

Erewash Core Strategy Review Examination Response to Matters, Issues & Questions (MIQs)

Main Matter 6: Housing Allocations

Issue:

Whether the proposed housing site allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Relevant Policies: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6

Please note: In responding to the questions below the Council should identify and address specific key concerns raised in the representations.

Questions

5. Strategic Policy 1.2 South Stanton

5.A. What is the background to the site allocation and how was it identified?

The wider Stanton Regeneration Site, comprising both South Stanton and Stanton North, was allocated for the development of a new neighbourhood of 2,000 homes by Policy 20 of the extant 2014 Erewash Core Strategy. A planning application to achieve this had been received from the site's owners Saint-Gobain PAM Ltd. during the production of that plan in January 2013, but was withdrawn in July 2015 after the adoption of the plan.

The Stanton Regeneration Site Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was prepared in 2017 to set out a high level masterplan for the site to demonstrate how the requirements of Core Strategy Policy 20 could be met. This stimulated interest in the site from private developers and no fewer than three government agencies. However, none of these parties could negotiate an acceptable purchase price with the site's owners, Saint-Gobain PAM Ltd.

Eventually, the local consortium Verdant Ltd. purchased the freehold of the half of the site north of Lows Lane. In negotiation with that landowner, the emerging Core Strategy Review allocated that land for employment development (Stanton North). The remainder of the land at South Stanton was retained in the Core Strategy Review as a housing allocation for 1,000 homes.

5.B. What is the basis of the scale of development proposed and is this justified?

The reduced scale of South Stanton compared to the Stanton Regeneration Site allocated by Policy 20 of the extant 2014 Core Strategy reflects its reduced size. The

scale of 1,000 homes is considered the minimum necessary to support a new neighbourhood, being the quantum of development necessary to support a new single form entry primary school.

5.C. What is the background to the specific policy requirements? Are they justified and consistent with national policy? Do they provide clear and effective guidance on constraints and mitigations?

The specific policy requirements are informed by the requirements of Policy 20 of the extant 2014 Core Strategy, by the Stanton Regeneration Site Supplementary Planning Document, and by the Sustainability Appraisal supporting the Core Strategy Review. The justification for these requirements is provided in the text of the Core Strategy Review, and include the following:

Criterion 1 – Comprehensive remediation is required by the virtue of the sites 250 year long industrial history, including Georgian and Victorian coal and iron ore mining, and subsequent iron smelting and foundry operations.

Criterion 2 – Multiple vehicular accesses onto Lows Lane are required to provide adequate access to a site of this scale.

Criterion 3 – The need for a replacement roundabout for the junction of Lows Lane / Sowbrook Lane / Ilkeston Road was identified through transport modelling carried out to support the Stanton Regeneration Site SPG, and further confirmed through transport modelling to support the Core Strategy Review. The land for a junction has already been provided through the Stanton North planning consent.

Criterion 4 – The need for new bus services to provide a choice of modes of transport for a new neighbourhood at the Stanton Regeneration Site was identified in transport modelling carried out to support the extant 2104 Core Strategy Review, and confirmed through transport modelling to support the Stanton Regeneration Site SPD, and further confirmed through transport modelling to support the Core Strategy Review.

Criterion 5 – The new bus services identified above will require new bus halts.

Criterion 6 – The need for a pavement along Littlewell Lane to the neighbouring village of Stanton-by-Dale was identified in the Stanton Regeneration Site SPD as necessary to allow that settlement to sustainably access the new facilities that would be provided by the new neighbourhood.

Criterion 7 – Pedestrian links to the wider public footpath network, including a crossing of Littlewell Lane are required to provide access to the surrounding countryside and thus help support healthy lifestyles.

Criterion 8 – A new village centre on Lows Lane is required to provide the services that the new neighbourhood would need in a sustainable location.

Criterion 9 – A new primary school is required to provide for the educational needs of the new neighbourhood and provide a community hub whilst also reducing the need to travel off the site.

Criterion 10 – Additional provision at other schools, e.g. secondary school provision, may be required.

Criterion 11 – Affordable housing provision in accordance with Policy 8 of the extant 2014 Erewash Core Strategy is required.

5.D. What are the highways implications of the allocation and how will any impacts be mitigated?

Highways impacts of the plan as a whole are set out in ETB1.1. That work has been carried out in partnership with Derbyshire County Council Highways Authority, Nottinghamshire County Council Highways Authority, Derby City Council Highways Authority, and National Highways.

Criteria 2 to 9 of Policy 1.2 set out the transport mitigations informed through work on the Stanton Regeneration Site SPD, subsequent additional transport modelling and Sustainability Appraisal that will be applied to this allocation. The transport modelling also identifies a sub-regional list of junction improvements that can be further tested at the planning application stage for this site.

Even with the proposed mitigations, the site will result in an increase in traffic. However, it is not considered that either unacceptable highway safety impacts, or severe impacts on the road network, would result from that increase in traffic that would justify the prevention of this allocation.

5.E. Does the policy appropriately identify any necessary infrastructure requirements? How will these be provided and funded? Is this sufficiently clear?

The need and provision of infrastructure requirements is addressed in the answers to Questions 5.C. and 5.D. above.

5.F. Are there potential adverse effects not covered above? If so what are they and how would they be addressed and mitigated? (The Council's response should address key issues raised in representations.)

Matters raised in representations include the impacts of developing a brownfield site, impacts on traffic and transport, and impact on local services.

The brownfield status of this site, including its contamination and land stability legacy, are reasons that support its remediation through development, and are adequately addressed through criterion 1 of Policy 1.2.

Traffic and transport impacts have been considered under the answer to Question 5.D. above.

Suitable provision for shops and services and schools is provided by criteria 8 to 10 of Policy 1.2. No evidence of need for any additional provision has been submitted to the Core Strategy Review.

5.G. What evidence is there to demonstrate that the allocation is viable and deliverable within the plan period? What is the situation with regard to land ownership and developer interest?

Delivery of the allocation including the infrastructure identified by Policy 1.2 has been found to be viable in the Local Plan Viability Report (EBC04). Half of the site has recently been sold to Verdant Ltd, the local consortium that is currently delivering the Stanton North allocation. The other half remains in the ownership and use of Saint-Gobain PAM Ltd, pending their relocation to alternative premises in their ownership.

5.H. How will the site be brought forward for development? What mechanism will there be to ensure a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development, ensuring infrastructure requirements are provided?

The development will be brought forward through a planning application, either jointly by the two owners or after land ownership has been rationalised further. The infrastructure requirements identified in the policy will then be delivered as conditions of section 106 agreements associated with a planning consent, as appropriate.

5.I. What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is this realistic?

Due to the land ownership issues that remain to be resolved, it is not anticipated that this site will contribute to development needs over the first 5 years of the Core Strategy Review. However, it is expected to be delivered over the following 10 years.

5.J. Overall, is the allocation justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?

For the reasons set out in the answer to the questions above, the allocation is considered to be justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy.