

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 9:32:17 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, October 31, 2019 3:18:33 PM
Time Spent: Over a week
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1 Your contact details

Name
Organisation (where applicable)
Address
Address 2
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? **Other**

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

Several and Various

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

Support with changes

Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Development Plan

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

- It maybe should be made clearer that the so called “settlement boundary” or “built framework” has in fact little relevance for a tier 4 village such as Kirk Ireton. The impression given by the draft may be misleading as such boundary or framework is not defined and does not exist for tier 4 villages such as Kirk Ireton. DDDC have omitted the boundary for good reasons and their plan will likely take precedent over the neighbourhood plan – so why not align it with the DDDC framework.
 - The underlying tone throughout the document is that development is unappealing and unwelcome in the village. A question of whether that tone is sufficiently balanced should be asked. For Example approx. 25% indicate they are not worried about future development. Surely, like us, many would welcome future development in the village that is of appropriate scale, quality and density and that reflects sensitivity to the characteristics of the conservation area. All settlements in the Derbyshire Dales, including Kirk Ireton, ought to contribute to achieving the housing supply target for DDDC. Housing supply is currently lacking, and meeting those targets should not be restricted to the larger settlements only.
 - The whole section and reference to views would seem somewhat arbitrary. Whilst recognising the importance of views, it should also be recognised that views evolve and that sensitivity should be to maintaining a connection to the wider landscape and to the characteristics of the conservation area. It is unrealistic to believe that views will not change at a micro level
The selection of views seems random, with statements such as “valued views” and “treasured views” being made, with no reference as to who’s judgement that is based upon. It should be noted that there are some inaccuracies and inconsistencies between numberings on views and photographs
 - Point 7 page 21 (View from Nether Lane across pastureland to the Ecclesbourne Valley with tithe barn. One of the only unobstructed views out of the village.) One may wish to consider what this means? It is clearly not the only unobstructed view. Should it read one of many or one of a few? What is the quantification of many or few?
 - It is well known that the use of data and statistics from surveys etc. is extremely difficult to interpret, even when carried out by major specialised and sophisticated organisations. Avoiding bias and suggestion in questions is key to maintaining objectivity. This is also true when presenting results, so as to avoid bias. An example may be in respect to “Sites that should be protected from future development” where “Land Fronting Nether Lane/The Crofts” gets a mention. Yet the converse opinion that gets more support only appears under “Further comments – Positive” where a greater number of people are encouraging of “Expand settlement Boundary to Allow Development along Nether Lane”. This could be construed as bias.
 - It is very difficult, if not impossible, to reflect such diverse and often conflicting opinions. It may be appropriate, as is the norm in processes developed by committee, for committee members to declare (and if necessary record), their interests or conflicts of interest.
 - It does not appear that all of the points raised by DDDC and [REDACTED] have been addressed sufficiently within the main draft and in our opinion remain requiring of attention.
-