

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Purpose of document

This Consultation Statement sets out how South Derbyshire District Council has undertaken community consultation and stakeholder involvement in preparation of the proposed submission Local Plan Part 1 (formally known as the Local Development Framework Core Strategy). The document describes the consultations undertaken, outlines who was consulted and how, presents a summary of the main issues raised and explains how they have shaped the Local Plan Part 1.

The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 155 sets out the Government's principles for community engagement; "Early meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made". This replaces previous guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12).

This Consultation Statement has been produced to fulfil the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. It forms the statement defined at regulation 17 comprising, a statement setting out:

- (i) which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18,
- (ii) how those bodies and persons were invited to make such representations
- (iii) a summary of the main issues raised by those representations and
- (iv) how those main issues have been addressed in the local plan

When work commenced on the Local Plan, the relevant regulations were those produced in 2004 followed by updates in 2008 and 2009. These regulations were then replaced entirely by those published in April 2012 in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Work produced under the previous regulations is still valid; however the specific regulation (including number) may have changed.

The statement also shows how the District Council has met the requirements of its Statement of Community Involvement which was adopted in March 2006.

Prior to the publication of the Pre Submission version of the Local Plan Part 1 six consultations have taken place:

- Issues and Ideas (January 2009)
- Issues and Alternative Options (January 2010)
- Your Neighbourhood Talk to Us (February 2011)
- Options for Housing Growth (July 2011)
- Preferred Growth Strategy (October 2012)
- Draft Local Plan Part 1 (November 2013)

Reflecting the weight required to be attached to the above consultations, the District Council has not responded to each individual representations received for the first five consultations. Instead the main areas of concern/support raised have been

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

identified and explanations provided as to how these has been addressed in the preparation of the Local Plan Part 1.

Consultation has been on-going since the start of the Local Plan preparation process and has not been restricted to these six periods. During and following the consultations, stakeholders, developers, landowners and infrastructure providers have had input into the Plan. Consultation methods have included workshops, presentations and individual meetings. In addition, consultation documents have continued to be available to view on the Council's website.

All parties entered into the Local Plan consultation database have been informed of Local Plan consultation exercises at each stage. The database has grown substantially since the beginning of the Local Plan preparation process, and at the time of writing over 3000 consultees are represented. Appendix G2 lists some of the organisations, including statutory bodies, that have been consulted.

It should be noted that this document does not attempt to include every individual comment but does identify the broad Issues raised. We have endeavoured to summaries all the issues raised but reference should be made to the summary of representations for full details which can be found [here](#).

Statement of Community Involvement

In March 2006, the Council adopted its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), which sets out how the community and other stakeholders will be engaged in the preparation of the Local Plan and in development management matters.

The Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amended) Regulations 2008 altered the stages of production of a development plan document (regulation 26, the Preferred Options stage, was removed). Under the current legislation there are two stages where the document should be subject to consultation: regulation 18, where issues and policy options are explored and regulation 19, the formal consultation on the publication draft plan.

The District's SCI was produced before the pre-2008 regulations, however its content is still considered to be consistent with the 2008 requirements. The Council has undertaken more consultation than is required under Regulation 18. This has ensured that the public and stakeholders have had the opportunity to fully engage in the preparation of the Local Plan.

The SCI proposes possible methods of consultation involvement and indicates the approach which will be used to involve the community in the preparation of the Local Plan. It also includes the approaches that may be used if it is believed to be beneficial and/or the resources are available. The Council has employed a range of consultation methods, which are considered to be consistent with the SCI.

The following table is an extract from the SCI setting out the approaches the District Council will use to involve the community in the preparation of the Local Plan and its different documents (✓). It also indicates the additional approaches that may be used where it is believed that they would be beneficial and/or resources are available (P).

