

Appendix 1

Successful Healthy Places SPD Summary of Representations received and Council's Response

The Coal Authority (Rep 1)		
1	Our records indicate that within the Bolsover area there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including; mine entries, coal workings and reported surface hazards. These features may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety. We note that this current consultation relates to a Successful Healthy Places SPD and I can confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document.	Response: The Mining Remediation Authority is right to highlight that part of the site assessment will be to look for coal mining features. Given that Bolsover was a coal mining area we have added and signposted towards further information requirements. Action: Added in paragraph on page 23 (Site Assessment), Paragraph 2.7.2 that within Bolsover District to check for mining features and to signposted to Mining Remediation Authority regarding coal mining risk assessments.
Natural England (Reps 2 – 6)		
2	Para 2.6 - We welcome the inclusion of the reference to landscape character areas and the Landscape Character of Derbyshire (2014). Further information on national character area profiles is available at: Natural England - National Character Area Profiles - National Character Area Profiles	Response: National Character Areas (NCA's) are wider landscape areas responding to underlying geology. We agree with Natural England to refer to the information in the NCA's as well as the character areas outlined in the Derbyshire Landscape Character documents. The NCA profiles and DLC profiles overlap but together give a comprehensive overview of the context of surrounding landscape. Action: Page 21. An additional Text box now states: Also refer to Natural England's National Character Areas: NCA30 Southern Magnesium Limestone and NCA38 Nottingham, Derbyshire and Yorkshire Coalfield

		Further information on national character area profiles is available at: Natural England - National Character Area Profiles
3	Para 2.8 – We suggest that developers should also be referred to Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles & Standards Green Infrastructure Home. The Framework is a commitment in the Government’s 25 Year Environment Plan. It supports the greening of our towns and cities and connections with the surrounding landscape as part of the Nature Recovery Network. Within the GI Framework is the GI Planing and Design Guide which provides details of what good GI design looks like linked to the ten characteristics of well-designed places as set out in the National Model Design Code - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) and the National design guide - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)	Response: Natural England’s ‘Green Infrastructure Framework’ and associated documents support the key messages within the ‘Blue and Green Infrastructure’ Section of the report, and therefore we have included reference to these as additional information resources. Actions: Page 37. Reference is now made in the side column to the Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles and Standards website and Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide, 2023 Page 129. Under Useful References an added reference and link to GI Planning and Design Guide.
4	Section 3.1 – We welcome this section which covers accessibility and sustainable transport. We draw your attention to Natural England’s Accessible Greenspace Standard which clarifies the quantity, quality and location of the green infrastructure required to meet local needs. In particular it focusses on access to green and blue spaces within 15 minutes’ walk from home. Accessible Greenspace Standard. Your authority may want to refer to this standard within the SPD.	Response: We agree that Natural England ‘Green Space Standards’ support our section on accessibility and sustainable transport, however, consider the information is better placed within the Green and Blue Infrastructure page of the report that talks about the benefits of access to nature for health and wellbeing. We have added information in referred to their documents in this section. Actions: Page 68. Added text relating to access to green and blue spaces within 15 mins walk from home.

		Added bullet point referring to Natural England's Accessible Greenspace standard clarifies quantity, quality and location of green infrastructure. Page 76: Added reference and link to Accessible Green Space User Guide, Sept 2024
5	Section 3.3 – We welcome this section on Green & Blue Infrastructure. Spending time in green and blue spaces has been shown to encourage physical activity and promote better mental health and wellbeing. Such spaces create opportunities for recreation, community gatherings, connecting with nature, and social interaction. For more information, see Natural England's Review of Nature Exposure and Human Health and Wellbeing. We also suggest that you may want to reference the Green Infrastructure Framework and the GI Framework 5 headline standards. Local Planning Authorities can apply these Standards locally that will help deliver good GI networks for people and nature. The five standards are: • S1: Green Infrastructure Strategy Standard; S2: Accessible Greenspace Standard; S3: Urban Nature Recovery Standard; S4: Urban Greening Factor Standard; S5: Urban Tree Canopy Cover Standard.	Response: We are happy to reinforce the Blue and Green Infrastructure Section of the document with references to Natural England document 'Review of Nature Exposure and Human Health and Wellbeing.' Actions: Page 68: Added reference 'Natural England - A narrative review of reviews of nature exposure and human health and well-being in the UK (March 2024).' Page 77: Added text 'See Green Infrastructure Framework and five standards: S1: Green Infrastructure Strategy Standard; S2: Accessible Greenspace Standard; S3: Urban Nature Recovery Standard; S4: Urban Greening Factor Standard; S5: Urban Tree Canopy Cover Standard'
6	Section 3.11 – We welcome the section on integrating biodiversity into the design of development. Again we refer to the Natural England Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide 2023 which provides a valuable resource on this topic.	Response: Welcome this response to support the inclusion of an extra section on biodiversity in our document. Action:

