

Appendix 2: Site 45041 Land South of Markham Vale – Sustainability Appraisal Scoring Review

Objective	Overall Scoring	Reason for Negative Scoring	Savills / WBD Comments
1 Biodiversity & geodiversity	-	LWS overlap (-) Priority habitat overlap (-)	It is noted that the red line boundary submitted at Call for Sites stage included land in the south-eastern corner of the site which overlapped with the 'Peter Fidler Reserve & The Goit Railway' Local Wildlife Site ('LWS') and priority habitat. This part of the site is not considered to be developable due to the shape and size of the small 'finger' of land containing the LWS, and therefore this has been removed from the red line boundary of land WBD are seeking to secure an allocation on. It is therefore considered that the site can come forward without impacts on the LWS. Ecology officer comments received as part of the ELAA site assessment stated that there are <i>"no known features of high value"</i> within the site and that the impact on the LWS <i>"will depend on what work is undertaken in this area. May only be pedestrian access improvements which would be unlikely to impact key features of LWS"</i>.
2 Landscape	-	Landscape character (-) Coalescence (-)	The SA methodology states that <i>"Where development proposals are potentially discordant with the characteristics set out in the [Landscape Character of Derbyshire] assessment, a potential minor negative effect is identified"</i>. Landscape officer comments received as part of the ELAA site assessment state that <i>"Although there are no significant landscape constraints affecting the site, the allocation of the land for employment purposes could introduce significant visual effects in to the wider landscape including views out from Bolsover Castle to the east and add cumulatively to landscape and visual impacts of the Markham Vale development along the M1 corridor to the north"</i>. These comments have been addressed through technical work provided as part of this submission.
3 Cultural heritage	-	Historic Environment (-)	The site has scored negatively in the SA on the basis of an overlap of between 5-50% of the site area with HER features and/or being located within 100m of a HER feature. A Heritage Statement has been prepared by Pegasus Group and is provided as Appendix 3 to these representations. This statement includes a desk-based assessment of archaeology potential, concluding that the HER provides very limited evidence for archaeological activity within the site itself. Although geophysical surveys carried out the nearby former Coalite site suggested the potential for Iron Age or Romano-British activity, subsequent trial trenching revealed only post-medieval features. Archaeological remains, if

			any, are expected to be of local or regional significance only. It is therefore considered that archaeology should not pose a constraint to the site being allocated.
4 Air	-	Main road (-)	The site has been scored negatively due to being located within 200m of a main road. The SA methodology assumes that such sites have a potential for indirect adverse air quality effects and the exposure of sites to poor air quality. Of the assessed sites, 163 (46%) are located within the 200m zone. Whilst it is recognised that unacceptable air quality impacts should be avoided, it is likely that at least some development within the District will need to be located within 200m of a main road, due to the obvious locational sustainability benefits of this. For I&L development in particular, proximity to the Strategic Road Network is not just preferable, but is necessary to ensure that suitable access is provided for HGV traffic onto this network.
5 Water	0	N/A	N/A
6 Natural resources & waste	--	Previously undeveloped land (-) BMV land (--)	The site has been scored negatively on the basis that the site does not comprise previously developed land (PDL). Of the assessed sites, only 9 sites comprise PDL, and therefore it is reasonable to assume that the majority of development in the district will need to utilise greenfield land. This is therefore not considered to represent a development constraint at this site. The site has also scored negatively on the basis that a desk-based assessment has identified that the site consists of Grade 3 agricultural land which, for the basis of the SA assessment, has been assumed to be Best Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land. There are numerous other areas within the District which comprise Grade 3 agricultural land, and therefore it is not considered to be reasonable that all development of Grade 3 land is avoided. In this case, land south of Markham Vale is considered to be the only suitable site which can accommodate the District's strategic employment need, and therefore the economic benefits are considered to significantly outweigh any harm arising from the loss of employment land.
7 Climate change mitigation	+/-	N/A	N/A
8 Climate change adaptation	+	N/A	N/A
9 Sustainable communities	+	N/A	N/A
10 Economy	++	N/A	N/A
11 Health	-	Access to GP surgery (-) Access to green space (-)	The site has scored negatively on the basis that it is located over 1km from a GP surgery and is located beyond the recommended walking distance to all types of green space.

			Green spaces include equipped play areas for children, amenity green space, parks, green corridors, cemeteries, outdoor youth facilities, allotments, and informal recreation fields. The site is being promoted for employment uses and consequently, it is not considered that access to all of the above green spaces would be required given the proposed use. The development proposals would include areas of incidental open space for employees to utilise, and the development could also provide new pedestrian and/or cycle connections to the existing 'Peak to Sherwood' route. Similarly, it is not considered that proximity to a GP surgery is a relevant assessment criterion through which to assess employment development proposals.
12 Transport	-	Access to railway station (-)	The site has been scored negatively on the basis that it is located more than 1.6km from a railway station. Of the assessed sites, only 6 sites are located within 1.6km of a railway station, with the remaining 353 sites outside of this radius. Therefore, the vast majority of sites within the district score negatively on this metric, and it is reasonable to assume that the majority of new development within the district will not be located in close proximity to a railway station. It is therefore considered that this should not represent a constraint to development.
13 Housing & equality	0	N/A – the site is not promoted for residential uses.	N/A