full text.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6106 - 10098 - Policy ID6: Sustainable Travel - None

CHAPTER: 9: Infrastructure & Delivery Provision of New Transport Infrastructure

5899 Comment **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: If the council has no plans to develop disused routes, the statement regarding the potential of disused rail routes is irrelevant.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5899 - 9166 - Provision of New Transport Infrastructure - None

- 5588 Support** **Respondent: Sheffield City Council (Ms Maria Duffy) [7769]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: We support the provisions set out in ID7 for providing and safeguarding transport infrastructure and particularly welcome the recognition of future rail opportunities. Sub-regional rail connectivity, to accommodate commuter trips and open up development sites, is an important part of Sheffield's emerging Transport Strategy. Although only an initial idea, providing a rail connection through Sheffield from Stocksbridge to Waverley, with onward routes to Worksop and Bolsover, is one that we are keen to explore with our neighbouring districts. This would offer the potential to provide sustainable access to some of the strategic sites identified in NE Derbyshire's vision for growth.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 5588 - 7769 - Policy ID7: Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure - None
- 6086 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: ID7 provision and safeguarding of transport infrastructure SUPPORT the policy and in particular the Identification of "The A61 corridor from south of Chesterfield to Clay Cross as a priority area for a combination of sustainable transport measures and highways improvements".
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: S - 6086 - 8156 - Policy ID7: Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure - None
- 5900 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: The plan contains no commitment to implement any new transport infrastructure.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 5900 - 9166 - Policy ID7: Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure - None
- 6702 Comment** **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
- Summary: The supporting text to Policy ID7 at paragraph 9.5 refers to the Local Transport Plan 3 and states "Clay Cross Railway station is included as a project for further appraisal as a County Council scheme". The LTP dates to 2011, and the potential station is not included within the Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan published in 2013. Until this further appraisal has been undertaken and there are proposals to secure funding for such a scheme it is not appropriate to refer to an aspirational proposal in the Local Plan. Therefore this reference in the supporting text should be removed.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6702 - 11287 - Policy ID7: Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure - None
- 6747 Comment** **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
- Summary: The supporting text to Policy ID7 at paragraph 9.5 references the Local Transport Plan 3 and states "Clay Cross Railway station is included as a project for further appraisal as a County Council scheme". However the LTP dates back to 2011, and the potential station is not included within the Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan 2013. Until this further appraisal has been undertaken and firm proposals to secure funding are in place it is not considered appropriate to refer to an aspirational proposal in the Local Plan. This reference in the supporting text should be removed.
- Change To Plan:
- Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
- Full Reference: C - 6747 - 8407 - Policy ID7: Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure - None

- 5326 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Alison Dean [10732]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: "The village requires the developer to contribute towards infrastructure" On previous developments within Morton Section 106 agreed contributions were removed during the build process. This is particularly important for the schooling provision within Morton as an earlier study "Settlement role and Function Study Dec 2013" stated that Morton school had a net capacity of 70 and was oversubscribed by 24.3%. This was the third worst in the whole NE Derbyshire area and only three schools in all categories have less capacity. The school is full any new pupils are required to find alternative school places.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 5326 - 10732 - Plan Delivery and the Role of Developer Contributions - None
- 5170 Comment** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steve Baker) [7985]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Infrastructure delivery plan and Community Infrastructure Levy
The local planning authority should consider whether developer contributions and CIL could be used to conserve and enhance the significance and appreciation of heritage assets and historic areas within the District. I would be happy to provide fuller comments and recommendations at a future date when these issues are being considered in detail.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5170 - 7985 - Plan Delivery and the Role of Developer Contributions - None
- 5174 Comment** **Respondent: Morton Parish Council (Ms Tina Frost Morris) [7882]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: 9.68 - Plan Delivery and the role of developer contributions.
"the Council will require the developer to contribute towards infrastructure"
Concern raised over how this hasn't happened in the past and that the school would need to be expanded to accommodate new housing. Statement that the school in Morton is oversubscribed. Further statement that the school is unable to accept any new pupils and local villagers currently have to find alternative school places elsewhere.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 5174 - 7882 - Plan Delivery and the Role of Developer Contributions - None
- 6117 Comment** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The main concern from an education point of view relates to the District Council's indication that it is considering the potential to fund infrastructure through the implementation of a CIL.

From an education point of view DCCs officers would wish to ensure that the CIL pot was adequate to fund the necessary developments in schools necessitated by the Plan's proposed housing growth and did not result in funding that was less than that which is achieved through Section 106 contributions.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: C - 6117 - 10098 - Plan Delivery and the Role of Developer Contributions - None

5902 Object Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166] Agent: N/A

Summary: The Infrastructure Delivery Plan must be part of the consultation process, not published after the local plan is adopted. Consequently, the current consultation process is flawed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5902 - 9166 - Infrastructure Delivery Plan - None

6115 Comment Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098] Agent: N/A

Summary: It is noted from paragraph 9.17 of the LPCD that the District Council will before the publication version of the Local Plan prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

Ideally the IDP should have been published at the same time as the LPCD so that it provided the necessary evidence to indicate what critical infrastructure will be required and where to support and deliver the scale and distribution of growth across the District being proposed in the LPCD.

