

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE
OF STAVELEY TOWN COUNCIL**

Wednesday 12th June 2013
Commencing at 6.00 p.m.
In the Council Chamber, Staveley Hall

Present:

Councillor Bacon
Councillor Bagshaw
Councillor Cauldwell
Councillor Tidd

In attendance:

Graeme Challands – Town Clerk and Financial Officer
2 Members of the Public

		ACTION
104/13	ELECTION OF CHAIR OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE YEAR 2013/2014 RESOLVED – That Councillor Dyke be elected to serve as Chair of the Planning and Environmental Committee for the Year 2013/2014.	
105/13	ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE YEAR 2013/2014 RESOLVED - That Councillor Cauldwell be elected to serve as Vice-Chair of the Planning and Environmental Committee for the Year 2013/2014. In the absence of Councillor Dyke Councillor Cauldwell took the Chair.	
106/13	PART ONE: PUBLIC BUSINESS PUBLIC SESSION	

Interim Notes

Wind Farms (with particular reference to Woodthorpe) prepared June 1st 2013 by Roger Davenport

Reason for these Notes

In late 2012 Chesterfield Borough Council published their sites and boundaries paper for the Chesterfield Area highlighting ten areas where the Chesterfield Borough planning department wanted wind farms to be built.

A meeting with council planners revealed that the only research undertaken into the sites had been on the subject of available wind power: no other factors had been either considered or taken into account.

These notes are designed to provide some of the information about wind farms which needs considering when identifying sites.

Types of Wind Turbines

Wind turbines used for commercial production of electricity are normally three-bladed. They are pointed into the wind by computer-controlled motors which can swivel the head. The blades are usually white (to provide visibility by aircraft) and can exceed 40 metres (130ft) long. The steel towers range in height from 200ft to 300ft high. A gearbox usually is used for stepping up rotation speed to the generator. The blades are expected to rotate at 10 to 22 revolutions per minute. At 22 rpm the tips travel at over 90 mps (300 ft/sec).

A varied selection of turbine types are available and there are smaller options however these are generally used for domestic or small-site power and not for main-stream electricity generation.

Aerodynamic modelling is used to determine the optimum tower height, control systems, number of blades and blade shape. This determines the exact location of the turbine, variations of as little as 30 metres can affect electricity production by up to 50%

Wind turbines require an average wind speed of 10 mph or more for commercial production.

> *Note that developers expect the aerodynamic considerations to take precedence over environmental and aesthetic considerations. Accordingly it is often a case of site it where the best wind is or not at all.*

> *Chesterfield Borough planning department should publish the wind speed data they have for each of the sites that they have proposed thus identifying marginal sites and demonstrating the accuracy of their data.*

There are a number of considerations relating to wind farms some of which are highlighted below.

Noise and Vibration

A 2007 report by the U. S. National Research Council identified that *beyond half a mile* noise should not be a problem to householders. However it also stated that effects of vibration etc. on humans were not fully understood (an area needing more research). Because of this lack of research caution should be taken when siting wind farms – this means keeping them some distance from occupied property. It is not enough to claim that as there is no/insufficient evidence the effects can be ignored – the lack of available research does not automatically mean that the population is safe.

A 2009 report by a standing committee of the Parliament of New South Wales recommended a minimum set back (from dwellings) of *2 kilometres*.

In Ontario (Canada) the Ministry of the Environment set a minimum (setback) distance for up to 5 wind turbines of 550 metres for a group of relatively quiet (102 dB(A)) turbines rising to 1,500 metres for a group of 11 – 25. Larger groups would require a noise assessment study (and possibly a larger setback requirement).

A 2008 quotation from Environmental Health Perspectives (U.S. National Institutes of Health Science (part of U. S. National Institute of Health) states:-

'Even seemingly clean sources of energy can have implications on human health. Wind energy will undoubtedly create noise, which increases stress, which in turn increases the risk of cardiovascular disease and cancer'.

Chesterfield Borough Council should adopt as a safe distance from dwelling a setback of half of one mile based on current information.

Site *SBWIND05* is stated by the council planners to be East of Woodthorpe Hall Farm being a site of 13.9 hectares.

It is approximately half a mile between Woodthorpe Hall farm and the M1 motorway Southwards (in which area is also Bank Hall farm). It is also about half a mile from Woodthorpe Hall farm to the borough boundary Eastwards. Wellsholme farm would also be within range being very near Woodthorpe Hall Farm. The Bolsover Road is within half a mile of Woodthorpe Primary School.