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

Method	Core & general policies			Development Plan documents (e.g. area action plan)			Supplementary Planning documents	
	1 ¹	2 ²	3 ³	1	2	3	1	2
Making documents available for review at Council Offices and libraries	-	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	-	✓
Newsletter or leaflet available at local venues, e.g. supermarkets, surgeries	✓	P	P	✓	-	-	✓	-
Information sent to existing network of organisations and their newsletters	✓	P	P	✓	P	✓	✓	P
Press releases/articles in press	✓	✓	✓	✓	P	✓	✓	P
Exhibition/display in local area(s)	-	P	-	-	✓	-	-	P
Information and documents on website	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Questionnaire survey	✓	-	-	✓	-	-	P	-
Public meeting/surgery	-	✓	P	-	✓	P	-	✓
Focus group with representatives of specific issue area	P	-	-	P	-	-	✓	P
Workshop with representatives of range of issues or interest areas	P	✓	-	P	✓	-	-	P
Participative planning activities	-	P	-	P	-	-	-	-
Community liaison group	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

Each consultation was undertaken in accordance with the methods stated within the SCI and in some instances these requirements have been exceeded.

In regards to making newsletters and leaflets available at local venues e.g. supermarkets, surgeries, during the Issues and Ideas consultation stage an attempt was made to distribute materials to local supermarkets. However, this was unsuccessful as supermarkets were only willing to accept material from charities. Consultation documents were made available at South Derbyshire libraries during each consultation stage.

¹ Stage 1: Pre – production (undertaking research and gathering evidence)

² Stage 2: Pre submission

³ Stage 3: Submission and Examination (producing submission document and independent examination)

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Duty to Co-operate

Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 introduced a 'Duty to Co-operate'. Local Authorities are required to work with neighbouring authorities and other prescribed bodies in preparing Development Plan Documents. Local Authorities must "engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis" during the preparation of Local Plans when they relate to strategic matters. Strategic matters are defined as development including infrastructure that "would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas".

The District Council must work with neighbouring authorities, Derbyshire County Council and the following organisations:

- The Environment Agency
- The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage)
- Natural England
- The Civil Aviation Authority
- The Homes and Communities Agencies
- Primary Care Trust
- The Office of Rail Regulations
- Integrated Transport Authorities
- Highways Agency

Partnership working has been a key element in the preparation of South Derbyshire's Local Plan Part 1 and the authority has worked closely with other local authorities within the Derby Housing Market Area (HMA). The Derby HMA covers the authorities of South Derbyshire, Amber Valley and Derby City in conjunction with Derbyshire County Council. Due to the functional relationship across the Derby HMA, particularly regarding housing markets and travel to work patterns, aligned working on the respective Local Plans was agreed. It was considered that preparing separate but aligned Local Plans would enable the authorities to achieve consistency.

To facilitate close working relations across the Derby HMA, the following groups have been established:

- Derby HMA Joint Advisory Board, which comprises committee chairs/portfolio holders and chief executives from each Local Authority. The Joint Advisory Board meets on a quarterly basis and its role is to advise on spatial planning and implementation matters of mutual concern within the Derby HMA. The Joint Advisory Board makes representations to the relevant Local Authorities in the HMA but has no executive powers.
- Coordination Group: Planning officers from South Derbyshire, Amber Valley and Derby City attend meetings, usually held fortnightly. Coordination Group discusses the progress of the Local Plan and makes decisions regarding the development of the Local Plan, including consultations and the production of a joint evidence base, to help ensure that the HMA local plans are aligned and progressing.

Along with the above, the HMA authorities have worked jointly to create a robust evidence base. Specific research and studies have been carried out, including:

- Strategic Housing Market Assessments, 2013
- Education Position Statement
- Transport Position Statement, 2012
- Housing Requirement Study, 2012

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- Derby Urban Area – Traffic Impact Assessment Report, 2012
- Green Belt Study, 2012
- Gypsy and traveller accommodation assessment, 2008
- Derby HMA Strategic site options study final report, 2010
- Derby HMA Employment Land Review: Forecasts Update, 2013

Further information on the HMA joint evidence base can be found [here](#).

Throughout the preparation of the Local Plan the Council has also consulted its neighbouring authorities outside the Derby HMA, including East Staffordshire and North West Leicestershire. As a minimum, consultation letters have been sent to neighbouring Authorities at each stage of the consultation process and, in some instances, cross-boundary officer meetings between South Derbyshire and neighbouring authorities have taken place.

A separate document setting out in detail how the Council has discharged its responsibility under the Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the proposed Submission version of the Local Plan Part 1.

Local Plan consultation stages

A number of consultations have been carried out as part of the Local Plan process. The following table summarises the key stages of the development of the Local Plan Part 1.

