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1. **Introduction**

1.1 Bolsover District Council is preparing a new Local Plan for the District. Several major consultation exercises have been carried out in recent years under the title of the 'Core Strategy'. The most recent of these was consultation on revised Preferred Options for the Core Strategy in April and May 2010. That work was prepared under legislation which requires the Strategy to be in general conformity with the *Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)*, which in our case is the East Midlands Regional Plan, approved in March 2008. The Regional Plan sets a regional and sub-regional context for the preparation of local plans, including identifying the appropriate scale of housing for which provision should be made.

1.2 In July 2010, the Secretary of State announced his intention to abolish the RSS level of guidance, and issued a letter revoking the current RSS. Subsequently, a legal challenge ruled that such revocation was unlawful. Then the Secretary of State indicated that legislation would be introduced very rapidly to abolish the RSS – and the Localism Act, which received Royal Assent in November 2011 provided the powers to do so. The Government have repeated the intention to revoke regional strategies outside London, subject to the outcome of environmental assessments and consideration by the Secretary of State and Parliament of the findings of the assessments.

1.3 Accordingly, whilst for the time being the East Midlands Regional Plan remains in place, it may not do so for much longer. Given this situation and the fact that the economic context and future population projections that informed the Regional Plan have changed considerably, it is considered that Bolsover’s Local Plan should set out its own view on the levels of housing and employment growth that are appropriate within Bolsover District. In doing this, however, the Council is conscious that it has a duty to co-operate with other local planning authorities and agencies. For example, paragraph 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that local planning authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross boundary impacts when their Local Plans are submitted for examination. This report, termed the *Local Strategy Statement (LSS)*, is intended to help in fulfilling the duty to co-operate. It seeks to clarify the context for preparing the Local Plan, and through consultation on this Paper reach agreement on the way forward. The preparation of this Statement is part of the drawing together of work to show how the Council is proposing to deal with strategic issues, and that the necessary ongoing co-operation has taken place between the Council, its neighbours and relevant agencies. It is hoped that the draft Statement will facilitate a dialogue with our neighbours, to ensure that the Local Plan is
consistent with their own strategies, and that all our plans, taken together, make coherent sense.

1.4 In an ideal world, it might be preferable for all authorities in a certain area, to contribute to a sub-regional strategy statement. In reality, authorities are all at different stages of the local plan process, and decisions about the appropriate boundary of a sub region for planning purposes could be a matter of some debate. In addition, local planning authorities have been left in no doubt that Government expects them to progress with preparing and adopting local plans as quickly as they possibly can. This Local Strategy Statement is designed therefore as a pragmatic way forward in this context.

1.5 There are a number of reasons for working with neighbouring authorities. These include:

- Sharing best practice;
- Aligning local plan documents;
- Developing shared evidence bases;
- Undertaking the joint commissioning and funding of evidence base studies to develop cross boundary approaches and reduce costs;
- Responding to initiatives jointly at an appropriate scale (e.g. county wide, sub-regionally or Local Enterprise Partnership level).

1.6 The Statement shows the mechanisms for engagement, and highlights both areas of agreement and areas where further work on particular issues will need to take place at later stages of the local plan process.

1.7 Section 2 of the Local Strategy Statement starts by outlining national advice on cross boundary planning. Section 3 gives a strategic overview of the district and outlines the changes that have taken place since the East Midlands Plan was adopted in 2009. Section 4 sets out the arrangements for cross boundary working, whilst sections 5 -7 examine the cross boundary issues raised through this exchange of information. The Statement concludes with an overview of the strategies of each neighbouring authority, and an assessment of their likely impact on Bolsover district.
2. **National Advice on Cross Boundary Planning**

2.1 Guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is aimed at ensuring Local Planning Authorities work with each other and public, voluntary, and private sector organisations to produce Local Plans. Paragraph 178 of the NPPF states that public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly where these relate to the following strategic priorities:

- the homes and jobs needed in the area;
- the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
- the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, and flood risk management;
- the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and
- climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.

2.2 Details of the duty to cooperate in relation to the planning of sustainable development are set out in the requirement of Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 which includes a new Section (33A) to Part 2 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Details of the steps taken under this requirement are set out at Appendix 1.
3. **Arrangements for cross boundary liaison**

3.1 This section of the Statement focuses on the processes that are in place to facilitate cross boundary liaison. It describes the groups, and outlines the workstreams that each group is progressing. The issues arising from work with neighbouring authorities is discussed in sections 5 – 7 below.

3.2 Officers from the Council’s Planning Policy Team attend meetings of the Derbyshire Planning Policy Officers Group. The group, made up of representatives from each of the planning policy teams in the County plus the County Council meets quarterly to discuss issues such as:

- Joint working projects
- Local Transport Plan
- Minerals and Waste Plans
- Cross boundary issues, for example housing figures and landscape policy
- Service Level Agreements (for example with the Wildlife Trust)
- Evidence bases and data collection
- The group is currently in the process of drafting and agreeing a draft Statement of Co-operation, and draft Terms of Reference for the Group.

3.3 Following the creation of the Local Enterprise Partnership, the Sheffield City Region Planning Officers Group (SCRPOG) was formed to work together to disseminate information and best practice across the city region (Barnsley MBC; Bassetlaw DC; Bolsover DC; Chesterfield BC; Derbyshire Dales DC; Doncaster MBC; North East Derbyshire DC; Peak National Park; Rotherham MBC; and Sheffield CC).

3.4 The group plans to meet bi-monthly and is currently in the process of agreeing Terms of Reference.

3.5 Bolsover District Council is also a participant in the Local Development Framework Liaison Group. This is an officer level group of authorities in the Northern (Sheffield/Rotherham) Housing Market Area; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire County Councils. The group was formed in 2009, and meets on a regular basis to discuss:

- The implications of growth options ;
- Infrastructure (transport, utilities, social infrastructure, etc)
- Cross boundary issues, such as the impact of development around motorway junctions; transport links (disused railways etc); flooding
- Progress on Local Development Schemes
- Work Programmes
- Evidence Base Studies – both to consider the commissioning of joint studies where appropriate (e.g. the Strategic Flood Risk Study), and share
information and best practice on individual studies (for example the Water Cycle Study)

- Joint working, for example on strategic housing requirements and population/household projections
- The development of joint methodologies where appropriate (for example the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment)
- Infrastructure Delivery Plans and Community Infrastructure Levy
- Progressing issues of joint concern, for example formulating a joint response to the Joint North Eastern Derbyshire Transport Study.

3.6 Since the announcement to abolish Regional Plans in 2010, the work of the group has increased in importance, as a way of discussing work being undertaken in neighboring authorities and exploring opportunities for joint working. This is reflected in the development of a joint Memorandum of Understanding between the six authorities, which was signed in April 2012. The joint memorandum covers all significant activity and development plans relating to land in the authorities in the Housing Market Area and requires the sharing of information on matters which are likely to have significant cross border implications, and other relevant information. A copy of the memorandum is attached as Appendix 3.

3.7 In addition discussions which take place at formalised group meetings, meetings have also taken place with officers from neighbouring authorities not in the above groups.

3.8 The most recent meeting with officers from Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council took place in January 2012. Issues discussed included: the setting of a housing target, employment targets, the transport evidence base, the deletion of a strategic site in the north of Bolsover district from the Local Plan Strategy, each authority’s work on Infrastructure Studies, the development of Local Strategy Statements.

3.9 The most recent meeting with officers from Mansfield District Council took place in January 2012. Issues discussed included: programmes for the Local Development Framework, housing targets, development options at Pleasley, Glapwell by-pass, Pleasley by-pass, the transport evidence base, affordable housing, retail development proposals, the implications of growth on the Bath Lane Sewage Treatment works in Mansfield.