DCC's Officers would welcome the opportunity to comment on the IDP when it is published in due course and ensure therefore that there is consistency of approach between the District Council's IDP and the Derbyshire Infrastructure Investment Plan (DIIP).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6115 - 10098 - Infrastructure Delivery Plan - None

6116 Comment Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098] Agent: N/A

Summary: It is noted from paragraphs 9.73 and 9.74 that the District Council sees the production of the IDP as a first step in determining whether the introduction of a CIL would be appropriate for the District; that the District Council intends to carry out work to assess viability of the Plan as a whole.

The approach above is justified and supported. Should the District Council decide to introduce a CIL, DCC's Officers would request that the District Council consults the County Council early in the process of drafting its CIL Charging Schedule.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6116 - 10098 - Community Infrastructure Levy - None

5903 Comment Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166] Agent: N/A

Summary: The council appear to be suggesting that if developers object sufficiently strongly the council will not pursue infrastructure funding via CILs. Thus developers will provide the minimum on-site infrastructure necessary to meet any applicable mandatory regulations. Statements over viability render purported safeguards and policies over infrastructure in this plan ineffective. Developers must be required to deliver schemes meeting immutable requirements that ensure the provision of appropriate infrastructure. Paragraph 9.76 renders all the stated infrastructure policies mutable, it also states "schemes will not be supported", rendering the paragraph ineffective.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5903 - 9166 - Viability and Developer Contributions - None

- 5327 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Alison Dean [10732]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Since the initial local plan started in 2011 total housing completions within Morton have reached 53 with a further potential planning application for another 48, this should be taken into account within the plan. If an additional 100 homes are built, it would grow the village by 20%+ which cannot be supported by the infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5327 - 10732 - Policy ID8: Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions - None
- 5618 Support** **Respondent: Sport England (Mrs Helen Cattle) [4563]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Support this requirement.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 5618 - 4563 - Policy ID8: Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions - None
- 6087 Support** **Respondent: Chesterfield Borough Council (Mr Alan Morey) [8156]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: ID8 infrastructure delivery and developer contributions SUPPORT policy approach and note that this may require cross boundary co-operation on delivery of specific infrastructure proposals and that suitable mechanisms exist through the Derbyshire County Council Infrastructure Plan process and Local Plan Liaison Group to identify these on an ongoing basis.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6087 - 8156 - Policy ID8: Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions - None
- 6114 Support** **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Policy ID8: Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions is welcomed and fully supported.
 The policy approach above is broadly consistent with the approach to developer contributions set out in the Derbyshire Developer Contributions Protocol Refresh (September 2016).
 The indication in Policy ID8 that the District Council will use Section 106 Agreements, unilateral undertakings, planning conditions, and if and when adopted the District Council's CIL Charging Schedule to secure necessary infrastructure is broadly welcomed and supported.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 6114 - 10098 - Policy ID8: Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions - None
- 5661 Comment** **Respondent: Mr Robert Gilmore [10344]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The Plan should provide a strategic overview for how the level of housing proposed in Dronfield would be accommodated. This should include a detailed assessment of existing infrastructure capacity, proposed future capacity (with & without housing allocations) & then a plan for how infrastructure would be improved to accommodate the assessed level of growth.
 Assessing infrastructure impact on a site by site basis is not sustainable & not in accordance with the NPPF para 158.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5661 - 10344 - Policy ID8: Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions - None

5901 Comment **Respondent: Mr Eric Singleton [9166]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The Council requiring developers to contribute towards any necessary site specific infrastructure does not address improving local infrastructure outside the proposed development sites to meet demands arising from the planned developments.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5901 - 9166 - Policy ID8: Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions - None

6703 Comment **Respondent: Rippon Homes Ltd [11287]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
Summary: The supporting text to this Policy at paragraph 9.69 indicates that the Council are still to prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Therefore RPS would request that the updated evidence base should be made available when it is complete and this should be issued for consultation alongside other Local Plan Evidence Base documents.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6703 - 11287 - Policy ID8: Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions - None

6748 Comment **Respondent: St Modwen Developments Ltd [8407]** **Agent: RPS (Birmingham office) (Mr Joe Murphy) [8406]**
Summary: The Council are still to prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. RPS reserve the right to make further comments once the updated evidence is available. Therefore RPS would request that the updated evidence base should be made available when it is complete and this should be issued for consultation alongside other Local Plan Evidence Base documents.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6748 - 8407 - Policy ID8: Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions - None

CHAPTER: Appendix B - Green Belt Maps Dronfield, Eckington, Renishaw and Killamarsh Green Belt Map

5039 Object **Respondent: Mrs Sandra Fraser [8828]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I object strongly to the erosion of the Green Belt land in this plan. There are disused brownfield sites in many places and these should be developed first. Given that proposed boundary changes appear to change the nature of NE Derbyshire is this plan out of date before it has even finished the consultation?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5039 - 8828 - Dronfield, Eckington, Renishaw and Killamarsh Green Belt Map - None

6036 Support **Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Appendix B of the LPCD identifies those areas of land which are proposed to be removed from the Green Belt to facilitate new housing development. Whilst the County Council's Officers would not wish to comment in detail on each individual area of land, it would appear in principle, that all the areas that have been identified for removal from the Green Belt are well related to and / or well contained by existing areas of built development and are those areas which would appear to be likely to have least harm on the main Green Belt purposes and overall strategic role of the North Derbyshire Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6036 - 10098 - Dronfield, Eckington, Renishaw and Killamarsh Green Belt Map - None

