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**REPRESENTATION FORM**

**NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE LOCAL PLAN**

**PUBLICATION DRAFT**

**General Information**

This stage of the consultation is focussed on whether the Publication Draft version of the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound, rather than the wider ranging questions that we have asked in previous consultations on the Local Plan.

* The deadline for representations is 5pm on Wednesday 4 April 2018. Late representations will not be accepted.
* Be clear about which policy, paragraph or Map of the Local Plan you are responding to.
* Be clear whether you are supporting or objecting to the Local plan. If you think the Local plan is not **legal** or **sound**, be clear why. Please refer to the Guidance Note for more details.
* Try to support you representation(s) with evidence.
* Be clear about any changes you want to see.
* Briefly and precisely cover all information and evidence to support or justify your representation(s). Once the consultation closes there is unlikely to be a further opportunity to provide further information or evidence.
* The Council has also published supporting documents to accompany the Publication Draft Local Plan. They are the Sustainability Appraisal, Policies Map and Consultation Statement and are available to view on the Council’s website, and at deposit venues (the Council Offices on Mill Lane and libraries throughout the District). A range of evidence base studies that underpin the policies within the Plan are also available to view on the Council’s website.

If you wish to make comments on this Plan you may fill in this form. Additional copies of the form are available on line at [www.ne-derbyshire.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.ne-derbyshire.gov.uk/localplan) and can be submitted by e-mail to local.plan@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk. Or by post to:

**Planning Policy Team,**

**North East Derbyshire District Council,**

**2013 Mill Lane, Wingerworth,**

**Chesterfield, Derbyshire,**

**S42 6NG**

**All comments must be received by 5pm**

**on Wednesday 4 April 2018**

|  |
| --- |
| **Submitting your representation online**Submitting your representation online is a quicker way of getting involved.* You will receive an instant confirmation email to give you a receipt so that you know your representation has been successfully delivered and that your comments will be considered.
* Go to <https://bolsover.jdi-consult.net/localplan/> for more information.

*(If you don’t yet have an account, you can set one up easily from this web address)* |

**Filling in the form**

* **PLEASE READ THE GUIDANCE NOTE BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM**
* **Your comments are classed as formal representations on the Local Plan.**
* **This form has two parts:**

**Part A: Personal and contact details**

**Part B: Your Representations**

* **Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make**

Only the content of your representation and your name will be available for public inspection, and will be published online and in public reports and documents.

|  |
| --- |
| **PART A – PERSONAL AND CONTACT DETAILS** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Personal Details**  |  | **Agents Details (if applicable)** |
|  |  |  |
| Rep ID (if known from previous |  |  |
| consultations) |  |  |
| Title | Mr. |  |
|  |  |  |
| First Name  | Paul |  |
|  |  |  |
| Last Name | Johnson |  |
|  |  |  |
| Job Title  |  |  |
| (where relevant) |  |  |
| Organisation  |  |  |
| (where relevant) |  |  |
| Address Line 1 | Rose Cottage |  |
|  |  |  |
| Line 2 | 1 Spinkhill Road, |  |
|  |  |  |
| Line 3 | Killamarsh, |  |
|  |  |  |
| Line 4 | Sheffield. |  |
|  |  |  |
| Post Code | S21 1EH |  |
|  |  |  |
| Telephone Number | 0114-248-2929 |  |
|  |  |  |
| E-mail Address | pjassociatespaul@aol.com |  |

If you do not complete this section, your comments cannot be registered or considered as part of the process.

|  |
| --- |
| **PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION** |

Please use a separate form for each representation/ point you wish to raise and firmly attach these to part A which contains your contact details.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1** (See page 3 of the Guidance Note) |

To which part of the Local Plan does your representation relate?

(Please quote paragraph or policy reference)

|  |
| --- |
| Chapter 5 – Living Communities (Specific Sites, paragraphs 5.32 – 5.40). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 2** (See page 3 of the Guidance Note) |

Do you wish to state your support or objection to this part of the Local Plan?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SUPPORT | ☐ |
| OBJECT | X☐ |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 3** (See page 3 of the Guidance Note) |

Please enter your representation here. This should explain why you either support this part of the Local Plan or why you think the Local Plan is or is not legally compliant or sound (see guidance note for an explanation of legally compliant and sound). Please be as precise as possible (in no more than 100 words).