3.10 The most recent meeting with Ashfield District Council took place on 24th February 2012. Issues discussed included: programmes for the Local Development Framework, housing targets, cross boundary issues (the A38 and junction 28; significant open spaces; and the setting of Hardwick Hall), affordable housing, and the Community Infrastructure Levy.
4. Strategic overview

A. The District and its relationships

4.1 Bolsover District is situated in the north-eastern corner of Derbyshire. It covers an area of 160km². The district boundary to the east and south-east follows the line of the county boundary, and the neighbouring authorities are the Nottinghamshire authorities of Bassetlaw, Mansfield and Ashfield District Councils. To the south west the district has a short boundary with Amber Valley District Council. The western boundary adjoins North East Derbyshire District Council, and Chesterfield Borough Council. The northern boundary with Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council forms both a county and regional boundary with South Yorkshire County and the Yorkshire and Humber region.

4.2 The district sits in the Northern sub-region of the East Midlands, together with: Ashfield, Mansfield, Newark and Sherwood, North East Derbyshire and Bassetlaw District Councils; and, Chesterfield Borough Council. Together with neighbours in Bassetlaw, Chesterfield and North-East Derbyshire, the district is identified as part of the Northern (Sheffield/Rotherham) Housing Market Area in the East Midlands Regional Plan (the RSS).

4.3 This District is a member of two Local Enterprise Partnerships: the Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership and the Derby and Derbyshire and Nottingham and Nottinghamshire (D2N2) Local Enterprise Partnership. One of the main initiatives undertaken by the Sheffield City Region LEP has been the inclusion of land at Markham Vale in the Sheffield City Enterprise Zone which aims to create a modern manufacturing and technology growth area at sites along the M1, and provide incentives for business. The Markham Vale Growth Zone is a major brownfield site, including land in three local authority areas in north Derbyshire.

4.4 Similarly, the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership is striving to help to deliver a dynamic economy. The LEP’s initial priorities include developing manufacturing, engineering, creative industries, and tourism; and securing investment in regeneration and infrastructure projects.

4.5 The map below shows the relationship between Bolsover district and its neighbours, and the groups of which each neighbour is a member.
4.6 The District is a mainly rural area. It does not contain any sub-regional centres. The largest settlements are Bolsover, Clowne, Shirebrook, and South Normanton, which are defined as ‘medium size’ towns in the Regional Plan. The district has high levels of out-commuting, and high levels of retail expenditure leakage to adjoining centres. These outflows are not made to, or dominated by, any single nearby centre. It appears that destinations for both commuting and shopping are based on the proximity of settlements in the district to several neighbouring sub-regional centres and employment areas.

4.7 In addition, as South Normanton, Shirebrook and Bolsover are all similar sized towns; the District is not dominated by any one town. Attempts have been made in the past to identify sub-areas within the District. For example, the Joint Structure Plan (2001) identified the following four sub areas:

- The Chesterfield Sub-Area which includes Barlborough, Bolsover, Clowne and other settlements in the north west of the District;
- The Creswell/Whitwell Sub-Area which includes Creswell, Hodthorpe and Whitwell;
- The Shirebrook Area including Pleasley and Glapwell;
- The Alfreton Sub Area including Pinxton, Tibshelf, South Normanton

4.8 Whilst there is some logic behind such an identification of sub-areas, such a classification is not always useful. Accordingly, following consultation in 2006, work on the Local Plan has progressed by considering issues at a variety of levels, from individual settlements, to sub areas, and also District level.

4.9 The Bolsover Retail Capacity Assessment 2010 update contains details showing the pattern of destinations for convenience goods expenditure leakage from the district into neighbouring districts. The trend to shop outside the district for convenience goods occurs throughout the district. The highest proportion of total convenience goods expenditure leaking outside the district goes to stores in Alfreton, Sutton–in Ashfield, and Staveley, followed by Mansfield Woodhouse, Mansfield, Worksop, Chesterfield and Halfway. There is also significant leakage of comparison goods expenditure. The assessment calculated that out of the total comparison goods expenditure ‘pot’, of £163.3m, just £19.10m is spent at stores and centres within the district. In addition, the strength of the links to neighbouring areas can be seen in the patterns of out-commuting for jobs. The table below is an extract of the table at Appendix 2 showing the main destinations of the people travelling outside Bolsover District to work. It illustrates the strong connections between the district and neighbours to the east and west. There is considerably less commuting to nearby cities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Destination from Bolsover District to</th>
<th>Percentage of out commuting to work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Derbyshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full details of commuter patterns in the district are contained in Appendix 2.

B. Key issues identified in the Regional Economic Strategy

4.10 The Regional Economic Strategy, published in July 2006 by the East Midlands Development Agency, identifies the key challenges of the Northern sub-area as high levels of unemployment; physical regeneration and economic renewal; the legacy of environmental damage from its industrial past; and major strategic sites in need of physical regeneration. The strategic key priorities are identified as economic renewal; enterprise and business support; employment, learning and skills; and land and development.

C. Key issues identified in the East Midlands Regional Plan

4.11 The Regional Plan was adopted in March 2009. It splits the region into 5 sub areas. Bolsover District falls within the Northern Sub-area, which is described as “comprising the former coalfield areas of north Derbyshire and north Nottinghamshire which have been adversely affected by economic restructuring and environmental degradation.”

4.12 The Regional Plan identifies the economic, social, and environmental regeneration of the Northern Sub-area as a regional priority. Two of the ways of achieving this are identified as promoting environmental enhancement as a fundamental part of regeneration; and significantly strengthening the Sub-Regional centres. However, the Plan also notes that the decline of mining has also affected medium sized towns and smaller rural settlements (such as those in Bolsover District). Therefore, regeneration initiatives must address the needs of both urban and rural communities. The Plan notes that there are many brownfield sites in the sub-region, and whilst some are in sustainable locations, the location of others makes them more suitable for environmental enhancement than redevelopment. It goes on to say that there could be Greenfield sites more closely related to medium sized towns such as Bolsover and Shirebrook which provide greater opportunities for sustainable development.
4.13 The sub-regional housing priorities again note that regeneration is a priority for the Northern (Sheffield- Rotherham Housing) market, and that Bolsover District has substantial regeneration needs and requires housing provision to enable economic and social regeneration. In setting the regional housing provision, the Regional Plan considered (amongst other factors) the market conditions within the housing market area. The sub-region employment priorities state that there is a need to link decisions about housing to those over employment, in particular to address the issue of out-commuting, through increasing employment opportunities allowing more people to work as well as live in the area. In terms of the sub-regional priorities for natural and cultural resources, the Plan views environmental enhancement as going hand in hand with regeneration initiatives. It states that there is a particular challenge in the sub-area to protect existing and deliver new green infrastructure as part of regeneration. The Plan also sets out the sub-regional transport priorities, including strategic transport infrastructure. The main priorities are to improve sustainable transport, and promote sustainable transport patterns where urban extensions or other major developments are planned.

D. Changes since the adoption of the East Midlands Regional Plan

4.14 The main changes since the Regional Plan was adopted can be grouped under three main headings: changes to the evidence base; economic changes; and legislative/political changes.

4.15 Since evidence was collected to inform the targets set in the Regional Plan, three sets of both population projections and household projections have been published by the Office for National Statistics. The 2004 revised Sub-National Population Projections (SNPP) which were used to inform the RSS projected a population of 86,600 by 2029 (up from the 71,776 recorded in the 2001 census). However, the recently released 2010 SNPP projects a population figure of 84,100 by 2031. The Regional Plan set Bolsover District a target of 400 dwellings a year, which the District Council considered was over ambitious and which is hard to justify even using the projection data from 2004. Despite there being no shortage of allocated housing sites, or sites with planning permission in the district, house building rates in the district over the last decade have been consistently less than the Regional Plan requirement. In addition, the lower growth projections clearly indicate a need to reassess the amount of housing the district needs to plan for.

4.16 The table below shows recent levels of house completions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Completions</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.17 The main economic change has been the recession, and its impact on the ability of developers to fund new development. In addition, funding streams, for example from the Local Enterprise Growth Initiative and grants for the development of social housing from the Homes and Communities Agency have ceased. This has significantly affected the local property market, and the amount of development built. In addition, information from the Council’s regeneration team suggests that most of the development taking place is for a specific client. There is currently no known speculative development taking place in the district. The recession has significantly changed the market conditions and assumptions that the Regional Plan was based on.