The map produced for sites and boundaries suggests that the wind farm would be sited near the 125M high contour (top of the hill) right against the borough boundary and at the highest spot on the Chesterfield side of the boundary.

The top of the hill would most likely provide the best wind power for wind turbine operation.

This is within half a mile of 'Mastin Moor Hospital' (nursing home immediately on the Chesterfield side of the borough boundary accessed from the A619) and the nearby A619 ribbon development immediately over the boundary in the Bolsover District Council Area as well as Woodthorpe Hall farm, Wellsholme farm and Bank Hall farm.

> *The presence of dwellings within half a mile of the site causes concern in respect of Vibration and Noise. The presence of a nursing home within this range is of particular concern.*

Light Pollution

Wind towers may require aircraft warning lights. These can give rise to light pollution.

Nearby properties may have a degree of illumination and those interested in astronomy would be disadvantaged.

- > *Wind turbines and their lights must be properly sited to mitigate this.*

Weather Related Factors

Ice can form on turbine blades and then be thrown off during operation. Modern turbines can detect this (through excess vibration caused by build up) and shut down the operation. However this is not 100% fail safe (and will only happen after the ice has started to form) and turbines should be kept at a safe distance from occupied property – especially bearing in mind that the tips of the turbine blades move very quickly - potentially at over 300ft/sec - and can be pointed in a range of directions depending on where the wind is coming from. The ice can be flung in a similar way to a bowler delivering a cricket ball which could be some significant distance..

High wind can cause other problems including structure failure. Modern turbines should shut down automatically but only after the high wind has been experienced..

- > *Wind turbines must be at a safe distance from property, roads and public rights of way. A farm road runs eastwards from Woodthorpe Hall farm almost to the motorway and a proper safety distance should be allowed.*

- > *Any planning application must stipulate that the turbine incorporates all of the modern safety shut-down features.*

Wind farms affect the weather in their immediate vicinity. Spinning wind turbine rotors generate a lot of turbulence (like a boat does in water). This increases mixing of heat and water vapour affecting meteorological conditions downwind of the turbine causing warming at night and cooling by day.

Night warming may be beneficial to agriculture by reducing the impacts of frosts.

Daytime cooling may not be so welcome to local residents who like hot sunny weather to enjoy in their gardens and may face consequent extra day-time heating costs.

The effect increases with the size of the operation.

- > *Large wind farms with many turbines in one area should be avoided especially in densely populated areas such as Chesterfield.*

- > *Any planning application should be accompanied by a report by an independent expert on possible climate changes consequent on the proposed number of turbines and specific to the proposed site of the turbines.*

Mechanical Failure

Failure of brakes can cause the turbines to spin and disintegrate or cause the turbine to catch fire. This has caused modern turbines to be fitted with automatic fire extinguishing systems.

Although rare, there have been a sufficient number of reported cases world wide to require these appropriate safety precautions.. The result can also include toxic fumes and fires which cannot be extinguished (being too high up).

As with ice-formation, we have a fast moving blade tip which can throw a projectile some considerable distance.

> *Wind turbines must be at a safe distance from property, roads and public rights of way. A farm road runs eastwards from Woodthorpe Hall farm almost to the motorway and a proper safety distance should be allowed*

Bird life

The effect depends on location and bird population. An article quoted from the journal nature suggest that each wind turbine kills 4.27 birds per year. Some wind turbine sites report few bird deaths however others report significant bird deaths and we must not rely on the few with minimal deaths as a stereotype for all sites – especially as there seem to be no reports of zero deaths.

The likelihood is that there will be an impact on the bird population. It should be noted in this context that bird populations are stated to be very much under pressure in the U. K. as a whole.

The R S P B (UK) suggest that appropriate siting of wind farms may mitigate the problem. In 2009 they also warned that 'numbers of several breeding birds of high conservation concern are reduced close to wind turbines'

> *The key is proper siting. There needs to be a proper assessment made by an appropriate knowledgeable independent competent body (independent of both the developer and Chesterfield Borough Planning Department).*

Bats

There are bats about Woodthorpe (q.v. Chesterfield council report on strategic gaps 2010).

Bats may be injured by direct impact with turbine blades, towers or transmission lines. Bats may be killed by suddenly passing through a low-pressure region surrounding the turbine blade (especially at the tip of the blade).

A 2004 study in the U. S. identified that over 2,200 bats died in just six weeks at 2 sites.

> *Stopping wind farm operations during low wind conditions helps (bats are more active then). Any planning application should reflect this requirement.*

> *The key is proper siting. There needs to be a proper assessment made by an appropriately knowledgeable independent competent body (independent of both the developer and Chesterfield Borough Planning Department).*

Shadow Flicker

Shadow flicker is a serious consideration.

Shadow flicker is caused by the sun passing behind the turbine creating flickering bands of alternate light and darkness. It can last hours.

The distance affected will depend on the topography of the area and will be affected by the time of day, for instance the proposed Woodthorpe Hall site would produce the effect in the direction of Woodthorpe village in the morning as the sun rises in the East.

> *It is important not to site turbines too near to people's homes so as to eliminate/minimise this effect.*

Aesthetic Considerations

These can be subjective and differing views are held by differing people. For instance some supporters of renewable energy automatically consider any renewable structure to be beautiful whilst others – not necessarily those opposed to renewable energy - automatically consider them to be hideous. It is important to discount dogmatic views on both sides.

It should be noted as well that viewpoints change with time. In Victorian times there was a massive protest about the building of the Monsal Head railway viaduct – now it is a listed structure.

Prominence is also important. The proposed site near Woodthorpe Hall Farm is at the top of the hill from where the ground slopes down to the Doe Lea valley. Given that the structures can be up to 300ft high they will be visible for some considerable distance, especially when sited at the top of a hill – as is the case with the proposed Woodthorpe Hall site.

From the proposed site – the highest point near Woodthorpe Hall farm within the Chesterfield Borough Boundary – a straight line runs through Norbriggs (canal branch terminus) to Staveley Hall.

If the towers are 60 metres high and the blades 40 metres the structure would stand proud of the hill by 100 metres. The hill summit is slightly over 125 metres above sea level.

The ground falls steadily (there is a dip between Woodthorpe Hall farm and Mastin Moor cross roads directly on the line to Staveley Hall). The line passes Norbriggs branch canal terminus and the valley bottom at the Doe Lea river before running on the level until a very small rise brings it to Staveley Hall itself. Trees at ground level may inhibit the view from the entrance door of the Hall however a very good view should be seen from the upstairs windows of the Hall.

Some people don't like looking at skylines full of wind turbines and if you are a local resident you cannot get away with them – you see your local views everyday. People's views on this are important and we must remember that everybody is a NIMBY when it comes to their own backyard. (people who call others NIMBYS are those not affected themselves by the developments that they are very happy to inflict on others).

The (then) Duke of Devonshire moved Edensor village because he could see it from Chatsworth House (and it spoilt the view). Ordinary people are not lucky enough to have such power and influence however this does not mean that they are not entitled to have similar points of view as the Cavendish family regarding what they have to look at every day.

> *A proper impact assessment should be done to determine the effect on neighbourhood and possible mitigation on visual impact should also be researched before the sites and boundaries paper is finalised.*

> *Any potential planning application should have due regard to impact made on the neighbourhood.*

(It should be noted that no wind farms are proposed on the hills visible from Rose Hill. It is understood that possible sites have been discussed with Chatsworth Estates).

Opinion.

A wind farm, *situated in the right place*, can contribute to providing renewable energy which benefits the fight against global warming. However the right place has to be one which produces a reasonable net benefit from the project. Some wind farms have been badly sited in that (although there may be some wind) net electricity production is so low as to make the project virtually worthless.

Many wind farms are situated off shore or in other areas at a reasonable distance from habitation. *These are examples of wind farms in exactly the right place.*

> *Chesterfield Borough does not have swathes of countryside within its borders and nowhere outside the Northern green belt is that far from habitation. This makes Chesterfield generally an unsuitable location for wind farms. Rather than slavishly follow National Guidelines which are not area specific and cannot properly be applied in Chesterfield as an already crowded town, council planners should resist all but eminently suitable sites for wind farms.*

That occasionally wind farms are found in urban areas is not an argument for more in urban areas as two wrongs do not make a right.

A Chesterfield planner suggested that in the designated area at Woodthorpe there might only be one wind turbine structure. Of course there might also be many however let us take this planner's suggestion as a hypothesis.

One turbine would produce relatively little renewable energy. This would mean negligible benefit in the fight for climate change. However the environmental impact of this one turbine, potentially towering 300ft. Above Woodthorpe would be out of all proportion to the benefits.

There would be little benefit in the way of renewable energy.

There would be impacts on local bird and bat wildlife.

The skyline would be violated.

House prices locally would be adversely affected hitting local residents particularly hard

Many locals would hate the project.