If your representation requires more than 100 words, please attach any additional sheets securely to this form and use the box below to summarise your representation.

|  |
| --- |
| There are significant risks and obstacles in respect of the two main sites planned for Killamarsh, one at Westthorpe (330 dwellings) and another at Rotherham Road (70 dwellings). The village will only serve as a dormitory site for, predominantly, Sheffield. Both are located in the Green Belt and are outside the current settlement limits, necessitating travel by car – a factor acknowledged by the Transport Evidence Base report (2018).Killamarsh is unique in NE Derbyshire because it located on the District edge, bordering Sheffield, Rotherham, Bolsover and Chesterfield. Each plans significant expansion, all of which will impinge on Killamarsh air quality through excessive traffic movement.**Supporting Comments.****Killamarsh – Specific Sites (Paragraphs 5.32 – 5.40) (Policy SS2).**Paragraphs 5.32 – 5.34 inclusive deal with a major site at Westthorpe, Killamarsh. The site is currently within the Green Belt and is expected to deliver 330 dwellings, the majority within the first 10 years of the Plan.This site is within the High Risk area because of historical mining work. There is anecdotal evidence of house subsidence and sinkholes on the planned site.The Sustainability Appraisal for this site raised a number of issues:-* Significant increase in Greenhouse Gas emissions;
* Inefficient land use;
* Outside limits for GP and hospitals;
* Close to site of three Grade II listed buildings;
* It would alter the urban fringe and intrude into the countryside;
* Disturbance to local wildlife sites, potentially damage ancient hedgerows, trees and biodiversity;
* In a mining high risk area.

This site is owned by Harworth Estates Limited, part of the Harworth Group of companies. The land passed to RJB Mining Ltd., which became UK Coal Limited, which had Harworth Estates Limited under its corporate umbrella. Other residents suffered the dust, dirt and inevitable disruption that the scale and nature of working coal mines entail. After the collieries closed subsequent reclamation projects returned the land to its former rural appearance. These sites are now used as recreational areas by walkers, dog walkers and those who enjoy the proliferation of species of flora and fauna that abound in the fields. It is interesting to note some comments made by RJB Mining (UK) Ltd. When they obtained permission to open cast for coal on the Westthorpe and High Moor areas of Killamarsh, and promised to restore the sites:“….some of the lower quality land will be converted into woodland and wildlife habitats to enhance the species diversity and recreational amenity of the area.”“Steps will be taken to protect and preserve part of this site, and upon restoration create a larger habitat than presently exists to enhance wildlife interest in the area.”“The…. scheme is an opportunity to substantially enhance wildlife habitats and species diversity. Advance planting, including the creation of a wetland habitat will extend beyond the site boundary…”**Desktop studies will not disclose these issues, neither will they identify the variety of species currently present in the land there. Only local people who use the site know these because of the lack of any official study.**As you will be aware, RJB Mining was the predecessor of UK Coal, which owns Harworth Developments, and which now wants to build 330 houses (if they are to be believed) on this same land. ***To allow them to do so would be tantamount to an act of environmental criminality.***There are five footpaths (not four) crossing this proposed development site, passing through the created wildflower meadow. These are used by local residents to walk dogs or just to walk for health and recreation.The road network around the site is totally unsuitable for the addition of large numbers of additional people and vehicles.The unique position of Killamarsh within the North East Derbyshire District needs to be considered as well.Situated on the far north eastern corner of the District it abuts Sheffield City, Rotherham Borough, Bolsover District and Chesterfield Borough councils.Due to this unique position Killamarsh is vulnerable to development in the four areas and, to a lesser extent, to that within the Bassetlaw District and Eckington. Here is an example of relevant development within those areas:-* Clowne (Bolsover District) – 1,800 homes and an industrial estate;
* Sheffield City – 745 dwellings in directly adjoining areas;
* Bolsover (Bolsover District) – 500+ dwellings;
* Cresswell (Bolsover District) – 277 dwellings;
* Whitwell (Bolsover District) - 200 dwellings;
* Barlborough (Bolsover District) – 150 dwellings;
* Eckington (NEDDC) – 400 dwellings.