4.18 The Annual Monitoring Reports have continued to report on the amount of employment land developed, and houses built in the district each year. Unsurprisingly given the above circumstances, the number of new houses built and amount of employment land developed have reduced over the last few years. However, it should be noted that the decline in the amount of residential development in the district has not been due to the refusal of planning applications, as on average over 80% of applications for housing have been granted over the last 5 years.

4.19 In terms of legislative/political changes, the new National Planning Policy Framework has been introduced. Amongst other provisions this allows Local Planning Authorities to set their own housing targets, based on a robust assessment of housing need.

4.20 In terms of the key issues for the District that planning needs to help to address it is considered that there has been little change since the Regional Plan was published. The district is still economically lagging, and in need of economic, social, and environmental regeneration. The need to create sustainable communities and reduce out-commuting remains. However, the changes to the evidence base, economic changes and political/legislative changes all to some extent raise the issue of what levels of development will be achievable.

4.21 It would clearly not be possible to produce a realistic Local Plan for the levels of growth identified in the Regional Plan. The District Council did not support the levels of housing growth identified in the Plan because it did not consider them to be deliverable. Given the changes outlined above, such levels of growth now appear to be completely unrealistic. In addition it is considered that the evidence base needs to be robust, and that local communities and developers should be able to plan on the basis that development(s) have a reasonable chance of coming forward.
4.22 The Regional Plan did not set targets for employment land. However, there has been considerable cross boundary work between authorities in North Derbyshire and North Nottinghamshire on employment land surveys, which have been influential in shaping approaches to this issue.
5. **Housing**

5.1 As noted in section 3 above (strategic overview), the District is in need of physical and economic regeneration. However, there is still a national recession, low levels of public sector intervention, and low growth levels. In addition, paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that ‘Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic’.

5.2 All seven of the districts in the Northern Sub-region participated in the commissioning and preparation of a joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Subsequently districts have undertaken additional work to update or improve their evidence base on particular aspects e.g. affordable housing viability. Similarly, Bolsover District has recently commissioned work to improve its evidence base on affordable housing needs and viability.

5.3 The Regional Plan deals with the issues around Gypsies, Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople on a county basis. The Derbyshire Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Group is made up of representatives from all of the authorities in Derbyshire, and meets quarterly to discuss guidance and good practice. The evidence base in relation to future accommodation needs for Gypsies and Travellers is in need or updating, and the Council supports the view that a co-ordinated assessment across the County should be undertaken as a matter of urgency.

A. **Scale of Housing Growth Proposed In Bolsover District**

5.4 Given the background of economic recession, falling levels of dwelling completions, and the imminent revocation of the Regional Plan, authorities in both Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire commissioned a revised demographic evidence base to assess the need for new policies for housing development in each district. The work involved the production of a range of different scenarios based on different patterns of growth (The 2010 Edge Report). The findings and implications of the Edge Report have been widely discussed at the LDF liaison group, and in workshops organised by Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils.

5.5 In addition to this work Bolsover District Council considered past patterns of housing delivery in the district. This information was used to produce a discussion paper which proposed a revised housing target for the district of 6,000 additional dwellings between 2011 and 2031, or an annual target of 300 dwellings a year. The discussion paper was circulated to neighbouring authorities for comment. Three authorities responded, two of these (Derbyshire County Council and North-east Derbyshire District Council) supported the revised target, and one (Ashfield District Council), made ‘no comment’. At their meeting on 28th September 2011, members of the Council’s Planning Committee endorsed the use of a minimum housing
requirement target of 300 dwellings a year as the basis upon which to make changes to the Council’s emerging Core Strategy.

5.6 For information purposes and to help neighbouring authorities gain an appreciation of the likely effect of the housing target upon particular settlements, Appendix 4 to this report provides totals for the future distribution of housing growth across the District. Such totals may change before the publication version of the Local Plan is finalised so they are ‘indicative’ at this stage.

B. Scale of Housing Growth proposed elsewhere in the Northern Housing Market Area.

5.7 Bassetlaw District Council adopted its Core Strategy on 22nd December 2011. At the time the Regional Plan was still in force, and the housing figure in the Core Strategy was in line with the 350 dwellings a year requirement in the Regional Plan. The figure was chosen to support the role of Worksop as a sub-regional centre, and to allow the district to respond to regeneration needs.

5.8 Chesterfield Borough Council published a draft Core Strategy in February 2012 for consultation. The proposed housing requirement is in line with the Regional Plan requirement of 380 dwellings a year. Chesterfield believes that although the requirement is likely to be challenging, particularly in the short term, it is necessary to underpin its regeneration and economic growth ambitions.

5.9 North East Derbyshire is currently in the process of setting a revised housing target to inform its Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework documents. This is likely to be below the 380 dwellings a year requirement in the Regional Plan. The district has no sub-regional centre, but has four towns defined as ‘other urban areas’ in the Regional Plan. Three of these are in the green belt and growth in these are likely to be constrained.

C. Discussion and Conclusions

5.10 In summary, the districts in the Northern Housing Market Area all accept the need for growth to aid much needed regeneration. The National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to ensure that their local plans meet the full objectively assessed needs for their areas. It is also clear, that there will be no specific government endorsed methodology for assessing such needs. Instead it is up to each local authority to demonstrate that it has undertaken a rational evidence based approach to determining its housing target, and that it is consistent with the localism approach for there to be variations on the way in which this takes place. Consequently, it is useful that authorities in the Housing Market Area are taking account of and discussing
the outputs from jointly funded population and household projection work. But this does not or should not inhibit authorities from taking account of other factors that are particular to their local areas. Accordingly, whilst it is useful to have reference points like the Sub National Population Projections or the regional plan targets, it would be wrong to expect all authorities to have a target which has the same relationship to such projections or targets.

5.11 Nevertheless, the issue arises of whether Bolsover’s intention of setting a target of 300 dwellings a year, which is 100 dwellings a year below the Regional Plan target, will increase demand for housing in other local authority areas. The Council does not believe this will occur because in Bolsover’s case the recent sub-national population projections produced by the Office for National Statistics provide a better benchmark for objectively assessed needs than the Regional Plan target. These projections suggest that 300 dwellings a year would be a higher figure than that needed to support realisation of the projections. Consequently demand would not be displaced to other authorities.

5.12 Secondly, there is the issue of the characteristics of Bolsover District compared to its neighbours. Of the districts in the Northern Housing Market Area, Bolsover has the lowest population and lowest number of households, but the highest housing requirement under the Regional Plan figures. Bassetlaw and Chesterfield have significantly larger populations, and a greater number of households. They also each contain a sub-regional centre. To achieve sustainable patterns of growth it would therefore be anticipated that these districts would need to plan for higher levels of growth than Bolsover. Accordingly 380 dwellings a year in Chesterfield, 350 a year in Bassetlaw and 300 a year in Bolsover would appear to be a more suitable distribution of growth than that suggested in the Regional Plan.

5.13 Bolsover’s proposed target of 300 dwellings a year will require a significant increase on past housing completion rates, in an area where the viability of development can often be an important issue. It is therefore a challenging target but is line with the Government’s and the Council’s growth agenda. However, it is important that housing does not take place greatly in excess of this figure, in order to achieve a satisfactory balance with employment provision and to protect the rural qualities of the area that are important to many local residents and communities.
6. **Employment**

**A. Regional Plan**

6.1 The sub-regional strategy contained in the Regional Plan contains an objective to provide jobs and services in and around settlements (other than the sub-regional settlements) that are accessible to a wider area or service particular concentrations of need, and to support regeneration of settlements. The sub-regional policy on employment regeneration priorities states that in reviewing employment land allocations local planning authorities should consider additional locations to assist the growth and regeneration of areas including Markham Vale and to the west of Bolsover by exploiting the brownfield land opportunities in the area; and around Barlborough and east towards Clowne, Whitwell, and Creswell, with an emphasis on brownfield land. The general intent of this policy is supported, but needs to be refined by the more detailed analysis that has been possible since the Regional Plan was adopted.