Stage in Local Plan Part 1	Consultation Period
Issues and Ideas	January 2009 - 3 April 2009
Issues and Alternative Options	January 2010 - 28 May 2010
Your Neighbourhood: Talk to us	February 2011 – 3 May 2011
Options for Housing Growth	July 2011 - 30 September 2011
Preferred Growth Strategy	October - 21 December 2012
Draft Local Plan Part 1	27 th September – 15 th November 2013

Consultation Methods

The District Council has used a broad range of methods to consult and engage with stakeholders and the public. The table below provides a summary of the methods used at each stage.

	Issues and Ideas	Issues and Alternative Options	Your Neighbourhood: Talk to Us	Options for Housing Growth	Preferred Growth Strategy	Draft Local Plan
Letters or emails to all individuals and organisations on the LDF consultation database	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Letters or emails to South Derbyshire District Councils Councillors and MP.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Letter to Parish Councils	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

Consultation documents available to review at Council Offices	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Consultation document available to review online.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Banner advertising the consultations on South Derbyshire District Council's website homepage.		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hotlink to consultation information from South Derbyshire's District Council website homepage		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Information displayed on the screen in South Derbyshire District Council reception.		✓			✓	✓
Information displayed on the PC screens in South Derbyshire District Council reception.		✓				
Press Releases	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Newspaper articles		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tweets		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Drop in events/public exhibitions with officers in attendance		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Presentations or information given out at Area Forums		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Letters to all parents of pupils at all Primary Schools within South Derbyshire			✓	✓		
Letters to all parents of pupils at all Secondary Schools within South Derbyshire			✓			
Video uploaded onto You Tube					✓	
Questionnaires	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Member workshop/training	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Stakeholder events		✓		✓	✓	✓
Leaflets at Connexions office		✓				
Distribution of posters		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Flyers at the Festival of Leisure				✓		
Radio Interviews		✓		✓		✓
Use of QR Code on summary leaflets and notice boards					✓	
Short URL Code to webpage on the consultation			✓	✓	✓	✓
Local Plan Blog					✓	✓
Public meetings	✓	✓				

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

Consultation information given to all South Derbyshire libraries	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Information given to presented to the Local Strategic Partnership	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Further information regarding each consultation stage is set out later in this document and is supported by a comprehensive set of appendices.

Consultation on Issues and Ideas (January – 3rd April 2009)

Introduction

In January 2009 South Derbyshire District Council published its first consultation document towards its Local Plan – Issues and Ideas. This set out the Council’s initial thoughts on the main questions to be addressed in identifying the right options for development within South Derbyshire, such as the District Vision, employment, housing, rural issues, heritage and conservation, to name a few.

Consultation on Issues and Ideas ran from January until the 3rd April 2009. The consultation document and responses received can be found on the Council’s website [here](#).

Who was invited to be involved at this stage and how?

Different methods of public consultation were used to maximise community and stakeholder engagement in the process. These included:

- a) All organisations and individuals on the LDF consultation database being contacted by letter, or email where provided, with an enclosed summary leaflet, which explained the purpose of the consultation, how to find further information and how to make representations. Two different letters were sent: one aimed at statutory consultees and developers and the other at general amenity consultees (Appendix A1 & A2).

All South Derbyshire Councillors, Parish Councils and the South Derbyshire MP were sent a hard copy of the Issues and Ideas document and a summary leaflet (appendix A3, A4 & A5). Board members and Local Strategic Partnership member organisations were emailed separately to inform them of the consultation and provide details of where the Issues and Ideas document could be found on South Derbyshire’s website (Appendix A6 & A7).

A follow up email was sent to consultees to remind them of the closing date of the consultation and advising that there was still time to comment (Appendix A8).

- b) A paper **reference copy** of the Issues and Ideas document was made available to view in South Derbyshire District Council’s Main Reception along with questionnaires.
- c) **A questionnaire** was produced asking for thoughts on the Issues and Ideas document. This was available to download from the Council’s website and consultees were able to submit comments online by registering (Appendix A9).