All of the named development will impact the roads around Killamarsh, with the most likely to be affected being the unclassified Spinkhill Road/Station Road/The Avenue/Syday Lane. This will be the main road used by residents of the proposed Westthorpe estate if travelling anywhere south of the District.The Transport Evidence Base, 2017 shows that employment and Residential trip generation is estimated at 586 additional trips (a.m. – 1 hour only) and in the evening (1 hour only) 585 additional trips. The ‘rush’ periods extend to more than two hours each in both morning and evening. The report places Killamarsh in 15th place in the Transport Sustainability table (out of 35), with only Clay Cross of the Level 1 settlements being worse off at 18. However, Clay Cross will benefit from the provision of significant money to ameliorate problems on their main trunk route, the A61.The same report includes a map showing where potential work may ease traffic flows in Killamarsh. It refers to a number of pedestrian crossings being present, road width reduced by parking bays (the few that there are), a mini roundabout at Norwood and a bad bend on Upperthorpe Road. The map also refers to the river bridge on the B6058 (Sheffield Road). It shows ‘the potential to remove footway to increase road width.’ This shows the folly of looking at maps after a quick drive through of an area. The removal of the footpath at this point would leave the bridge parapet vulnerable to a vehicle strike, thus damaging the bridge and closing the road. It could also allow a vehicle to fall into the river. There have been two fairly recent fatal accidents near this bridge and the removal of the footpath on the ‘offending’ corner would possibly add to these tragic incidents. In any event, the removal of the footpath, which is very narrow at this point, would give about 18” of additional room. Unfortunately vehicles still need that 18” to miss the bridge parapet (Transport Evidence Base, 2017, figure 3.5). The Transport Evidence Base also refers to Travel to Work Patterns (Figures 3.17 and 3.18). These show that North East Derbyshire is a significant net exporter of commuters. The accuracy of the evidence currently is debatable as it was compiled using the 2011 Census. Significant building has continued in Killamarsh during the period 2011 to 2018. It still continues.There are only three access/egress routes in Killamarsh, the main one being the B 6058/A 618 Rotherham Road/Mansfield Road. The A618 Rotherham Road leads towards J31 of the M1 motorway. The other route is the unclassified Spinkhill Road leading to J30 of the M1 motorway. This latter route is used as a ‘rat run’ from Killamarsh to the M1 southbound and, due to satellite navigation directions, sees heavy goods vehicle traffic along a totally unsuitable road.The other main site in Killamarsh is at Rotherham Road. This has similar drawbacks to Westthorpe. The sustainability appraisal finds similar issues, excluding proximity to Grade II listed buildings but including the potential for air and light pollution from the proximate Norwood Industrial Estate. In addition, a family living in a house beside the proposed development site had to leave their home for 18 months so that subsidence damage could be repaired. Traffic leaving this site would need to enter the A 618 road.The A 618 Rotherham Road is the only route to travel to the M1 northbound at J31. The Rother Valley Country Park is located in the Rotherham Borough area, literally yards from the boundary with Killamarsh/North East Derbyshire. Traffic is very heavy on this road at peak times, and weekends in the Summer. This situation will be exacerbated as the development of the Gulliver’s Valley theme park progresses after it successfully obtained planning permission in March, 2017. This development includes three hotels and parking spaces for 1,600 vehicles, when completed. The entrance is on Rotherham Road (A 618). A large proportion of vehicles wishing to access this Park will travel through Killamarsh.The B 6058 Sheffield Road is the major route out of Killamarsh into which all other traffic wishing to traverse the centre of Killamarsh flows. At morning and evening rush periods the road is heavily congested, a situation exacerbated by the narrowing of the road at a longstanding road bridge over the River Rother. The angle of the bridge to the road means that it is virtually one-way if a heavy goods vehicle, or a bus or other large vehicle, is trying to pass in either direction. There are very many heavy goods vehicles and some public service vehicles traversing this route. |

If you have stated your support for this part of the Local Plan, please move to Question 5. If you have stated your objection for this part of the Local Plan, please move to Question 4.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 4** (See page 3 of the Guidance Note) |

If you are objecting to this part of the Local Plan, please let us know what changes you think are needed to make the Local Plan legally compliant and / or sound (see guidance note for an explanation of legally compliant and sound).