6.2 General policies in the Regional Plan identify regional priorities for the economy, which include the need to raise skill levels, develop the service sector, and high value manufacturing and create innovative businesses. Jobs are expected to move away from traditional employment space into retail, education and health. Local authorities are encouraged to ensure that a range of different sites are provided which are attractive to the market.

**B. Employment Land Reviews**

6.3 The Regional Plan does not set any district wide targets for the amount of employment land allocated in districts. Therefore each of the authorities in the Northern HMA have either developed, or are in the process of developing their own targets. However, some of the evidence base is shared. In March 2008 an Employment Land Review was published. This was a joint study, and covered all of the authorities in the East Midlands Northern Sub-Region. All of the authorities in the HMA have used this work (supplemented by additional studies/information) in deriving their employment land targets. Bolsover also had its own Employment Land Study carried out in 2006.

**C. Economic Development Strategy**

6.4 In addition, the regeneration teams of the three Derbyshire authorities in the HMA have developed an Economic Development Strategy. This joint strategy sets out the national, regional, and sub-regional policy context in relation to economic development; the economic performance of the three districts, and emerging trends and prospects. It also contains a SWOT analysis of the key issues facing the economic development in this part of the county. Cross border working on employment issues is taking place through the Sheffield
City Region, which is involved in the development of the Markham Employment Growth Zone. This site is spread over the three authorities in north eastern Derbyshire. In addition, Bolsover District Council is working with Bassetlaw Council on the re-development of a large brownfield site at Steetley that crosses the district/county boundary.

D. Scale of Employment Development proposed in Bolsover District

6.5 At present, the District is characterised by comparatively high rates of unemployment, coupled with low levels of skills and qualifications. There is a need for both physical regeneration and renewal to be complemented by action to help unemployed residents back into work. The District has high levels of out-commuting and low levels of jobs in comparison with the size of the economically active population.

6.6 At the District level, the aim is to provide greater opportunities for more sustainable lifestyles by aligning the number of jobs in the District with the number of households in the District. To do this it has been calculated that the District will need to accommodate some 155 hectares of employment generating development between 2011 and 2031 (further information is contained in a Local Plan Employment Topic Paper). Accordingly, it is proposed that a 20% contingency allowance is added to this figure, to provide prospective developers with a reasonable degree of choice and flexibility and to allow for the possibility of non delivery of some sites. Consequently, it is proposed that the Local Plan Employment Land Provision Policy makes provision for 185 hectares.

6.7 Currently the District has around 130 hectares of committed employment land (i.e. land with a local plan allocation or planning permission for an employment use). However, approximately 3 hectares of this total has little or no prospect of development for employment purposes. Consequently, the Local Plan will need to plan for an additional 58 hectares of employment land in the District, beyond existing commitments.

6.8 It is also likely that the Local Plan Strategy will seek to provide for a specific minimum percentage of jobs to households in each town and main village in the District (80% for towns and 50% for main villages). In order to achieve this, new employment land allocations will need to be concentrated in Bolsover town, Creswell and Tibshelf.
E. Scale of Employment Growth proposed elsewhere in the Northern Housing Market Area.

6.9 Bassetlaw District Council adopted its Core Strategy on 22nd December 2011. The Strategy has an employment land target of 107 ha, and policies to guide 45% of employment land development to Worksop, 35% to Harworth and 21% to Retford. Bassetlaw has a good ratio of employment opportunities to economically active residents, so there is no particular need for employment growth in Bassetlaw beyond that needed to maintain this ratio.

6.10 Chesterfield Borough Council published a draft Core Strategy in February 2012 for consultation. The Strategy states that “Sheffield Local Enterprise Partnership sees Chesterfield as the key employment centre in the south of Sheffield City Region, a high quality centre linked to Sheffield and the East Midlands via the A61 corridor where there is potential for growth. It is considered as a gateway to the Peak Park and to London, via the Midland mainline.” The Strategy seeks to provide 79 ha of land between 2011 and 2031 for new high quality employment development so that together with existing employment areas, a range of jobs and training opportunities are easily accessible to those who need them. The key areas for provision of new employment land are at the already committed Markham Vale development, and at Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor. Chesterfield is currently a net importer of labour, so again there is no reason for employment growth beyond that necessary to maintain its position as a sub regional centre.

6.11 North East Derbyshire has yet to determine its position on employment land needs.

F. Discussion and Conclusions

6.12 Both Chesterfield and Bassetlaw have strategies which seek to maintain their current economic roles within the sub region. North East Derbyshire have yet to determine their approach. In Bolsover, Council members have given a clear steer that they are not in favour of perpetuating or enlarging dormitory settlements, and that work should continue to re-establish a strong economic base following the demise of coal mining which the District was so reliant upon. This approach fits well with the aim of pursuing sustainable development, as long as levels of economic development do not become excessive and lead to Bolsover District becoming a net importer of labour. This would be inappropriate in a semi-rural area with relatively poor public transport provision. Consequently, the aim is to match the number of jobs in the District with the number of households, and also to seek a better balance between housing and employment in the District’s main settlements.
6.13 There is plenty of evidence from past development rates and current interest to suggest that development of 155 hectares of employment land in the District over a 20 year period is achievable given reasonable economic conditions. The District has a number of large sites which benefit from good access to the strategic highway network. These sites tend to be on land which benefit from existing commitments in the south of the District, in Shirebrook, and South Normanton. New allocations are likely to be concentrated in the north of the District in Bolsover town where suitable brownfield sites exist and in Creswell.
7. **Transport**

7.1 In general, this emerging Local Plan Strategy seeks to support a pattern of development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport whilst also planning for the ambitious levels of growth. Furthermore, the emphasis in the Local Plan on seeking to achieve a better balance of housing and employment provision within the District’s towns, main villages and villages is considered to recognise the significance of journeys to work within traffic patterns and peak hour congestion.

7.2 Based on this, it is considered that planning to minimise the negative impact of new development on overall journeys to work by locating development away from locations that will be more likely to generate additional traffic, together with efforts to provide greater opportunities for shorter journeys to work by seeking a better employment density, represents an appropriate transport strategy. Efforts to provide alternatives to car based journeys, particularly to work, through an improved network of attractive and convenient cycleways and walking routes to complement the better balance of housing and employment provision are considered to further enhance this strategy.

A. **Evidence base and joint working**

7.3 Nevertheless, even with the strong encouragement that the emerging Local Plan will give to use of sustainable modes of transport, it is recognised that the scale of development proposed will inevitably have impacts upon the highway network. Accordingly, a vital part of the evidence base to support and inform the preparation of Local Plan Strategy is to understand the impact of the Council’s proposed Strategy on both the strategic and local highway networks.

7.4 To gain this understanding, the following studies have been carried out in partnership with Chesterfield Borough Council and North East Derbyshire District Council under the lead of Derbyshire County Council as Local Highway Authority (with input from the Highways Agency):

North Derbyshire Transport Study
- Stage 1: Strategic Transport Issues Report (March 2010)
- Stage 2: Traffic Impacts of Proposed Development (Bolsover Assessment) (May 2010) (draft report)
- Stage 2: Traffic Impacts of Proposed Development (Cumulative Assessment: Chesterfield, Bolsover and NE Derbyshire) (February 2012)

North Derbyshire Highway Assignment Model: Traffic Forecasting Report (April 2012)

M1 Junction 29A Headroom Study (June 2012)
7.5 In addition, in order to understand the more detailed potential impacts upon Bolsover town, the District Council commissioned the Bolsover Town Transport Study (May 2012)

7.6 To pull all this evidence together and to explain how it relates to the current transport situation in Bolsover District, a Transport Topic Paper has been prepared to identify the key transport issues and summarise the key evidence that should be taken into account by the Council’s new Local Plan.