- 4552 Object** **Respondent: Christine Sleath [10217]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Concern over proposed housing on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over: loss of green space, impact on infrastructure, loss of council, impact on Dronfield's character. Suggestion to only use brownfield land.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4552 - 10217 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4555 Object** **Respondent: Mr Martin Lumb [10220]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I am writing to strongly oppose the destruction of valued green belt in Dronfield. There has been no thought for the residents living around these areas and the impact so many new houses will have on the already stretched infrastructure. There are enough brown sites that can be utilised so leave our green belt alone.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4555 - 10220 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4557 Object** **Respondent: Rachel Lumb [10222]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I wish to register my total objection for parcels of the green belt land in Dronfield to be used for housing. I feel the plans are to the detriment of the town and should be cancelled.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4557 - 10222 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4564 Object** **Respondent: Susan Hickman [10231]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection against erosion of the green belt between Dronfield and Unstone.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4564 - 10231 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4591 Object** **Respondent: Mr Nathan Keegan [10239]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection against the proposed removal of land from the greenbelt around Dronfield. Concern has been raised over the sheer scale of the proposed new housing and over whether the local services; doctors, schools and roads are able to handle the increase in population. Questions have been raised about what the exceptional circumstances the Council used were which allowed them to review the Green Belt and propose to take parcels of land out.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4591 - 10239 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4598 Object** **Respondent: Ms Yvonne Taylor [10247]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed removal of parcels of land from the green belt.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4598 - 10247 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None

- 4603 Object Respondent: Jennie Dunn [10268] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection against the proposed release of green belt land in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4603 - 10268 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4613 Object Respondent: Mr Dennis Greatbatch [10274] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I reject totally NE Derbyshire County Councils proposal for the removal of parts from the Greenbelt for housing development. The reason for having a Greenbelt is to preserve our town boundary and prevent this type of activity
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4613 - 10274 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4625 Object Respondent: Mrs Jan Gleadhall [10286] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I DO NOT agree to loose any green belt in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4625 - 10286 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4630 Object Respondent: Elizabeth Dashper & Ben Johnson [10290] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of land from the green belt.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4630 - 10290 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4646 Object Respondent: Mrs Rachel Thomas [10304] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: "4.59 The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence, providing long term protection and certainty from inappropriate development, which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. Green Belts can also assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land." The proposal to build 860 on green belt land in Dronfield completely flies in the face of this policy. Look at brown field sites and derelict land first if additional housing is required.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4646 - 10304 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4647 Object Respondent: Mr Robert Hickman [8910] Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the release of land from the green belt. Questions raised over what the exceptional circumstances are. Questions whether brownfield sites were assessed, and states that the council failed to identify existing planning approvals within Dronfield. Suggestion to use Sheffield Football Club ground and other land around this site for development instead. Concern over potential merging of Unstone and Dronfield. States that para 7.6 says Dronfield is lacking in green space, however land from the green belt is being proposed to be released.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4647 - 8910 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None

4668 Object **Respondent: Mrs Rebecca Dommett [10323]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: In Summary
.You are creating urban sprawl- loss of identity.
.Influx of traffic, affects safety, environment, causes pollution
.Infrastructure affected, schools and Doctors unable to cope.
.Main access roads to/from and within Dronfield not designed for excess traffic.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4668 - 10323 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None

4711 Object **Respondent: Mr Graham Briggs [10207]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land around Dronfield. Concern over how removal of the land could lead to Dronfield merging with Chesterfield or Unstone.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4711 - 10207 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None

4715 Object **Respondent: Anne Briggs [10356]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to proposed release of land from the green belt around Dronfield.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4715 - 10356 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None

4759 Object **Respondent: Ruth Rodgers [10378]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed release of land around Dronfield. Concern over impact the proposed release of green belt parcels could cause. Concern over urban sprawl.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4759 - 10378 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None

4783 Object **Respondent: Mr & Mrs G Younge [10400]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land around Dronfield.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4783 - 10400 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None

4793 Object **Respondent: Audrey Atkinson [10413]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection raised to proposed release of green belt land. Concern over potential urban sprawl.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4793 - 10413 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None

- 4802 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Victoria Wood [10370]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land around Coal Aston. Questions raised whether the need for housing is an exceptional circumstance.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4802 - 10370 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4804 Object** **Respondent: G Landman [10422]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed release of green belt land in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4804 - 10422 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4807 Object** **Respondent: P Hacker [10423]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed release of green belt land in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4807 - 10423 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4815 Object** **Respondent: Mr Mark Kearsley [10436]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Object to the building of houses on green belt
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4815 - 10436 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 4876 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Valerie Struggles [10483]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I strongly object to the removal of land from the Green Belt as identified on the map. At first glance it appears that the basis for selecting the areas identified is simply to provide a 'neat rounding off' of the town perimeter. On closer inspection the development of these areas will create severe noise, disruption and inconvenience to householders in the surrounding areas, as well as an significant increase in traffic flow, particularly with heavy vehicles during the construction phase
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4876 - 10483 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 5046 Object** **Respondent: Don Longley [10604]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to any removal of green belt in Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5046 - 10604 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None