The only people to benefit would be the paid Chesterfield Town planners who would now have the satisfaction that they could tick the appropriate box saying that Chesterfield are facilitating renewable energy when reporting back to an (unelected) National government department thus allowing the (paid) officials there to tick their little box also.

I would suggest that it is the planners both Nationally and Locally ticking boxes who are least important and the local population's views which are most important.

> *Wind farms should only be sited where there are overall benefits which outweigh the harm that is done to the ambience of the area. The case for the site at Woodthorpe has not been made at all. Chesterfield planners must make proper cases where they want wind farms.*

> *There are grave doubts about the Woodthorpe site especially because of the proximity of occupied property (under half a mile distant).*

RD 1st. June 2013

**Wind Farms
Planning Guidance Changes**

(main sources:- A BBC Business News release 6th June 2013 3.37 am)
(also Hayes McKenzie Partnership Report 6 April 2011)

This is a summary of the BBC announcement in respect of planning guidance changes with some additional notes.

Changes to Planning

> Local opposition can now over-ride National energy targets

This should mean that Chesterfield Borough does not have to proceed with any or all of their 10 sites selected for wind farms should the local population not be in favour of the sites.

Note also that that in the high court Judge Howells ruled against an application by RWE and in favour of Milton Keynes council's stance in that it was not unlawful because it conflicted with national renewable energy targets – a decision which now allows councils to place restrictions on wind farms.

> Local communities to have a greater stake in the planning process

All sites are now subject to local consultation before planning applications are made.

Developers are required to submit detailed plans. Government sources have stated that these must be fair reflections of the scheme and must not include misleading photographs, artists impressions or misleading statements.

> Developers are to pay increased (5 fold) benefits to communities hosting wind farms of £5,000 per megawatt or installed capacity per year for the lifetime of the wind farm.

Estimated at £100,000 per year from a medium sized farm.

Local communities decide how this is spent and provision is made for some of the money to be used to subsidise host community residents' electricity bills. An example is Meikle Carewe near Aberdeen where residents receive £122 per year against their electricity bills.

> Landscape protection is a key factor. The new guidelines are designed to ensure that wind farms are only built in suitable places.

These guide lines should ensure that there are not continuous repeat planning applications made for ridges and other places where the landscape would be destroyed.

> The Department for Communities and Local Government will make sure that the need for renewable energy does not automatically override the planning concerns of the community.

Community comes first. Confirms Judge Howell's ruling in the Milton Keynes case.

> Guidelines – distance from habitation.

England has no fixed distance from habitation. Scotland has a guideline of 2 kilometres (more than one mile). Some English Councils have guidelines e.g. Lincolnshire which has the following criteria:-

No wind turbine developments shall be constructed in close proximity of a residential property (the accepted distance for separation is 700 metres) however noise and amplitude modulation issues can be present up to 2 kilometres away. Therefore, unless through assessment, it can be demonstrated that there would be acceptable noise levels within the 2km radius of a residential property, the minimum distance should be 2km.

No wind turbines should be constructed within a distance of a factor of ten times the diameter of the blades, unless intervening topography/structure negates the impact (of flicker).

Wind farms must demonstrate that they would have no unacceptable impact due to noise, amplitude modulation, low frequency sound or vibration on residential amenity.

Note though, that in the RWE -v- Milton Keynes Council High Court case, Judge Howells ruled against *arbitrary* distances – thus noise pollution can still be a valid factor in setting parameters. However as well as in Scotland (Scottish government policy) world wide set back distances are generally above half a mile.

> World Health Organisation guidelines

This states that the external noise should apply 'at the outside façades of the living spaces' (to enable people to sleep with the window open).

> UK Government guidance

PPS22 *Renewable Energy* states that:-

'local planning authorities should ensure that renewable energy developments have been located and designed in such a way to minimise increases in ambient noise levels'.

Having assessed both the daytime and night-time background noise levels for the area (under normal conditions i.e. no rain or strong wind etc.) noise levels are derived according to the following:-

Day time noise limit is 5 dB maximum above the prevailing background noise for the quiet day-time hours (but not to exceed 35-40 dB if this is greater)

Night time noise limit is 5 dB above the prevailing background noise (but not to exceed 43 dB if this is greater)

Levels are slightly different if property occupied by someone with a financial interest (i.e. landlord or proprietor or shareholder etc.) in the wind farm.

RD 8th June 2013

<p style="text-align: center;">Wind Farm Planning The Better Way and the Chesterfield Way</p>
--

A report from the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government suggests a good way to deal with Wind Farm Planning.