B. Key Issues

7.7 The evidence base identifies:

- the busiest roads in Bolsover District are those that form part of the strategic highway network, i.e. the M1 and the A38, and that these roads will get marginally busier as a result of the proposed and potential development strategies of Bolsover District Council, Chesterfield Borough Council and North East Derbyshire District Council;

- the key congestion issues are those in the south of the District where the A38 meets the M1 at J28. This strategic junction will have become busier by the end of the plan period. Although major growth is not planned at either South Normanton or Pinxton, this junction takes traffic from wider afield due to its strategic function with the A38 connecting the West Midlands to the East Midlands, and to the East Yorkshire ports via the M1 and M18;

- predictions indicate that by the end of the plan period the next most congested locations are at J29 and then J29A. J30 of the M1 appears to be less affected following the District Council’s decision to omit the Clowne North Strategic Allocation that was proposed in the Core Strategy: Revised Preferred Options;

- on the local highway network (within Bolsover District) the principal impact of note is that there will be traffic flow increases on the B6417 Rotherham Road to the east of Bolsover as a result of the planned development in Shirebrook and Whitwell during the plan period;

- at a more detailed level, in Bolsover Town the Town End / Welbeck Road / Moor Lane junction is the key location requiring capacity improvements within the plan period;

- the greatest potential for achieving a modal shift to sustainable transport is targeted investment in cycling and walking facilities to improve linkages between principal employment areas and the towns they principally relate to, i.e. Markham Vale and Bolsover Town, Barlborough Links and Clowne, South
Shirebrook and the town centre, and Castlewood to South Normanton – efforts to link these facilities into the wider network outside the District will also be desirable.

C. Strategic Aspirations

7.8 A number of potential schemes have been identified which are key infrastructure requirements which will need to be funded through developer contributions. Beyond this, the following wider transport aspirations are of a more strategic and cross boundary interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Aspiration</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to J28 of the M1 to reduce congestion at this nationally strategic junction with the A38</td>
<td>From discussions with the Highways Agency, it is noted that J28 is already a fully signalised scheme. Potential solutions to this would be to create an 'at-grade junction', although this would involve significant spend and land acquisition and currently does not feature in any Infrastructure Investment Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the stretch of M1 between J28 and J31</td>
<td>From discussions with the Highways Agency, it is noted that the full Motorway Widening Scheme has been reviewed and that this proposal has been substituted for consideration for Hard Shoulder Running. This proposal is being worked up currently and could commence in 2014/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the J29A of the M1</td>
<td>From discussions with Derbyshire County Council, it is noted that the Eastern and Western roundabouts could have capacity issues at the end of the plan period and that improvements may be required to mitigate the situation. Any proposals will require further analysis and design work before being taken forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the B6417 (Rotherham Road) between the A619 and the A617</td>
<td>From the evidence base, it is noted that the M1 and the A61 provide strategic north-south links and that both suffer from congestion of traffic passing through the North Derbyshire area. There would appear to be merit therefore in improvements to the generally rural B6417 to provide an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>alternative north-south link between the A619 and the A617. This proposal should be considered for inclusion in future Local Transport Plans.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creation of a rail link between the Robin Hood Line at Creswell through Clowne and on to Chesterfield</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From discussions with Network Rail regarding the draft Infrastructure Study, it is noted that this proposal does not feature in any Infrastructure Investment Plan and would require lobbying of the Department for Transport to seek the reopening of the line as a special condition through the national rail franchise process. Although the Council do not consider that the link is necessary for the delivery of the Local Plan Strategy, the strategic aspiration is considered to have merit and for this reason it is proposed to protect this rail line to enable retention of this option for future consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic road link to Shirebrook</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirebrook has poor links to the strategic network. Consideration has previously been given to address this via an extension from the once proposed Glapwell bypass. However it is understood this scheme is likely in due course to be deleted from the LTP. Consequently it is suggested that an alternative approach could be a link from an upgraded B6417 Rotherham Road. This proposal should be considered for inclusion in future LTPs and during discussions relating to potential developments in the south Shirebrook area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Retail

8.1 As noted above, two other authorities in the Northern Housing Market Area, Chesterfield and Bassetlaw (Worksop) each contain a sub-regional centre. There are also large towns close to the district border at Alfreton, Mansfield, and Sutton/Kirkby in Ashfield. The four main towns in Bolsover are much smaller, and the level of retail activity is correspondingly less. Nevertheless the district aims to improve choice in its town centres and encourage the promotion of sustainable lifestyles by providing an appropriate level of goods and services locally.

8.2 Bolsover Council had a Retail Capacity Assessment carried out in 2010. This revealed the ‘leakage’ (i.e. people within the district shopping for goods outside the district) of both convenience (i.e. mainly food shopping), and comparison (i.e. non-food items such as DIY goods, furniture, and domestic appliances) to adjoining districts.

8.3 In terms of comparison goods there is most leakage to Chesterfield Town Centre. This accounted for (£37.95 million) in 2010, and Mansfield Town centre (£32.33 million), followed by Worksop (£19.12 M), Meadowhall (£11.09 M), Sutton-in-Ashfield (£11.03 M), and Alfreton (£ 9.78 M). The figures are presented on a district-wide basis but are most likely to be drawn from the parts of the district that are geographically nearer to each destination, for example, the leakage to Worksop is most likely to be from settlements in the north-east of the district.

8.4 In terms of convenience goods expenditure leakage, £15.35 M is leaked towards Tesco at Alfreton and ASDA in Sutton-in-Ashfield, this is most likely to be from settlements in the south of the district. £ 9.12 M is leaked to stores in Mansfield and Mansfield Woodhouse, and is most likely to be from the Shirebrook area. £5.77 M is leaked to Morrisons in Staveley. This is most likely to be from the Bolsover, Clowne and Barlborough area. A smaller sum (£1.81m) leaks out to Sainsburys at Worksop, most probably from Hodthorpe/Whitwell/Creswell.

8.5 The Retail Needs Assessment has identified a qualitative need for a new foodstore in Bolsover Town Centre to redress the balance and retain a greater level of spend in the district. Likewise a new Tesco foodstore granted planning permission in Shirebrook should reduce the need to travel out of the town to shop in the Mansfield area. At the present time the only town in the district with enough quantitative and qualitative provision to retain convenience expenditure is Clowne.
8.6 Given the semi-rural nature of Bolsover district, and the small size of most of its settlements it is clearly unrealistic to expect settlements in the district to complete with the larger towns and sub-regional centres for all types of retail shopping. Nevertheless the Bolsover Retail Capacity Assessment concludes that there are qualitative gaps in the retail offer, particularly on the comparison side, which results in many residents having to travel further afield in order to undertake their shopping. In addition, comparison goods expenditure in the district is expected to rise from £163.3m in 2010 to £302.81m in 2026. Convenience goods expenditure growth is expected to be more limited, rising from £110.69m to £134.90. The scale of leakage of retail trade in both convenience and comparison shopping to neighbouring authorities is therefore an issue of concern.

8.7 The Local Plan Strategy is likely to propose planning for an increase in the current retention rates i.e. the amount of retail expenditure which is retained in the District. On convenience expenditure an increase from 55% to 70% is proposed, and on comparison expenditure an increase from 13 % to 23%. This is felt to be an achievable change, in line with the general growth proposals of the District, and follows the recommendations made in the Council’s Retail Capacity Assessment. It will mean a lower percentage of expenditure flowing out of the District into neighbouring sub-regional centres, but because the impacts will be spread across many several different sub-regional centres, it would not have a significant adverse effect on such centres.
9. **Green Infrastructure**

9.1 Green Infrastructure is the network of natural or semi-natural green environmental features and spaces (including watercourses and water bodies) which contribute to and support a healthy, functional and robust natural environment. These in turn can significantly contribute to the quality-of-life for local communities. At its best it affords a linked network of functional high quality green spaces with public access providing opportunity for education, understanding and enjoyment. Across Bolsover, which is essentially rural in character but includes a legacy of former mining and heavy industrial landscapes, a strong green infrastructure resource is seen as being an important enabling asset.