- 5131 Object** **Respondent: Amy Nolan [10630]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of greenbelt land around Dronfield. Statement made that by government policy the greenbelt around Dronfield fulfils its functions. Questions over exceptional circumstances that justify the release of green belt land for housing. Statement that unmet housing demand does not qualify as an exceptional circumstance. By taking the parcels of land proposed for development from Green Belt, NEDDC is irresponsibly contravening national planning policy guidelines for Green Belt functionality as outlined in the NPPF. Concern over precedent release of land could set. Concern over urban sprawl and impact on character. Concern over loss of farm land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5131 - 10630 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 5232 Object** **Respondent: Charles & Janet Coldwell [10672]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed use of green belt land. Statement that it would lower the quality of life for the present generation & give no regard to the health & wellbeing of future generations.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5232 - 10672 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 5522 Object** **Respondent: Bernard Caddy [10828]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Greenbelt must be protected for future generations, not exploited for immediate political and financial gain to the long term detriment of the environment and community. It is an irreplaceable part of the shape and feel of Dronfield. Losing the greenbelt now and for evermore is unacceptable. It is a price we should not pay.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5522 - 10828 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 5634 Object** **Respondent: W Redmile & Sons Ltd [10859]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Michael Edgar) [4355]**
 Summary: The review boundary should also exclude additional land shown in Figures 7 and 13 of the attached.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5634 - 10859 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 6045 Object** **Respondent: Rebecca Akid [10788]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt around Dronfield. Concern over: loss of GB land, justification of the exceptional circumstances, lack of brownfield sites being used, impact on green infrastructure in the area and potential urban sprawl.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6045 - 10788 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None
- 6243 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Sharpe [11174]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of Dronfield's Green Belt. Concern over: impact on community, safety, impact on health, loss of green space.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6243 - 11174 - Dronfield Green Belt Map - None

CHAPTER: Appendix B - Green Belt Maps Eckington Green Belt Map

5153 Object

Respondent: mr ben draper [10641]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site ECK2101 is not suitable for removal from the green belt nor for a strategic housing allocation. The green belt review is manifestly flawed and the housing site assessment which follows is therefore also flawed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5153 - 10641 - Eckington Green Belt Map - None

CHAPTER: Appendix B - Green Belt Maps Killamarsh Green Belt Map

4822 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Barbour [8099]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I am 100% against the removal of greenbelt. The reasons for having Green Belt have become more key in the last 30 years. The council should not erode the protection it creates, once Green Belt is developed on a precedence will be created and it will be difficult not to continue to erode greenbelt. This is not a decision that should be made in desperation as there really is no going back. Please see my attachment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4822 - 8099 - Killamarsh Green Belt Map - None

5113 Support

Respondent: Persimmon Homes (Mr George Breed) [8035]

Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Ben Mitchell) [10149]

Summary: Support given for the removal of land at Manor Farm, Uppertorpe Road, Killamarsh from the Green Belt. Statement that the site represents a sustainable extension to Killamarsh and is available, suitable and achievable within the plan period for development. Conclusion given that the release of this site from the Green Belt to be allocated for housing would not undermine the essential characteristics or reasons for including land within this designation, as set out in paragraph's 80 and 89 of the NPPF. (see submission for more detail)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5113 - 8035 - Killamarsh Green Belt Map - None

5303 Support

Respondent: John & Mary Birds [10715]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support for proposed release of green belt land around Holymoorside.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5303 - 10715 - Holymoorside Green Belt Map - None

6091 Comment

Respondent: Mr D Camm [11152]

**Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) East Midlands (Miss Sarah Allsop)
[11128]**

Summary: Site submitted for potential green belt release; Land of Holymoorside Road. (A part of Parcel HOLY/GB/0001)

Proposal that the Green Belt boundary be revised to follow the physical line of the curtilage of both Belmont Park apartments and the land owned by the client.

See attachment for more details.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6091 - 11152 - Holymoorside Green Belt Map - None

5035 Object **Respondent: Mr Dale Cupitt [10590]** **Agent: A & D Architecture Ltd. (Mr Andy Cooper) [9524]**

Summary: Renishaw proposals Map and Relevant parts of SS3 and proposals map:
Objection: It is currently proposed to retain within the green belt a parcel of land accessed from garden avenue, Renishaw. Objection to proposed site not being allocated. Statement that the emerging local plan is unsound and would fail the test of justification and the test of compliance with National Policy. Suggestion to removed proposed parcel of land from the green belt and allocate it as housing land. This representation is supported by drawings 16-11- 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and by a report which are attached.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5035 - 10590 - Renishaw Green Belt Map - None

5647 Object **Respondent: Christine Stimson [10558]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection is on the following grounds:
1.unacceptable increase of pollution.
2.Increased flood risk.
3...Unsuitable access points to construction/ housing area onto minor roads leading to unacceptable congestion and road safety issues.
4. Unacceptable pressure on small primary school owing to increased intake.
5. Inadequate facilities in village to cope with increased population.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5647 - 10558 - Renishaw Green Belt Map - None

6409 Object **Respondent: Mr Paul Stock [8388]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: We contend the release of the land described as to the north east of Hague Lane, Renishaw from the Green Belt is consistent with the Framework. The proposed site is already enclosed on three sides by existing development. The proposed site does not play a role in preventing coalescence. The site is bounded by clear, defensible features preventing coalescence and urban sprawl. The proposed site represents a release of Green Belt land that is entirely consistent with S85 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6409 - 8388 - Renishaw Green Belt Map - None

6408 Support **Respondent: Mr Paul Stock [8388]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: We fully support the proposal by the Council to remove the land hatched in green from the Green Belt as shown on the Renishaw Green Belt Plan. We believe the proposal by the consultation draft Local Plan to release land from the Green Belt and allocate it for housing development helps in removing a serious question on the ability of the Local Plan to provide the increased need for new housing especially in places where it is most needed in market terms such as Renishaw.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 6408 - 8388 - Renishaw Green Belt Map - None

