



MAIN MATTER 3 EXAMINATION STATEMENT

DUNTHORNE & MORLEY

**WHETHER OR NOT THE PLAN WILL SECURE HIGH
QUALITY SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND
SAFEGUARD AND ENHANCE THE DISTRICT'S
LANDSCAPE CHARACTER, NATURAL AND
HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT**



Main Matter 3 – Whether or not the plan will secure high quality sustainable design and safeguard and enhance the District’s landscape character, natural and historic environment

Issue -Place Making and High-Quality Design

1. Claremont Planning Consultancy Ltd submits this statement on behalf of Dunthorne & Morley with respect to their land interests at Mansfield that form the SUE1 Pleasley Hill Farm and residential allocation H1L at High Oakham Farm. Both allocation policies identify pertinent issues that require consideration in the delivery of the sites, with reference to access, landscape and environmental considerations. The wording of the allocation policies and matters of consideration is considered to be suitable in terms of ensuring that the resulting development proposals will address pertinent matters.
2. The phased delivery of SUE1 must however be taken into account, particularly with respect to landscape mitigation that is proposed along the new settlement edge. The delivery of earlier phases away from the new settlement edge should not be required to provide additional landscape mitigation when the strategic landscaping of the SUE will provide the chief mitigation. It should be noted that the land under the control of Dunthorne & Morley covers an area of 3.56ha in size to the north of Wharmby Avenue. As such, the site relates well to the urban edge so should be deliverable without substantive landscaping mitigation for the rest of the SUE area; or be assessed without the contribution of the wider SUE area. The Wharmby Avenue area of the SUE1 allocation is therefore considered to be deliverable ahead of the establishment of SUE1 landscape mitigation as it does not represent a development location that would result in a significantly adverse impacts on the local landscape character.
3. Whilst it is understood that the wider SUE1 area is regarded as having a relatively substantial landscape sensitivity (Mansfield Landscape Character Assessment – Landscape Policy Zone 23), the Wharmby Avenue component of the SUE1 is relatively self-enclosed, with urban form on three sides.

4) Is the requirement in Policy P4 for a masterplan on large sites (5 hectares or more or 150 dwellings) and public involvement in the design of major development proposals justified and how will this be secured and delivered?

4. The emerging Local Plan’s requirement for a masterplan led development for SUE allocations has been fully engaged with by Dunthorne & Morley, realising the requirements of the SUE1 area and committing to delivery of a comprehensive allocation. The indicative masterplan provided at Appendix 8 of the emerging Local Plan provides a suggestion of how the strategic site could be realised, however through discussions with SUE1 land owners and developers a number of fundamental flaws in the masterplan have been identified to the Council. The current SUE1 masterplan A8.1 shown at Appendix 8 promotes untested road linkages, inadequate drainage provision and does not adequately distribute open space. As such the Main Modifications M133, M134, M135 propose changes to the supporting text to this masterplan are not considered to go far enough and for the Masterplan figure to be truly useful in the delivery of the allocation, it should be revised accordingly.
5. It would be preferable for an amended Masterplan to have been produced for SUE1 instead of relying upon the flawed design approach that is provided at Appendix 8, Figure A8.1 at present. The Masterplan should be amended to ensure the appropriate quantum’s of development are



illustrated, boulevard style highways should be restricted to the primary routes, with residential aspect notations removed to allow the appropriate design of phases, whilst only linkages that are deliverable should be shown so removing through linkages from the wider SUE1 to Wharmby Avenue where junction capacity has not been demonstrated for development of more than an additional 125 dwellings.

6. Similarly, the comprehensive nature of the masterplan and SUE1 allocation must be translated into Appendix 8. The policy requires that the SUE apply a comprehensive approach to drainage provision, landscape mitigation, accessibility/linkage and site wide infrastructure. However, it is apparent from the delivery trajectory for SUE1 and the EIA Screening undertaken that the Council consider the majority area of the allocation will come forward ahead of the Wharmby Avenue component; despite the Wharmby Avenue site providing connectivity through pedestrian links to Chesterfield Road South bus routes and other links, that should be considered critical to delivering sustainable linkages to the proposed community. The postponement of the Wharmby Avenue site in the trajectory also means that it fails to be taken into account with respect of the comprehensive planning of the SUE's infrastructure and services, specifically the provision of surface water capacity for drainage from the Wharmby Avenue site. Although it is advanced that the Wharmby Avenue site is deliverable as a freestanding phase of the SUE, the overall planning of the allocation in respect of infrastructure capacity and mitigation must consider the Wharmby Avenue component, despite it being within different land ownership. Failure to apply these considerations means that the resulting development would not be comprehensive and would not take into account the cumulative impacts of the allocation through EIA. The trajectory proposed should be revised to allow for the delivery of the whole SUE1 within the same timescale, so that an application on Wharmby Avenue could be considered imminently and delivered alongside the first phases of the wider SUE, so not delayed unnecessarily.
7. Although it is accepted that considerations arising at the SUE1 site include historical and natural environment factors, the identified phase off Wharmby Avenue will seek to address these factors in accordance with the emerging policy through geophysical assessment and habitat surveys. In the first instance this is an appropriate and justified requirement to ascertain the presence of potential historical assets, particularly as not know heritage records or findings are within the immediate area of the land parcel.
8. Dunthorne & Morley support the provision of strategic development SUE1 at Pleasley Hill Farm. Whilst it is acknowledged that the delivery of the site could result in some impacts on the relatively sensitive local landscape, it is advanced that through the inclusion of policy requirements that provide appropriate SUE wide landscape mitigation measures, these concerns should be suitably overcome. Furthermore, it should be duly recognised that the Wharmby Avenue area of SUE1 is not as constrained by such considerations in comparison to the wider SUE site and therefore should be recognised as a highly deliverable element of the strategic allocation. Given that the site is less influenced by landscape factors, the delivery of the site should inform the phasing of the SUE as well as the delivery of the wider spatial strategy.



6) Does Policy P7 provide clear and robust guidance on how the impact of new development on amenity will be assessed?

9. It is not considered that any further modifications are required to the relevant design policies such as 'P7 – Amenity' to ensure that the allocations will be delivered sensitively regarding neighbouring uses and to achieve a high-quality design. Effective policies should be applied to housing allocations to ensure that bespoke designs are realised whilst achieving a standard of development that fulfils the Council's expectations. Over stipulation of design requirements through housing allocation policies or site wide masterplans overly constrain development design, which Claremont Planning would advocate is not necessary for the housing sites proposed. As such, the masterplans provided at Appendix 8, specifically figure A8.1 should not seek to address general amenity issues that are normally addressed through the development control application process and the use of Policy P7.

Issue – Are other environment policies soundly based and justified by the evidence?

9) How have landscape character and other natural and historic environment designations been taken into account in identifying site allocations?

10. The residential site allocations proposed include a consideration of environmental factors with recommendations of issues that should be addressed through the site delivery. With respect to the H1L allocation at High Oakham the policy recommendations concerning site design and assessment are informed by the context and address the heritage and landscape considerations of the context. The low-density design requirements advocated by the policy wording corresponds with the ecological and landscape factors that the site advocates. The requirements of the policy are acceptable and deliverable.
11. The farmed condition of the Wharmby Avenue site will promote the ability to enhance the ecological value of the site through the addition of water environments, additional tree planting and reestablishment of existing boundary hedgerows. Through the delivery of this phase of SUE1 an ecological benefit will be demonstrated. Allocation H1L High Oakham provides the potential for green networks within the site linking the Plantations to the south to the urban areas, as delivering the policy requirement of enhancing access as well as delivering net ecological gains in comparison to the current arable use of the site.