9.2 As a network of spaces and features, green infrastructure can be a cross-boundary issue and it is appropriate and necessary to consider the opportunities to co-ordinate positive green infrastructure interventions across administrative and spatial planning boundaries. Whilst individual components of the green infrastructure network may fall wholly within single local authority plan areas and still offer cumulative public benefits, other elements, particularly linear routes and wildlife corridors may be dependent on cross boundary partnership, actions and cooperation to maximise their function and benefit.

9.3 Recognising the growing importance of green infrastructure, Bolsover District Council commissioned a strategic green infrastructure study in 2008. This identified the main existing green infrastructure assets of the district. In doing so it also identified areas where deficiencies were evident in relation to delivery of community benefit and where opportunities lay for land use and land management interventions which could enhance the connectivity of the overall resource, and in turn increase its environmental, economic and social value.

9.4 Recognition of wildlife corridor functions within wider spatial planning policy and as a consideration in development management will be important in supporting landscape permeability across boundaries, but will often be more dependent on land management and agricultural practice than on the planning system.

9.5 Supportive spatial policy across administrative boundaries will be desirable also in respect to addressing recognised weaknesses in public access and rights of way. The Bolsover Green Infrastructure Study considered that South Normanton and Pinxton suffered from a poor green infrastructure context. In addition open space provision in South Normanton is low and therefore the remaining open areas have additional value as green lungs within the area. Therefore it is particularly important to work with neighbours to extend the access to the countryside where possible. Particular priority should be
afforded to improvements between Hardwick Country Park and Silverhill Park in Ashfield, and between South Normanton and the Erewash Valley to the south within Erewash.
10. Neighbouring Authorities

10.1 This section of the report outlines the stage that neighbouring authorities have reached in preparing documents in their Local Development Framework, and highlights the main cross border issues identified between Bolsover District and its neighbours.

10.2 Although the issues identified below relate to individual authorities, there are overarching issues that are common to all neighbours. Given the increase in population over the life of the Local Plans, and the regeneration needs of the sub-region, all districts are planning for growth. The main areas where there is the potential for conflict are:

- If a strategy plans for unrealistic levels of growth, either too much or not enough. This can lead to either development being squeezed out into adjoining areas or creating a situation where potential developers cherry pick easy to develop sites, meaning that high levels of development take place in one area at the expense of a neighbour;
- Where there is a significant strategic development close to an administrative boundary, and the development places additional infrastructure demands on an adjoining administrative area;
- Where the cumulative effect of development in one locality has an impact on infrastructure, for example the highway network.

A. Amber Valley Borough Council

10.3 Amber Valley is working towards the publication of a draft plan for publication. The Borough Council’s most recent Local Development Framework consultation was on ‘Options for Housing Growth’ and took place in July – September 2011. The document related to the Derby Housing Market Area (covering Amber Valley Borough, Derby City and South Derbyshire District), and was published for consultation by all three local authorities.

10.4 The paper included a range of questions on the level of housing to be accommodated, and the most suitable locations for growth. Question 6 of the paper asked which of the main towns in the housing market area would benefit most from development. Amongst the comments made were that Alfreton would benefit greatly from new development, and that land to the east and south of Alfreton is well placed to deliver significant sustainable extensions. New development could support existing service provision and provide affordable housing. Alfreton has had low rates of housing development over the last 10 years. In addition, the town has good transport links. However, it was noted that land to the east of Alfreton is adjacent to three local wildlife sites. Development of land to the east of Alfreton may impact upon the setting of three listed buildings at Carnfield Hall, including the Grade II* Hall. As well as the Hall and its immediate surroundings, the area of
historic interest includes the area of wider parkland and associated woodland. The boundaries of the park and woodlands fall within the Carnfield Hall Conservation Area.

10.5 The main cross boundary issues with Amber Valley are:

- Leakage of convenience shopping from South Normanton and nearby settlements to Alfreton. Bolsover Council’s Retail Capacity Assessment highlights that Tesco in Alfreton attracts the greatest proportion of convenience expenditure out of the district (7.8%);
- The strategic gap between South Normanton and Alfreton;
- The need to join up green infrastructure beyond the district boundary (this issue is discussed in the section on Green Infrastructure above);
- The need to protect wildlife sites and historic buildings close to the shared boundary;
- The consequences that new development has on the A38, and the M1 Junction.

10.6 The further development of Alfreton, in particular an increase in the town centre is likely to exacerbate the leakage of shopping from the south of Bolsover district to Alfreton unless this trend is counterbalanced by providing more convenience shopping in Bolsover district. South Normanton is one of the four main towns in Bolsover District. Although there are constraints to the development of South Normanton, it is expected that the housing target for South Normanton, Pinxton and nearby settlements in the south of Bolsover district is expected to be over 1,000 over the plan period. Policies in the Bolsover Local Plan Strategy will aim to improve the town centre to meet the needs of residents, and enhance the retail offer of South Normanton town centre.

10.7 Land within Amber Valley borough, but close to the boundary is currently under discussion for a site for the possible development of 600 houses. Bolsover has been involved in earlier discussions on this with the aims of: protecting wildlife sites from the impact of development; protecting the listed buildings and their settings; protecting the strategic gap; and extending the network of green infrastructure if the plans proceed, and the development offers an opportunity to do this. However, it should be noted that at this stage, it seems likely that the proposal will proceed through an outline planning application, ahead of a Local Plan allocation. Policies in the Bolsover Local Plan Strategy are likely to seek to protect the strategic gap as there is currently poor green infrastructure, and low levels of open space in this area. The remaining open areas separating Alfreton and South Normanton are viewed as being of significant importance.
B. Ashfield District Council

10.8 Ashfield District Council are working on a 10 year Local Plan. They intend to consult on a preferred approach in autumn 2012. At this stage the spatial distribution of development is expected to follow sustainable principles, with the largest proportions of development growth being allocated to the main centres in the district, and a smaller amount being allocated in the smaller settlements in the district. In common with a number of neighbouring authorities, the main cross boundary issues are:

- The leakage of retail expenditure from the south of the district, particularly into Sutton-in–Ashfield, where Bolsover district’s retail study identifies Asda as being the second main destination outside the district for convenience goods shopping after Tesco in Alfreton. Both of these foodstores are easily accessed by car from the south of Bolsover District via the A38;
- The consequences that new development has on the A38, and junction 28 of the M1 Junction.
- Development along the A38 corridor.
- The need to protect the setting of Hardwick Hall

10.9 Both of the first two issues are discussed in the sections above on transport and retail.

10.10 There are major existing employment commitments off the A38 within Bolsover District close to the shared boundary with Ashfield District Council at Castlewood and Wincobank Farm. There is some remaining undeveloped and unallocated land in this area which could form an extension to the Wincobank Farm site, but which is currently identified on the existing Bolsover District Local Plan as an Important Open Area. However, the Local Plan Strategy is not likely to identify any strategic need for further allocations in this area and it is therefore proposed to leave the issue of the Open Area for further analysis and discussion with Ashfield during the Sites and Policies stage of the local plan process.

10.11 With regards to the setting of Hardwick Hall, discussion will take place with Ashfield regarding defining a surrounding landscape area at the sites and policies stage of the local plan process.

C. Bassetlaw District Council

10.12 Bassetlaw is alone amongst Bolsover District’s neighbours in having a recently adopted Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (adopted on 22 December 2011). Aside from the issues covered in the topic sections above, there are three significant cross boundary issues:
• The protection of the possible future world heritage site at Creswell Crags and its setting;
• The quality of water leaving waste water treatment works in Bolsover district, and its impact on Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) in Bassetlaw at Welbeck and Clumber Lakes. Similarly, the treated water from Shirebrook waste water treatment works in Bolsover District travels through Mansfield district into a SSSI downstream at Thoresby Lake in Newark and Sherwood District.
• The leakage of retail expenditure from the north-east of Bolsover district.