6621 Comment Respondent: Home Builders Federation (Ms Sue Green) [4414]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is essential that the Council's assumptions on lead-in times, lapse rates and delivery rates for sites in the HLS as set out in Appendix C - Estimated Housing Completions for period 2016 - 2033 are realistic. These assumptions should be supported by parties responsible for delivery of housing and sense checked by the Council using historical empirical data and local knowledge. Under the recently published Housing White Paper's proposals from November 2017 the Council will be subject to the Housing Delivery Test.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6621 - 4414 - Appendix C - Estimated Housing Completions for period 2016 - 2033 - None

CHAPTER: Policies Maps

Calow Policies Map

6623 Object Respondent: Mr T Gaskill [11284]

Agent: JVH Town Planning Consultants (Janet Hodson) [1990]

Summary: We object to the Calow Policies Map, the proposed defined settlement boundary fails to include both the residential site x on the plan and the land to the east of that which is the site of the Duckmanton Lodge. The development boundary should be amended to include the permitted housing site and also the buildings of the Duckmanton Lodge complex.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6623 - 11284 - Calow Policies Map - None

6624 Object Respondent: Mr T Gaskill [11284]

Agent: JVH Town Planning Consultants (Janet Hodson) [1990]

Summary: We object to the allocation of the land north of Works Lane as a recreation site. This land is in private ownership, is not a functioning sports ground and is now down to pastureland. The allocation shown on the proposals map is quite inappropriate. A formal recreation area exists to the south of the Chesterfield road at Eastwood Park. with a further cricket ground located in Oaks Farm Lane.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6624 - 11284 - Calow Policies Map - None

6643 Comment**Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The primary employment area identified on the plan is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and DWT reserve (North Wingfield). The reserve and surroundings support protected species including grass snake. We would wish to see development within this area take account of the needs of protected and UK BAP species in the area and provide some additional habitat along the eastern edge of the employment area. This would strengthen and enhance this corridor for wildlife.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6643 - 2607 - Clay Cross Policies Map - None

6763 Comment**Respondent: Clay Cross Parish Council (Michelle Cowin) [11303]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Questions over designation of different sites on the Clay Cross Policy Map, questions over recreation, industrial and employment designations. See attachment for the different sites in the Clay Cross that has been highlighted.

Question over Plot L on Coney Green Road is still marked as Primary Employment Site. Is this still the case?

The area marked Multi User Route is not and never was feasible. It is overgrown, unadopted and dangerous. Suggest the route suggested by DCC would better alternative

Area marked Derbyshire Wildlife site at the bottom of Cavell Drive and Nightingale Close. It's owned by NEDDC and used as/and leased as grazing for horses.

Why is there a piece of land between St. Modwen's Strategic Site and Primary Employment Site adjacent to CX Footpath 28?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6763 - 11303 - Clay Cross Policies Map - None

- 4600 Object** **Respondent: Ms Yvonne Taylor [10247]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: States that all other options have not been exhausted. Suggestions have been made that housing development should instead go to Eckington, Killamarsh and Unstone.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4600 - 10247 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4617 Object** **Respondent: Barbara Childs [10277]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern over how proposed housing could take from the moss valley conservation area.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4617 - 10277 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4622 Object** **Respondent: Jasmin Hickman [10283]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed release of land around the green belt. Concerns over the impact on landscape. Concerns on house prices. Concerns on whether schools in Dronfield can accommodate an increase in population.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4622 - 10283 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4654 Object** **Respondent: Barbara Childs [10277]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to land that has been proposed to be released from Dronfield's green belt. Concern raised over possible impact on local wildlife, flora and fauna. Concern also raised over possible loss of amenities that are currently classified as green belt. Comments made over the importance of maintaining the green belt land around Coal Aston and Dronfield. Suggestion made that other areas of the District will be more suitable for development than Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4654 - 10277 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4674 Object** **Respondent: Mr Stephen Hallett [10331]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The reallocation of green belt land is abhorrent. the use of the land to the south east behind Southfield mount and the Hallowes golf club is Demonstrable urban sprawl causing the conjoining of Dronfield to Unstone which directly contradicts the purpose of green belt. The road proposed will significantly increase traffic through the historic areas of applerknowle and coal aston. The proposed 'straightening' of the town limits, which seems to only make for what some believe to be a pleasing town limit map, does not truly respect the topography of land and beauty and character it affords current residents.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4674 - 10331 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

