

**Matter 8 – Design, developer contributions and other place-making policies Issue Whether the Local Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to design, developer contributions and other placemaking policies.  
Relevant Policies – S5 and SD1-SD13**

**Questions Design**

8.1 SD5: Developer Contributions:

*The Forum is concerned that developer contributors are not being used to meet reasonable costs associated with the additional demands made of infrastructure as a consequence of proposals. As described in the Infrastructure Funding Statement 2021/22 the bulk of developer contributions for the extensive housing developments in Stanton Hill, for example, appear not to have not been spent (thus far) to benefit the area itself. If understanding correctly only relatively small amounts have been invested – to improve a footpath and a car park entry in Brierley Park (Skegby Road – unsure where this is) and improve shopfronts in Stanton Hill (a quick look down the High Street shows very few new shop fronts) and contribute new stock at Sutton Library. As a caveat it is challenging trying to read the IFS and identify specific funding and spend.*

*The Forum over the years have tried to engage with the Council to discuss ideas brought forward by the community which they would like to see introduced, including a drop-in centre to accommodate citizens advice, resource centre, financial advice etc. The Forum have held meetings with the developers of the Brand Lane development directly with various ideas. The developers were enthusiastic about working with us, and happy for changes to be made to the S106 agreement to meet the Forums suggestions on the application of monies. We were told by ADC that the Forums suggestions would not be accommodated.*

SD9 Environmental protection:

*Potential for construction and operation to have negative effects on noise and air quality due to emissions from plant and HGV movement. Dispersal of development throughout the district would reduce opportunities to ensure active travel through the provision of walking and cycling infrastructure and reduce reliance on cars. Car use would likely increase, particularly in the rural areas where public transport is limited. In consequence associated emissions would increase and have negative effects on air quality and noise pollution.*

8.3 Is Policy SD1 (Social Value) consistent with National Policy in seeking to maximise social values?

8.4 Is Policy SD6 (Assessing Development Viability and Development Demand) consistent with Section 5 of the National Planning Policy Framework in seeking to clawback contributions over the lifetime of a development?

8.6 Has Policy SD13 been shaped by engagement with all stakeholders, including infrastructure providers and statutory consultees in seeking to retain existing sporting facilities within the District?

*As a recognised stakeholder, we are not aware of having been invited to take part in any meaningful engagement on Policy SD13 (Provision and Protection of Health and Community facilities).*

8.7 Is Policy SD13 consistent with Section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework in seeking to protect the loss commercial community facilities?

8.8 Do Policies SD1 – SD13 serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of national policy? Is the wording consistent with national policy?

8.9 Do Policies SD1 – SD13 provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?