10.13 Creswell Crags is a world famous archaeological site, set in a limestone gorge with caves and a lake. It is home to Britain’s only known Ice Age cave art. This is thought to date back 13,000 years. It is a scheduled ancient monument and a SSSI. The site straddles the district/county border. The site is on the UK Tentative List of World Heritage Sites, and it is expected that the Government will put the Crags forward to UNESCO. It is anticipated that the two councils will work together to protect the crags, to pursue further work on defining a setting around the crags.

10.14 The impact of water quality on development downstream was highlighted in Bolsover’s Outline Water Cycle Study. The proposed spatial distribution of development to be put forward in the publication version of the Local Plan Strategy is considered to be compatible with the need to meet guidelines in respect of water quality in the outflow from water treatment works in the north–east of the district.

10.15 None of the four towns in Bolsover District is functionally close to Worksop (the sub regional centre in Bassetlaw). Whilst the Bolsover Local Plan Strategy proposes to increase employment provision and housing in Whitwell and Creswell, it is not anticipated that the levels of growth proposed in the Local Plan Strategy are significant enough to have a significant impact on Worksop.

10.16 The issue of retail leakage is discussed above in the section on retail issues.
D. Chesterfield Borough Council

10.17 Chesterfield Borough Council consulted on the publication version of their Core Strategy in April/May 2012. The Council have recently begun consultation on a proposed changes document.

10.18 The main cross boundary issues between the two authorities are:

- The comprehensive development of the Markham Employment Growth Zone, so that developments in each authority area complement the other;
- That the cumulative impact of development on the local highway network and the M1 is assessed – particularly Junctions 29a and 30, and if appropriate mitigated;
- The level of housing proposed in Chesterfield Borough as the district falls within the same Housing Market Area as Bolsover;
- The need to reduce out commuting from Bolsover town into Chesterfield to access jobs, in order to develop a more sustainable settlement, and reduce congestion on roads in Chesterfield;
- The leakage of retail expenditure;
- The need to increase tree cover along the Doe Lea catchment area in Bolsover.

10.19 The issues of transport and housing provision are discussed in the sections above. Chesterfield is the only neighbour in the Housing Market Area that is a net importer of jobs. Therefore whilst it is accepted that the Borough has regeneration needs, Bolsover District would not wish to see an employment strategy that significantly exacerbated this trend by encouraging high levels of in commuting. The proposals for future employment growth in Chesterfield as set out in the draft Core Strategy do not cause any concern in this respect. The Local Plan Strategy is likely to propose significant employment development in Bolsover town to address the low level of employment opportunities currently available in the town.

10.20 The River Doe Lea poses the biggest flood risk within Bolsover District and introduces flood water into Chesterfield Borough. Increasing tree cover along the Doe Lea could assist in reducing surface water run-off and so help to reduce flooding in Chesterfield Borough.

10.21 The issue of retail leakage is discussed above in the section on retail.
E. Mansfield District Council

10.22 Mansfield is currently working on its Core Strategy. The Council intend to consult on a Preferred Options version of their Core Strategy in December 2012, and then focus on the development of their Site Allocations document.

10.23 As part of the ongoing work on the preparation of the Core Strategy the Council consulted on a revised housing target given the impending revocation of the East Midlands Regional Plan. Following a report to Council, Mansfield District Council are putting forward a figure of 7,828 dwellings over the plan period (391dpa). Average completion rates over the past 10 years have been around 300, compared with the Regional Plan target of 530 dpa. The new figure is in line with the SNPP forecast. However, Mansfield is proposing an additional allowance of 20% above the target if house builders deliver the target during the plan period.

10.24 There are two main cross boundary issues between the two authorities. These are:

- Retail development;
- Green Infrastructure

10.25 The issue of retail development is discussed in the section above on retail.

The boundary between Mansfield and Bolsover districts is relatively short (from Pleasley to Shirebrook). Bolsover District has a Green Infrastructure Strategy, and Mansfield are developing draft policies based on their Green Infrastructure Study. As such the two authorities will be seeking to co-operate on the identification of green infrastructure and opportunities to link green infrastructure and footpaths and trails on each side of the district/county boundary.

F. North-east Derbyshire District Council

10.26 Bolsover and North-East Derbyshire District Councils are in a formal Strategic Alliance, with a shared management team under a single Chief Executive. The aim of the alliance is to share costs and expertise and deliver savings. North-East Derbyshire District Council have consulted on an Issues and Options version of their Core Strategy. The Council have recently completed a Housing Needs, Market and Affordability Study that updates the joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment carried out for the Northern sub-region. North-East Derbyshire are currently working on the preparation of the Core Strategy Part 1. Consultation is expected to take place shortly on the Local Strategy, and Housing Targets and a targeted review of the Green Belt.
10.27 The main potential cross boundary issues are:

- The comprehensive development of the Markham Employment Growth Zone, so that developments in each authority area complement the other;
- That the cumulative impact of development on the local highway network and the M1 is assessed – particularly Junctions 29 and 29a, and if appropriate mitigated;
- The level of housing proposed in the district as it falls within the same Housing Market Area as Bolsover;
- The future development of Renishaw, which is in North-East Derbyshire, but abutting the administrative boundary, due to the possible potential for flooding on both sides of the district border;
- North-East Derbyshire District council are about to publish their Green Infrastructure Study. Two core green infrastructure assets that overlap the shared boundary are the Doe Lea corridor and the Hardwick Landscape Area. Joint working will allow the retention (and where appropriate improvement) of these areas, and allow the development of links between these areas;
- The outcome of the Green Belt Review and possible impacts on Bolsover.

10.28 The issues of housing and transport are discussed in the sections above. Flooding and Green Infrastructure are issues that both authorities are aware of, and there are currently no emerging policies that would have an adverse impact on either topic.

G. Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

10.29 Consultation on Issues and Options for the draft Rotherham Core Strategy and Sites and Policies DPD took place in August/ September 2012. Consultation on the Core Strategy is scheduled for summer 2012.

10.30 The main potential cross boundary issues between the two authorities are:

- The development of a housing target for Rotherham and its impact on the green belt;
- Development at Clowne North.

10.31 Under the existing Regional Spatial Strategy (The Yorkshire and Humber Plan), Rotherham had a target of 1,169 new dwellings a year, but are currently looking at adopting a new target of 800 dwellings a year. Large areas of Rotherham Borough are covered by green belt and therefore even the lower target is likely to involve a significant loss of green belt. However, it is understood that there is no intention to review outer green belt boundaries which might impact upon Bolsover District, and that the review will be
confined to inner boundaries around existing settlements within the green belt. In the main relatively low levels of growth are planned for settlements close to Rotherham district near to the boundary with Bolsover.

10.32 The issue of Clowne North has been included for completeness. The Core Strategy: Revised Preferred Options published by Bolsover District Council in 2010, contained a proposal for a mixed use strategic development site at Clowne North. This was close to the shared boundary with Rotherham Metropolitan Borough. The proposal site has now been deleted from the emerging Local Plan Strategy. However, it is not considered that this would have had a significant impact on Rotherham Borough, and the Borough Council did not object to this site when it was proposed in earlier consultation.

10.33 In March 2012 Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council adopted a joint waste plan with neighbours in Doncaster and Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Councils. It is not considered that the plan gives rise to any significant cross boundary issues with Bolsover district.

H. Derbyshire County Council

10.24 As part of a two tier authority, the County Council is the planning authority responsible for minerals and waste in Bolsover District, and is also the transport authority.

10.25 The County Council consulted on the Derbyshire and Derby Minerals Core Strategy Issues and Options in June 2010. They consulted on a Derby and Derbyshire Waste Core Strategy in February 2010. However, they are now working towards a single Waste Plan and Minerals Plan rather than separate Development Plan Documents (i.e. separate Core Strategies and Site Allocations).

10.26 The main impact on the County Council of the proposals likely to be set out in Bolsover’s Local Plan Strategy is the level of development and the impact this is likely to have on the services and infrastructure provided by the County Council, for example roads and schools.

