



The Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012

Regulation 4 (3b) Specified Document (iii)

Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan: Summary of representations submitted to the independent Examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

During the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 statutory publicity period (23rd September 2019 to 4th November 2019) a total of 7 representations were received from individuals and organisations.

All responses are available in full on the Derbyshire Dales District Council website www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/KirkIretonNP

A summary of the District Council's representations on the Kirk Ireton Neighbourhood Plan were approved at a meeting of Council on 26th September 2019. These can be viewed on the District Council's website: [Council 26th September 2019](#)

A summary of the representations from local residents and organisations received during the statutory public consultation is set out below:

- Policy P1 aims to ensure all fields outside the existing built framework are designated as open countryside and cannot be development, however there are numerous examples of greenfield countryside sites being developed and granted planning permission in other settlements such as Matlock for instance. All settlements in the District should share development.
- Policy PS states many properties enjoy expansive views across the Ecclesbourne Valley, similarly many properties in Ashbourne, Matlock and other Derbyshire Dales settlements enjoy long ranging views, however there are many examples of where these views have been ignored as valid planning objections and permission granted for development. Acceptance of policy P2 in the KINP would be discriminatory and prejudicial.
- The existing built framework has not been applied uniformly across all properties of similar size and nature. Properties such as Green Cottage, Ivy Cottage, Glenworth, Smith Bungalow, Church Farm, Ireton Grange and Inglenook all retain their substantial grounds within the framework. Yet Cashel, Pearlwell Farm and Green Farm have their land curtailed. Please provide the evidence of how each of these decisions was applied uniformly and consistently.

- The proposed ‘Settlement Boundary’ or ‘Built Framework’ has little relevance for a tier 4 settlement such as Kirk Ireton. The Local Plan doesn’t include such a boundary for tier 4 settlements such as Kirk Ireton and the Local Plan should take precedence. The Neighbourhood Plan should align with the Local Plan.
- The Plans tone infers that development is unappealing and unwelcome in the village yet 25% indicate they are not worried about future development. 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 should not be restricted to the larger settlements only.
- The section of the Plan on views is 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 no reference as to who’s judgement that it is based upon.
- There are inaccuracies and inconsistencies between numberings on views and photographs in the document - 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?
- The Plan should present the surveys findings in a non bias manner to ensure 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”.
- In respect of Policy P2 the photographs used to illustrate the Plan have been taken in a very subjective way. Consent for such photographs to be used in the Plan should have been sought from the relevant landowners. Photographs taken on private land, even from the view point of a public right of way should be deleted or consent sort for their usage.

In addition the following organisations submitted representations:

Natural England – Welcome the Plan’s commitment to sustainable development as expressed in the recognition of the value of the local landscape character and the application of the ‘Landscape Sensitivity Study (2015)’, noting that the plan area includes rich ecological assets, many of which are Priority Habitats. Two Priority Habitats of deciduous woodland, two of which Greenhill Wood and Bottom Wood are designated Local Wildlife Sites. The area also includes small areas of the Priority Habitat good quality semi – improved grassland. These are important to the ecological network. Recommend that an inventory of natural assets is produced in the Plan which identifies to future developers opportunities for enhancements to green infrastructure and net gain to biodiversity. An example would be to name and map areas of Priority Habitat such as deciduous woodland and good improved semi natural grassland.

Recommend reference and use of Natural England's Planning Toolkit aimed at supporting Neighbourhood Plans, providing further guidance and best practice.

Severn Trent Water Ltd – Note the Plans approach to protecting the character area and maintaining significant views by limiting the scale of housing development in the village. Acknowledge that several sites have been identified in recent years but have not been able to progress due to constraints and the local plan policy S2 stating that there is “limited scope for development within these settlements” (tier 4). Based on the above the nature and scale of development within Kirk Ireton is small and limited however it should still be brought forward with care in order to avoid detrimental impact regarding flood risk. We encourage all new development to utilise Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) to control surface water leaving the site. Also encourage developers and planners to recognise a drainage hierarchy whereby disposal of surface water to the foul/combined sewerage system is a last resort and should be avoided. Surface water should be disposed of sustainably to either the ground, watercourse/ditch-course or a surface water sewerage system. Further guidance available on ensuring water supply, quality and efficiency are considered in new developments.

Historic England – No further comments provided above those submitted at Regulation 14 stage which encouraged the Neighbourhood Plan to engage with the District Councils Conservation Officer to ensure that the Neighbourhood Areas historic environment and heritage assets are safeguarded to protect their significance. Recommended reference to Historic England's numerous planning guides and best practice on neighbourhood planning and planning for the historic environment.

All responses are available in full on the Derbyshire Dales District Council website (www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/KirkIretonNP)