Public Consultation

- > *'(developers) should engage in active consultation and dialogue with the local community at an early stage prior to submitting a planning application'.*
- > *'Consultation should be meaningful and should give the local community an opportunity to comment upon and have an input into the planning and design of the scheme'*
- > *'put formal procedures in place to deal with queries and complaints from the general public'.*

Planning Authorities Should Consider

- > *Ground Conditions*
- > *Site drainage and hydrological effects, such as water supply and quality and watercourse crossings.*
- > *Potential impact of the project on natural heritage, to include direct and indirect effects on protected sites, on habitats of ecological sensitivity and biodiversity value and, where necessary, management plans to deal with the satisfactory co-existence of the wind energy development and the particular species/habitat defined.*
- > *Potential impact of the project on the built heritage including archaeological heritage.*
- > *Landscape issues*
- > *Visual impact of ancillary development such as access roads*
- > *Local environment impacts including noise, shadow flicker, electromagnetic interference, etc.*
- > *Adequacy of local access road network to facilitate construction of the project and transportation of large machinery and turbine parts to site.*
- > *Information on any cumulative effects due to other projects including effects on natural heritage and visual effects.*
- > *Information on the location of quarries used or borrow pits proposed during the constructional phase and associated remedial works thereafter.*
- > *Disposal or elimination of waste/surplus material from construction/sites clearance.*
- > *Decommissioning considerations.*

Environmental Impact Assessment

Areas for consideration include:-

- > *Birds (and other wild life)*
- > *Ground conditions/geology*
- > *Archaeology*
- > *Architectural Heritage*
- > *Noise*
- > *Safety*
- > *Proximity to Roads and Railways*
- > *Proximity to Power Lines*
- > *Interference with Communication Systems*
- > *Aircraft Safety*
- > *Shadow Flicker*
- > *Windtake*
- > *Decommissioning and Reinstatement.*

Aesthetic Considerations in Siting and Design

- > *Siting*
- > *Spatial extent and scale*
- > *Cumulative effect*
- > *Spacing of turbines (regular, irregular, graduated)*
- > *Layout of turbines (single line, staggered line, clustered grid)*
- > *Height of turbines (tall, medium or short).*

(note that developers are required to deviate from optimum turbine efficiency to accommodate aesthetic considerations).

Location

- > *Consideration of lower ground*
- > *Consideration of prominent land cover and structures, or features to which a wind energy development can provide a visual counterbalance.*
- > *Management of visual exposure from viewing locations in respect of the sectional profile striving in so far as is practical: to achieve full turbine exposure from sensitive key viewpoints, as the perception of complete turbines is more aesthetically pleasing than stunted turbines.*
- > *Avoiding creation of visual confusion and spatial dominance where landscapes are already cluttered, but take advantage of a moderate amount of visual absorption that might be provided by existing structures or infrastructure.*

Topographical Profile/Spatial Extent and Scale

(diagrams are provided showing good outcomes and bad outcomes)

(and much more)

Roger Davenport spoke to a series of handouts regarding windfarms and the Chesterfield Borough Council response following new guidance.

He believed Chesterfield Borough Council needed to firm up their response as it ignored the new guidance and best practice.

Amongst the issues highlighted were: noise, visual results, access roads and flicker.

It appeared from the Chesterfield Borough Council documentation that many of the windfarm sites identified would be in the Staveley area so Roger felt the process needed to be amended by Chesterfield Borough Council as

	<p>soon as practical.</p> <p>Councillor Bagshaw pointed out that pylons in gardens at Poolsbrook were having a negative effect on house prices.</p> <p>Councillor Cauldwell felt water power was a preferable option in terms of renewable energy in the area.</p>	
107/13	<p>DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS</p> <p>There were no Declarations of Members Interests.</p>	
108/13	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Councillor Dyke: Work Commitments</p>	
109/13	<p>COUNCILLORS NOT PRESENT</p> <p>There were no Councillors not present.</p>	
110/13	<p>MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE OF STAVELEY TOWN COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY 6TH MARCH 2013</p> <p>The Minutes of the Planning and Environmental Committee of Staveley Town Council held on Wednesday 6th March 2013 were APPROVED apart from corrections.</p> <p>595/12 Public Session</p> <p>596/12 Disclosure of Members' Interests</p> <p>Councillor Cauldwell had in fact declared it was his son in law who owned property affected by the HS2 proposals.</p>	
111/13	<p>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE OF STAVELEY TOWN COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY 6TH MARCH 2013</p> <p>612/12 Local Heritage List Assessment Panel</p> <p>The Town Clerk reported that the first meeting of the Assessment Panel was still being sorted at Chesterfield Borough Council.</p>	
112/13	<p>MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE OF STAVELEY TOWN COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY 1ST MAY 2013</p> <p>The meeting had not been quorate</p>	
113/13	<p>DETAILS OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS DEALT</p>	