10.27 Derbyshire County Council published their Developer Contributions Protocol and Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan on 24 April 2012. The protocol sets out the County Council’s expectations for mitigation measures and contributions towards the strategic infrastructure and services required to support growth and development in Derbyshire. However applications in the district will be assessed on their own merits and under the new NPPF, the impact of the County’s infrastructure requirements on viability will be a consideration.
I. Nottinghamshire County Council

10.28 Consultation on the proposed submission version of the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy took place in March/April 2012. No significant cross boundary issues were identified in the proposals in the document.

10.29 Nottinghamshire County Council also consulted on the first stage of a new Minerals Local Plan in March 2012. Two of the possible new extraction sites are close to the border with Bolsover. One of the sites is a new industrial dolomite quarry at Holbeck, and the other a new limestone quarry at Steetley. The proposed quarry could be injurious to the setting of the setting of Creswell Crags and potentially damaging to the bid for World Heritage Status. With regard to the proposal at Steetley, the traffic impacts are as yet unknown. Bolsover District Council will continue to engage with Nottinghamshire County Council on these issues.
APPENDIX 1 – OUTLINE OF THE STEPS TAKEN TO COMPLY WITH SECTION 33A OF THE PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 (AS AMENDED).

Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 sets out a requirement to include a new section (33A) in Part 2 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

This imposes duty to co-operate in relation to planning of sustainable development. For the purposes of the requirement, Section 33A (1) imposes this duty on: local planning authorities; county councils that are not local planning authorities; and the following bodies as set out in Section 4 and Part 2 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012:

(a) the Environment Agency;
(b) the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage);
(c) Natural England;
(d) the Mayor of London;
(e) the Civil Aviation Authority(1);
(f) the Homes and Communities Agency;
(g) each Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006(2) or continued in existence by virtue of that section;
(h) the Office of Rail Regulation(3);
(i) Transport for London(4);
(j) each Integrated Transport Authority(5);
(k) each highway authority within the meaning of section 1 of the Highways Act 1980(6) (including the Secretary of State, where the Secretary of State is the highways authority); and
(l) the Marine Management Organisation.

The duty imposed on local authorities is to co-operate with each other and the other bodies set out above, and the Local Enterprise Partnerships to engage constructively, actively, and on an on-going basis in any process of the preparation of development plan documents so far as relating to a strategic matter.

The mechanisms for engaging with other authorities are set out at section 3 above. The issues set out at 5 to 10 above are considered to be strategic matters.
Bodies a, b, c, f, g, and k listed above are ‘specific consultation bodies’ and have been consulted as required by The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations throughout the process of the preparation of development plan documents. In addition, English Heritage, Natural England, and the Environment Agency have been involved in the development of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Plan Strategy (formerly the Core Strategy).
APPENDIX 2: DESTINATIONS OF PEOPLE TRAVELLING OUTSIDE BOLSOVER TO WORK.

Destinations of residents commuting outside the district to work (2001 census - UK travel flows from Bolsover District as a place of residence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In no.</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Out no.</th>
<th>Out %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11,301</td>
<td>51.87%</td>
<td>Bolsover To Bolsover</td>
<td>11,301</td>
<td>38.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>Ashfield</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>7.48%</td>
<td>Amber Valley</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
<td>North East Derbyshire</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>9.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>Newark and Sherwood</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>Broxtowe</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>Derbyshire Dales</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>Erewash</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Gedling</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>South Derbyshire</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>4.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 21,789|        | Total                    | 29,460  |        |
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1. Purpose of the Memorandum of Understanding

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding is to set out the agreed arrangements for co-operation and liaison on local plans work and development of local strategy statements within the Northern Housing Market Area of the East Midlands. It provides a framework for delivery of the duties and obligations arising from the Section 110 of the Localism Act in particular that authorities engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis on matters such as development plans.

The MoU sets out a shared commitment to co-operation and liaison by all parties, as listed in (3) below.

2. Scope

The scope of this MoU shall cover all significant activity on development plans relating to land in the following areas: Bassetlaw District, Bolsover District, Chesterfield Borough, and North East Derbyshire District. Significant activity will include activity on:

- development plan documents which are required or intended to be subject to public consultation;
- local strategy statements or similar documents, which contain statements about cross boundary issues;
- documents that form key components of a development plan evidence base.

3. Parties

The following authorities have agreed to the protocol set out in this MoU:

- Bassetlaw District Council
- Bolsover District Council
- Chesterfield Borough Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- North East Derbyshire District Council
- Nottinghamshire County Council
4. Duration

This Memorandum of Understanding is effective from 12 April 2012. From this time, the parties listed above will endeavour to uphold the principles set out in this MoU unless or until at least three parties agree that an alternative approach should be adopted.

In any event, the implementation and continued relevance of the Memorandum will be reviewed annually in December. Significant changes in national planning policy guidance or legislation may also occasion a review in advance of the annual review.

5. Communication Principles

The parties agree to adopt the principles of open communication, the sharing of information, and a culture of “no surprises”.

- Each party will endeavour to keep the others well informed on both an informal (e.g. by telephone or email) and formal basis (e.g. letter or formal meeting) of matters arising which are likely to have significant cross boundary implications.

- The parties commit to the sharing of relevant information including background studies on strategic planning matters at no cost to the other party;

- The parties will meet on a regular basis at an operational level to ensure that all are informed of planning policy issues and that relevant information is shared between them. These liaison meetings will normally take place at a programmed meeting, to take place at no less than quarterly intervals, supplemented where necessary by more frequent meetings if determined by a majority of parties to be necessary. Meetings will rotate between partners and the hosting authority will issue the agenda, chair the meeting and provide notes of the meeting. Notes of meetings will be agreed by all parties and circulated to relevant Heads of Service within one month of the meeting.

- Where necessary, one or more partners may draw up Local Strategy Statements to describe the local sub-regional context to a development plan. Prior to any form of publication, draft versions of such statements will be circulated for comment to all parties to this MoU, with a two week period allowed for responses to be made. Any unresolved disagreements about the wording of such statements should be addressed through the conflict resolution procedure below.
6. Joint Commissioning Evidence gathering and analysis

Liaison meetings will be used to update an HMA wide programme of evidence base preparation and enable discussions to take place about the value of joint commissioning between one or more authorities. Studies on aspects of strategic planning will be jointly commissioned and paid for where this is more efficient and effective (e.g. in terms of meeting timetables in Local Development Schemes) than being commissioned by the individual Councils.

7. Resolution of disputes

If any serious disagreements arise at operational level between any of the parties about issues which could have strategic cross boundary implications, then the issues arising should be referred to a meeting of relevant Heads of Service and/or Chief Executives.

However, ‘co-operation’ does not necessarily require ‘agreement’. Accordingly, nothing in this Memorandum shall fetter or constrain the democratic process in any authority or any Council’s statutory role as a Local Planning Authority responsible for considering and determining planning applications, or a Council’s role to publish and adopt development plans for its area, or to make representations with regard to development plans prepared by other authorities.
APPENDIX 4: INDICATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF ADDITIONAL HOUSING ACROSS SETTLEMENTS IN BOLSOVER DISTRICT 2011 TO 2031
(N.B. Totals may change before the publication version of the Local Plan is finalised so they are 'indicative' at this stage.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Dwellings as of April 2011</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement for Additional Planned Housing Supply 2011 to 2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsover/Hillstown/Carr Vale</td>
<td>4,956</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clowne</td>
<td>3,393</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirebrook</td>
<td>4,849</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Normanton</td>
<td>4,778</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Villages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barlborough</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creswell</td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinxton</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibshelf</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitwell</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramley Vale/Doe Lea</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glapwell</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilcote</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodthorpe</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langwith/Whaley Thorns</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Houghton</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelterton</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasley</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarcliffe</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttlewood</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westhouses</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Settlements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34,316</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0* does not mean that no residential development would be allowed in these villages or small settlements, just that there would not be any site specific allocations made within the Local Plan.