- 4681 Object** **Respondent: Mr Richard Greatbatch [10339]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I strongly object to the removal of greenbelt areas in Dronfield g-k. I and H are not suitable in the slightest for the amount of homes proposed. The road system and accessibility are not made for the increase of traffic flow that the proposal will bring, not to mention the traffic during the building process. Hiltop road and the roads round the golf course are only just capable of the traffic and parking that currently exists.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4681 - 10339 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4768 Object** **Respondent: Roger Shepherd [10390]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land and the proposal to build over a thousand houses. Question whether the council has thought through their proposals. Concern over whether existing services and infrastructure can accommodate the proposed housing on green belt land. Concern over loss of green space around Dronfield. Concern over potential urban sprawl. Suggestion made that the owner of Hallowes Golf Club should be approached over the proposed removal of their land from the golf club.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4768 - 10390 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4906 Object** **Respondent: G H Tyler [10514]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: I totally object to the plan to build on the green belt because we will be to close to the big city.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4906 - 10514 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4909 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Luan Joel [10517]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing allocations. Concern over traffic congestion, road safety and pollution. Concern over how the existing infrastructure will accommodate the proposed increase in housing. Concern over the increase in flood risk. concern over loss of farm land and green belt land. Concern over potential urban sprawl ruining the character of Dronfield. Concern over how the Callywhite Lane extension could impact on roads.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4909 - 10517 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4952 Object** **Respondent: Mr Michael J. Wells [10549]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over loss of green belt land and impact on Dronfield's character. Concern over the town's infrastructure and services.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4952 - 10549 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4953 Object** **Respondent: Kyle Hammond [10550]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over precedent green belt release could set. Concern over impact on Dronfield's character. Statement that green belt is well used and compensates for Dronfield lack of green space. Concern over infrastructure, increase in pollution.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
Full Reference: O - 4953 - 10550 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

- 4955 Object** **Respondent: Laura Hammond [10551]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Dronfield. Concern over precedent green belt release could set. Concern over impact on Dronfield's character. Statement that green belt is well used and compensates for Dronfield lack of green space. Concern over infrastructure, increase in pollution.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4955 - 10551 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4960 Object** **Respondent: Mrs C Holmes [10555]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of green belt land for housing. Particularly I Shakespeare Crescent and Hallows Lane. Concern over impact on infrastructure and access.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4960 - 10555 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4972 Object** **Respondent: Felix Ng [10572]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to housing allocation north of Eckington Road in Coal Aston. Concerns over impact on traffic, infrastructure, wildlife, and ecology of Moss Valley. Further concerns over loss of green belt land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4972 - 10572 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4974 Object** **Respondent: F.J. Delves [10575]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed policies in Coal Aston.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4974 - 10575 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4975 Object** **Respondent: Emma Bowden [10574]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations in Sheffield. Concern over potential urban sprawl, impact on community, impact on mental health, infrastructure, road safety and increase in pollution from the proposed housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4975 - 10574 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4977 Object** **Respondent: MR JOHN NAYLOR [10567]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over precedent the action might set. Concern over potential urban sprawl and the impact on Dronfield's character. Statement that the removal of greenbelt land should only take place under "exceptional circumstances"; alleged 'housing demand' does not qualify as exceptional, particularly when there are brownfield sites and derelict houses in the district that can be developed. Concern over loss of green belt land. Concern over how loss of green belt could lead to climate change. Concern over pollution and impact on health and wellbeing. Concern over impact on infrastructure.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 4977 - 10567 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

- 5055 Object** **Respondent: Alexandra Pollard [10478]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Questions raised over exceptional circumstances and there justification for the removal of green belt land. Acceptance that more housing in Dronfield is need, but concern over why that housing is allocated in the greenbelt. Concern over the fact that there is not a brownfield review or infrastructure plan. Concern over visual impact on the town. Statement made that the plans for Dronfield contradict the plans objectives. Statement that there has been no co-operation with neighbouring authorities.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5055 - 10478 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5125 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Sandra Herman [10624]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the Lea Brook Valley being used as a large portion of it is flood plain and is a well walked nature reserve.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5125 - 10624 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5128 Object** **Respondent: Mr Mike Herman [10627]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the Lea Brook Valley being used as a large portion of it is flood plain and is a well walked nature reserve.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5128 - 10627 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5129 Object** **Respondent: Mr Russell Rodgers [10628]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed changes to the Green Belt surrounding Dronfield. Concern over impact on infrastructure due to the proposed housing allocations, urban sprawl, loss od historic sports facility (Hallowes Golf club) and impact on the local community.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5129 - 10628 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5151 Object** **Respondent: Mr R Mitchell [9035]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposals to re-designate the areas of Green Belt marked G, H, I, J and K on the map at Appendix B of The Local Plan (Dronfield), and to use the land for residential and industrial development. Main concerns are for pollution, use of brown field sites and empty houses, traffic, plans for infrastructure, impact on wildlife, available green space, health, site safety.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5151 - 9035 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5228 Object** **Respondent: Julie Connah [10668]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: In summary I oppose the removal of green belt, which currently serves the purposes of preventing urban sprawl. In addition it safeguards the countryside, farmland, woodland, conservation areas, recreational facilities for all ages and the special character of historic villages. Removal of the green belt would negatively impact the environment, increased pressure on public services and the local infrastructure and as an alternative I would encourage the development of existing empty properties and derelict and other brownfield sites. Brownfield and derelict sites should be exhausted before any building consideration is even given to existing greenbelt sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5228 - 10668 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

