

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, September 23, 2019 6:00:39 PM
Last Modified: Monday, September 23, 2019 6:02:55 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:16
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1 Your contact details

Name
Address
City/Town
Postcode
Email Address



Q2 If you would like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Independent Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan, then please tick here.

Yes, I would like to be notified

Page 2

Q3 Which part of the Plan does this comment relate to? **Policies**

Q4 Please state the page and paragraph number (if applicable)

Respondent skipped this question

Q5 Do you support, support with changes, object, or wish to comment on this part of the Plan?

Object

Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Development Plan

Q6 Please give details of your reasons for support/objection, or make other comments here:

Policy P1:

"All fields outside the existing built framework are designated as open countryside"

In short....no new builds. There was plenty of greenfield development allowed by DDDC and being vigorously fought (e.g. the Matlock Wolds development. Presentation Convent Fields, Oker!

Every Dales Community has to bear it's share of the load!

If DDDC were to accept Policy P1 it would be discriminatory against other communities!

Policy P2. "Properties enjoy expansive views across the Ecclesbourne Valley as ground falls quite steeply away to the east of Nether Lane and Bottom Lons."

So do many properties in Ashbourne, Matlock and other Derbyshire Dales settlements, and their respective Conservation Area Assessments. But there are dozens of examples where these have been [REDACTED] as valid objections by DDDC planning. Therefore, acceptance of Policy P2 by DDDC would be discriminatory and prejudicial.

Policy P3 - Conservation Area - no comment.

Policy P4 - Business Development. - no comment.

Policy P5 - Parking - no comment.