You will need to say why this change will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible (in no more than 100 words)

If your representation requires more than 100 words, please attach any additional sheets securely to this form and use the box below to summarise your representation.

|  |
| --- |
| Remove the two main sites from the local plan as being totally unsustainable development. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 5** (See page 4 of the Guidance Note) |

Do you consider that the Local Plan is legally compliant?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | ☐ |
| NO | X☐ |

If you have stated no, please make sure this links back to your response in Questions 3 and 4 (the meaning of ‘legally compliat’ is explained in the guidance note).

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6** (See page 5 of the Guidance Note) |

Do you consider Local Plan is sound?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | ☐ |
| NO | X☐ |

If you have stated no, please make sure this links back to your response in Questions 3 and 4 and let us know which of the ‘tests of soundness’ it has failed (Questions 6A – 6D below).

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6A** (See page 5 of the Guidance Note) |

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not ‘positively prepared’?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | X☐ |
| NO | ☐ |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6B** (See page 6 of the Guidance Note) |

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not ‘justified’?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | X☐ |
| NO | ☐ |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6C** (See page 6 of the Guidance Note) |

Do you consider that the Local plan is unsound because it is not ‘effective’?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | X☐ |
| NO | ☐ |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6D** (See page 6 of the Guidance Note) |

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not ‘consistent with national policy’?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | ☐ |
| NO | ☐ |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 7** (See page 6 of the Guidance Note) |

Do you consider that the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Co-operate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | ☐ |
| NO | X☐ |

If you have stated no, please make sure this links back to your response in Questions 2 and 3 (remember to look at the requirements in the guidance note).

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 8** (See page 7 of the Guidance Note) |

If you are objecting to this part of the Local Plan, please let us know if you raised this matter at an earlier stage of the plan making process such as the Consultation Draft Local Plan in February/March 2017.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | X☐ |
| NO | ☐ |

If yes, please move to Question 9. If no, please move to Question 10.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 9** (See page 7 of the Guidance Note) |

If you raised this matter at an earlier stage of the plan making process, which stage was it?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Consultation Draft Local Plan (February-March 2017) | X☐ |
| Initial Draft Local Plan (Part 1) (February-March 2015) | X☐ |
| Local Strategy Consultation (August-September 2012) | X☐ |
| Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation (April-June 2009) | ☐ |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 10** (See page 7 of the Guidance Note) |

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary for you to participate at the Hearing Sessions should the Inspector wish to discuss your representation / issue at the Hearing?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | X☐ |
| NO | ☐ |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 11** (See page 7 of the Guidance Note) |

If you wish to participate at the Hearing Sessions, please outline why you consider this to be necessary?

|  |
| --- |
| To emsure that the views of local people are heard. |

Please note that the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing sessions.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 12** (See page 8 of the Guidance Note) |

Would you like to be notified of one or more of the following (please tick the relevant boxes)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| When the Local Plan is submitted for independent examination? | X☐ |
| When the Inspector’s report is published? | X☐ |
| When the Local Plan is adopted? | X☐ |

Please return the completed form by 5pm Wednesday 4 April 2018 to:

By email:

local.plan@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk

By post:

Planning Policy Team

North East Derbyshire District Council

2013 Mill Lane

Wingerworth

Chesterfield

Derbyshire

S42 6NG

If you have any questions, please contact us on 01246 217171/ 7694/ 7169/ 7180

Next Steps

Following the close of consultation we will prepare a summary of the main issues raised by representations. The representations, summary of issues, Local Plan and other supporting documents and evidence base studies will then be submitted to the Independent Inspector for examination in May 2018.

|  |
| --- |
|  All personal information provided to North East Derbyshire District Council will be held and treated in confidence in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. It will only be used for the purpose for which it was given, which is to ensure your representation is recorded, and to contact you regarding your representation. However, the content of your representation including your name and address will be available for public inspection, and will be published online and in public reports and documents. |