- 5268 Object** **Respondent: Mr Alan Connah [10695]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: In summary I oppose the removal of green belt, which currently serves the purposes of preventing urban sprawl. In addition it safeguards the countryside, farmland, woodland, conservation areas, recreational facilities for all ages and the special character of historic villages. Removal of the green belt would negatively impact the environment, increased pressure on public services and the local infrastructure and as an alternative I would encourage the development of existing empty properties and derelict and other brownfield sites. Brownfield and derelict sites should be exhausted before any building consideration is even given to existing greenbelt sites.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5268 - 10695 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5285 Object** **Respondent: Diane Mitchell [10703]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield's greenbelt. Concern over: loss of green belt, lack of brownfield sites and empty homes used, exceptional circumstances, lack of account given to residents, conflict with vision and objectives, loss of recreation space, questions over GB functionality study, scale of proposals, lack of land stability assessments done, that padley and venables site was not included, impact on infrastructure and lack of infrastructure plan, air pollution, increase in flood risk, impact on wildlife and precedent for more land to be removed from green belt. Sheffield FC site suggested. Manor Farm suggested for housing.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5285 - 10703 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5286 Object** **Respondent: Geoffrey Lord [10704]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposed housing and employment on Dronfield's green belt. Concern over infrastructure, gp services, schools, traffic congestion.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5286 - 10704 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5296 Object** **Respondent: Ian Warburton [10710]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed release of GB land. Statement that other alternatives have not been explored. Concerns over: Lack of empty homes and brownfield used, lack of commuting potential, impact on infrastructure and lack of infrastructure plan, wildlife. Suggestion to use old petrol station and houses in Unstone for housing, suggestion to also join local plans with Chesterfield and use there housing land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5296 - 10710 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5346 Object** **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Parkin [9073]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to proposals on Dronfield's GB. Concern over: urban sprawl, impact on character, impact on infrastructure, impact on traffic from proposed housing and extension of Callywhite Lane.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5346 - 9073 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5633 Object** **Respondent: W Redmile & Sons Ltd [10859]** **Agent: DLP (Planning) Ltd (Mr Michael Edgar) [4355]**
 Summary: Dronfield Policies Map Site G) to be extended as shown in Figure 12 of the representations attached.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5633 - 10859 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

- 5956 Object** **Respondent: Mr Neil Mottram [11102]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Object to the proposals to take land out of the Green Belt in areas around Dronfield (G H, & I) and the subsequent plans to build houses on them, in particular the Golf Club land. Concerns based on Club being a historic part of Dronfield and the community, extensively used by dog walkers and families, even more so when Peak Resort is completed; traffic and access, including construction traffic; reduction of gap between Dronfield and Chesterfield; and impact on infrastructure such as schools.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 5956 - 11102 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 6039 Object** **Respondent: Clare Scholey [11124]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to removal of greenbelt surrounding Dronfield. Reasons for objection: Priority should be given to brownfield sites for development first, unviability of land around Hallowes Golf Club site and Hill Top site, empty properties not being filled first, Green Belt survey 2017 suggests the proposed sites are not suitable for development.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6039 - 11124 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 6177 Object** **Respondent: Jill Kay [10233]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Objection to the proposed housing allocations on Dronfield greenbelt. Concern over: loss of GB land, impact on infrastructure, lack of empty homes and brownfield sites used, contradiction with the NEDDC's Green Belt Land survey 2017, justification of the exceptional circumstances. Statement that Dronfield has seen enough growth over the last 60 years. Questions why the Padley & Veneables site was not used. Statement that the owners of Hallowes Golf Club are not going to develop their land.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: O - 6177 - 10233 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4965 Support** **Respondent: Mr Paul Edwards [10562]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Building new homes is a good thing for Dronfield...but only if matched by a commitment to funding new infrastructure to support it.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: S - 4965 - 10562 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 4945 Comment** **Respondent: Mrs Elaine Moore [10544]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Concern raised over proposals that could lead to the commercialisation of Dronfield.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 4945 - 10544 - Dronfield Policies Map - None
- 5044 Comment** **Respondent: James Lidgett [10569]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Comment made regarding huge amount of brownfield land in Chesterfield Borough, with suggestions being made that N.E Derbyshire should allocate housing on brownfield sites instead of greenbelt land. Statement made that it is not right that the council can release areas of land from the green belt and change boundaries due to not being able to meet their housing targets. Concern over impact on the housing market proposed affordable housing in Dronfield could have. Concern over urban sprawl that can come from greenbelt release.
 Change To Plan:
 Legally Compliant?: Not Specified
 Full Reference: C - 5044 - 10569 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

5623 Comment Respondent: Dan Hartley [10854] Agent: N/A

Summary: 1.Proposed Housing Sites GHI - Need for a convenience store in this location.
2.Proposed Employment extension to Callywhite Lane - severs Derbyshire Wildlife Site along River Drone corridor
3.Proposed housing sites - GHIK
Has location of vehicular access points been considered?
4.Proposed Housing site - J
Linear woodland corridor (north boundary) severed

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5623 - 10854 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

5963 Comment Respondent: Andrea Spinks [11105] Agent: N/A

Summary: Concern over: loss of GB land, impact on infrastructure, loss of green space, impact on traffic.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5963 - 11105 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

5971 Comment Respondent: Brenda Wilkinson [11108] Agent: N/A

Summary: Concern over: loss of GB land at Coal Aston, loss of recreation space, impact on health.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5971 - 11108 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

6110 Comment Respondent: Derbyshire County Council (Mr Steven Buffery) [10098] Agent: N/A

Summary: The LPCD proposes a number of employment allocations including Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate Extension at Dronfield and Stubley Lane/Wreakes Lane Industrial Estate. Consideration will also need to be given to the transportation implications of these together with other proposed employment allocations. The LPCD proposes improvements to Callywhite Lane Industrial Estate through improvement of the junction at Callywhite Lane/Chesterfield Road and provision of a new link road between the eastern end of Callywhite Lane and Chesterfield Road, although this is not shown on the Dronfield Policies Map.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6110 - 10098 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