		Page 69. Add additional reference 'Natural England's Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide 2023'
Stancliffe Homes – (Reps 8 - 12)		
7	The guidance successfully addresses climate change in the context of new housing with the exception of the comment on passive solar design, which I consider to be highly inflexible and question why it should feature in the guidance given the guidance goes on to say that it isn't always appropriate (I would guess not feasible in a high percentage of applications), I think the push to eco-friendly homes is positive.	Response: We agree that the issue of orientation can be inflexible to housing developers if the topography of a site does not lead to effective solar gain, however, as a first principal solar gain can inform layouts particularly where there are south facing slopes and land rises where roof orientation naturally leads to the use of solar panels. Façade studies can also inform where enhanced glazing and reduced openings can improve internal arrangements of the dwellings. This may be difficult for housebuilders with a standard package to achieve, other housebuilders may find it useful to carry out such analysis. Action: No action taken as this section was in the original document and not part of the update.
8	There are elements of the guidance that I think should be reviewed: Paragraphs 2.8.4 & 2.8.7 - When an applicant is asked to engage with Design Midlands I think Bolsover should commit in this document to having their own design officer there to shape the feedback out of that session. It's an expensive process and to go through that, prepare a full site design and then have a separate internal team review is not efficient and is costly and frustrating for an applicant. Committing to have the	Response: We welcome response from local housing developers and appreciate that there are differences in opinion regarding process and design issues within the document. We would welcome the opportunity to consult further with developers and discuss the differences between established practise and government requirements. The document is in line with current thinking within national policy and guidance documents. The NPPF in Paragraph 139 states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it

	Council's design input included as part of the DRP would be a positive step.	fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design. National planning practice guidance points towards Design Review as an independent assessment of development proposals by a panel of multidisciplinary professionals and experts, which can inform and improve design quality in new developments. Recommendations from design review panels can be used to help support decisions on applications, so development proposals need to show how they have considered and addressed them. Often development projects have been submitted that have not been through a level of interdisciplinary design review that we would desire. If a more resolved level of design is achieved before application submission there may be less need for independent design review. Action: No action taken, no changes to the document.
9	BFHL Assessments - I'd encourage the document to take a flexible approach to these rather than arbitrary traffic lights and scoring. In some instances, connections aren't available, etc. This doesn't mean the site has poor design.	Response: The NNPF recommends using BFHL assessment in Paragraph 138: For assessing proposals there is a range of tools including workshops to engage the local community, design advice and review arrangements, and assessment frameworks such as <u>Building for a Healthy Life</u> ⁵³. These are of most benefit if used as early as possible in the evolution of schemes and are particularly important for significant projects such as large-scale housing and mixed-use developments. Building for a Healthy Life was produced by Homes England, NHS England, and NHS Improvement, with input

		from urban design and construction professionals and has influenced national policy. I think there is merit in designers working through the traffic light system early on in their designs to ensure their designs reflect national guidance. Action: No Action taken, no changes to the document.
10	Document discourages the use of cul-de-sacs - I query why it should do so and why it recommends these should be avoided? In reality, people like living in them and I think that pedestrian / cycle connectivity can still be delivered whilst using these.	Response: The National Design Guide indicate that Mews, courtyards and cull-de-sac will generally only be appropriate at the most local level where there is little vehicular movement. Current thinking is to move away from car dominated schemes and to healthier more walkable layouts. There is plenty of evidence to show that people become more isolated in larger housing estates as they grow older. In cul-de-sac arrangements they have less opportunities to integrate and enjoy passing pedestrian traffic and therefore considered to result in less cohesive design. Action: No Action Taken, no changes to the document.
11	Paragraph 3.20.24 - This suggests that turning heads should be avoided, or essentially, not look like turning heads. This is highly impractical and to suggest that turning heads should not incorporated into the public realm is not realistic when you align that with DCC adoption standards (inc. the reality of their latest guidance). Surely better that this document focuses on key things that should be achieved (good design, placemaking, etc) rather than points like this which will just end up being ignored / overridden by the	Response: Turning heads can be engineered and road dominated, or they can be designed to fit well into the public realm so that they do not dominate the layout, using choice of materials and careful planning. Manual for Streets supports this approach. Where turning heads provide the tracking alignments and meet safety standards there are opportunities for them to be integrated into layouts in a more attractive way. This was part of the existing guidance and has not been updated as developers should be working towards

	practicalities of building new homes with adopted roads.	creating places that are not car dominated. Good design can achieve better arrangements. Response: No action taken, no changes to the document.
Historic England (Rep 12)		
12	Historic England welcomes the revisions to the 2013 SPD in respect of the historic environment. In particular, the emphasis on how heritage, in conjunction with green and blue infrastructure, has the potential to enhance a place for its community as well as the new section on heritage and retrofit.	Response: A welcome response in support of the SPD revisions.