	<p>WITH BY MEMBERS Noted.</p>	
114/13	<p>A LIST OF PLANNING DECISIONS NOTIFIED BY CHESTERFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL The list of planning decisions notified by Chesterfield Borough Council were available on the website www.chesterfield.gov.uk/planningapplications.</p>	
115/13	<p>MASTIN MOOR DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS Nothing to report.</p>	
116/13	<p>MARKHAM VALE The Town Clerk reported on recent success stories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new Egg Processing firm was to build new premises • The new link road to the Bolsover Road had opened. • A new development comprising a Filling Station, Subway Sandwich Shop and Starbucks was due to be built. • It was hoped two figures from the Walking Together Arts Project would be in place by the end of July. <p>Members welcomed the action being taken regarding the Reservoir.</p>	
117/13	<p>STAVELEY TOWN BASIN The Town Clerk informed Members that an email had been received from Mike Hayden, Head of Regeneration at Chesterfield Borough Council, informing him that Dr. Geraint Coles had resigned as Development Manager for the Chesterfield Canal Partnership.</p> <p>Members expressed their regret at the news and their thanks to Dr. Coles for all the hard work and his achievements during his time in the post.</p> <p>RESOLVED – That the Town Clerk write to Chesterfield Borough Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressing the thanks of Staveley Town Council for the hard work and achievements of Dr. Coles during his time as Development Manager • Requesting Chesterfield Borough Council to replace him as soon as possible with an equally talented and dedicated officer on a salary reflecting the importance of the post, given its strategic importance to Staveley. 	

118/13	<p>STAVELEY TOWN CENTRE MASTERPLAN The Town Clerk informed Members that it was likely a Vets would be opening soon in the Town Centre.</p>	
119/13	<p>STAVELEY WORKS SITE Nothing to report.</p>	
120/13	<p>CHESTERFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN Community Infrastructure Levy: Consultation on a Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule RESOLVED: In response to the Chesterfield Borough Council Consultation document 1.No Staveley Town Council do not agree that the proposed residential charging zones and rates shown at Appendix 1 are appropriate and viable.</p> <p>Staveley Corridor: Staveley believes that the Staveley Corridor area CIL Charging Fee per square meter should be £80. This is in light of our belief that the site will be remediated by the previous tenant prior to development. Accordingly it is felt that the developer should contribute a substantial sum to Staveley Town Council at least as referred to in 10.1. This reflects the fact that the Corridor site, when developed, will result in infrastructure outside of the corridor site itself, including (potentially) affordable housing, road improvements, education contributions to our 2 existing senior schools and community facilities.</p> <p>Lowgates and Woodthorpe Ward: Staveley Town Council believes that this area should join Hollingwood and Inkersall in the Medium Zone if not the High Zone.</p> <p>2. Staveley Town Council is in agreement with a Borough wide charge for A-A5 retail.</p> <p>3. We are in agreement with the proposal for relief in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>4. We support a regular review and suggest that details of what level of changes in sales values/build costs and developer activity is proposed. Whilst we wish to encourage rather than prevent development we wish the benefits of such development to go to the community commensurate with the developer benefits. Staveley seems set to be the area of the Borough where a large portion of the development is set to go and accordingly we believe it should benefit in line with this.</p>	

	<p>We are in agreement with the proposals for an instalment policy.</p>	
121/13	<p>DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL Nothing to report.</p>	
122/13	<p>HS2 RESOLVED – That the Planning and Environmental Committee of Staveley Town Council accept the offer of Freda Jesudasow for Staveley Town Council to meet with members of the HS2 Stakeholder Team in advance of the consultation.</p>	
123/13	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS The Town Clerk had distributed details of the Coalite Regeneration Scheme being consulted on by Coalite Regeneration.</p> <p>Members discussed the proposals which will, over a period of years, remediate the site and provide a mixture of residential industrial and community facilities.</p> <p>Members observed that the proposals would deal with an area of heavily contaminated land adjacent to the Staveley Town Council border and would not have an adverse impact on either Markham Vale or Staveley Corridor.</p> <p>RESOLVED – That Staveley Town Council support the proposals to develop the Coalite Site.</p>	