6158 Comment Respondent: Sheffield FC (Mr Richard Timms) [8364] Agent: DLP (Planning Ltd) East Midlands (Mr Doug Moulton) [8357]

Summary: This representation requests that the Sheffield FC site is to be released from the Green Belt and allocated for housing. This would not undermine the essential purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The existing assessment of Green Belt parcel DRO/GB/002 is categorically challenged. It is therefore suggested to amend the Green Belt boundary so that the Sheffield FC site is removed from the Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6158 - 8364 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

6644 Comment**Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is not clear from the map whether the proposed employment site in Dronfield would encroach into a Local Wildlife Site that separates the two areas. The markings on the map are blurred and indistinct. We would ask the Council to clarify whether this site would impact on the boundary of the LWS.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6644 - 2607 - Dronfield Policies Map - None

CHAPTER: Policies Maps

Eckington Policies Map

5398 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sharron Gibson [10771]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I strongly object to build 37 houses on the green belt land at Eckington. If this goes ahead it will create serious issues. Access to the site will be unsafe, the brow of the hill on Chesterfield road is already a concern with speeding traffic. Bolehill lane is a historic bridle path enjoyed by the community. Congestion is already a problem due to peak time traffic and the nearby school. There are plenty of other sites that do not impact on our beautiful countryside

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 5398 - 10771 - Eckington Policies Map - None

CHAPTER: Policies Maps

Grassmoor Policies Map

4656 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lisa Bell [10308]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Request that the settlement boundaries are reviewed ASAP and that the area shown on Appendix C is included within the Temple Normanton settlement to ensure that the curtilage of the dwelling house which is used as a garden is included and the boundary is 'defensible'.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4656 - 10308 - Grassmoor Policies Map - None

4657 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lisa Bell [10308]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We object to the lack of available detail on the policies map which are intended for use during the consultation. The drawing of a relatively thick line on small-scale maps results in the fact that it is impossible to tell with any precision where the boundaries actually lie. We would respectfully request an interactive version of the Policies Maps be available for the next consultation stage to ensure clarity and transparency.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4657 - 10308 - Grassmoor Policies Map - None

4903 Object**Respondent: Eric Stubbins [10511]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to proposed release of the green belt around Killamarsh. Concern over wildlife and the town's infrastructure, and the impact the proposed release of land for development could have. Suggestion to use empty homes instead.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4903 - 10511 - Killamarsh Policies Map - None

5246 Support**Respondent: Andrew Fletcher [8127]****Agent: Mrs Linda Trollope [8119]**

Summary: I would like to support the removal of the sites to the east of Rotherham Road (shown as site r on the policies map) and to the east of Upperthorpe Villas (part of site q on the policies map) from the Green Belt and their allocation for residential development. These sites only partially meet the five purposes of the Green Belt. Their exclusion from the Green Belt would do little harm to the open character of the Green Belt and their development for residential purposes would provide a valuable contribution to housing need in the area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 5246 - 8127 - Killamarsh Policies Map - None

5033 Comment**Respondent: mr david taylor [7999]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It was noted that two of the recreation sites on your map were behind Killamarsh Junior School and St Giles Primary School, suggestion that they should be removed from the plan as it make it look as if Killamarsh has around a third more areas for recreation than is actually available to the public.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5033 - 7999 - Killamarsh Policies Map - None

5489 Comment**Respondent: Keith Myall [10812]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Concern raised over Morton. Morton School is currently over subscribed, two bus routes no longer pass through the whole village, proposed areas are susceptible to waterlogging and flooding, possible land contamination on sites in Morton.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 5489 - 10812 - Morton Policies Map - None

6648 Comment**Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The stream margins need to be buffered from development within the more southerly and larger secondary employment site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6648 - 2607 - Morton Policies Map - None

6650 Comment

Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Along the western edge of the proposed secondary employment site we would urge the Council to seek the creation of a wildlife corridor to allow movement of species like grass snake along the north-south route that goes from North Wingfield Reserve to the Avenue Washlands. We consider that this corridor should form part of the District's ecological network.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: C - 6650 - 2607 - North Wingfield Policies Map - None

6178 Object

Respondent: John Church Planning Consultancy Limited (Mr John Church) [4417]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Questions over why the 'Land at Hallgate Lane, Pilsley' (Outline Permission) was not included in the Pilsley Proposals Map and was instead designated as being a settlement gap. Statement that this is at odds with the Council's clearly expressed decision to grant planning permission.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6178 - 4417 - Pilsley Policies Map - None

6651 Object

Respondent: Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Kieron Huston) [2607]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The primary employment site will impact on a small area of open mosaic habitat located in the east and this will need to be fully mitigated/compensated.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6651 - 2607 - Renishaw Policies Map - None

6190 Object

Respondent: John Church Planning Consultancy Limited (Mr John Church) [4417]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Concern over lack of Settlement Framework boundaries shown.

Is noted that allocations are provided at three locations identified as "aj, ak and al". These are each greenfield sites. Land to the north of the site identified as "aj" is the subject of these representations and it is shown to be protected as a Settlement Gap on the Proposals Map.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 6190 - 4417 - Shirland Policies Map - None

4571 Object

Respondent: Ms Karen Briggs [10235]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This is a very peaceful area where I live alone with my child, I am worried about all of the traffic, large machinery, noise and dust, this will be very disruptive and a possible danger to me and my child, I have Asthma that is why wanted to live with a field on my back garden and no fumes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 4571 - 10235 - Tupton Policies Map - None