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- d) The Issues and Ideas **webpage** on the Council's website provided information on the consultation, along with an electronic copy of the questionnaire and the Issues and Ideas document.
- e) Reference copies of the Issues and Ideas document, along with questionnaires, were made available to view at all South Derbyshire **libraries**, plus libraries in adjoining areas at Derby Central, Borrowash, Mickleover, Sinfin, Blagreaves Lane, Burton upon Trent and Ashbourne.
- f) At the time of the consultation, speculation about development proposals in Etwall, particularly development at Egginton Common, had given rise to strong local feeling within the area. As a response to this, residents in Egginton, Etwall and surrounding villages were invited to a **public meeting** on the 19 February, 2009 at Etwall, called by South Derbyshire District Council, to hear about future development plans within the area. A PowerPoint presentation was delivered on the role of the Local Development Framework, the Issues and Ideas consultation and how to get involved. The planning application process was also explained. A question and answer session followed. A generic press release was sent promoting the public meeting (Appendix A10) along with a specific press release to the Burton Mail (Appendix A11). Those concerned about development at Etwall also produced posters advertising the public meeting (Appendix A12). Notes from the consultation meeting can be found in Appendix A13. The Burton Mail published a follow up article on the 21 February 2009 (Appendix A14). Within this article an error was reported, which was later redacted in an article published on the 24 February, 2009 (Appendix A15). In addition "This Is Derbyshire" published an article on the 20 February, 2009 regarding the public meeting (Appendix A16).
- g) On 9 January, 2009 a **presentation** was given to the **Local Strategic Partnership** on the Issues and Ideas consultation (Appendix A17).
- h) An **LDF workshop** for Elected Members was held on the 17 March 2009 to update South Derbyshire District Council's Members on the process and progress of the LDF, exploring the content of the LDF vision and identifying some key LDF objectives (Appendix A18).
- i) An Elected **Member priorities seminar** was undertaken on 14 July 2009 in which planning officers sought to understand Member's priorities for their ward (Appendix A19).
- j) An article on the consultation was published by the Burton Mail (Appendix A20).
- k) An article was published in the Burton Mail regarding a 'memorandum of understanding' between South Derbyshire and East Staffordshire to the effect that both parties agreed to work closely on development likely to have a large impact on both areas (Appendix A21).

What were the main issues raised?

942 individual comments were registered from 116 contributors. The main issues raised were as follows:

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- The majority of consultees agreed that there was potential to harness renewable, low carbon or locally generated energy in the District and that it was desirable to make provision for renewable energy installations in the District. However the majority of responses received did suggest that there was a threat or potential threat to the landscape character of the District from renewable energy.
- A mixed response was received on whether there were opportunities for the promotion of eco buildings exceeding the design standards set out in national Building Regulations.
- There was a divide between developers and residents on whether the Core Strategy should plan for levels of growth significantly different to those set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). In the main residents suggested that the Core Strategy should not plan for levels of growth significantly different to those set out in the RSS or should plan for less, whilst developers suggested that the Core Strategy should plan for growth higher than that provided for by the RSS.
- The majority of the responses suggested that housing development should be located around the Derby Principle Urban Area and Swadlincote and some respondents suggested that the location of housing development should reflect the distribution provided for in the RSS. A mixed response was received on whether, and how much, housing development should occur in rural areas.
- The majority of consultees suggested that a mix of dwellings was needed in South Derbyshire.
- Regarding particular housing needs arising from specific sections of the population that were considered to be unlikely to be adequately met through general housing provision, housing for older people was mentioned most by respondents.
- A mixed response was received on whether the appropriate threshold for affordable housing provision should be sites of 15 or more dwellings.
- The majority of consultees suggested that a uniform approach to residential density should not be applied across the District.
- Consultees were asked whether major transport schemes/routes were required in addition to the Woodville - Swadlincote Regeneration Route. A range of schemes/routes were suggested (see Appendix A22)
- Very few respondents commented on the quantity of new employment land to be provided within the District to 2026. However, some locations for employment were suggested by consultees (see Appendix A22).
- The majority of responses supported the continued use of the Green Belt to prevent key settlements from coalescing. Two consultees suggested that a review of the Green Belt should be undertaken and two suggested specific locations for alterations to the boundary.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- Comments were received about specific settlements in the District, including things that residents liked and disliked about their neighbourhoods and suggestions for improvement.

A full summary of representations received can be found at Appendix A22.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

As the Local Plan process was at an early stage, further evidence was required to establish South Derbyshire's policy stance on a number of questions raised.

Further evidence was obtained to establish the potential for renewable and low carbon sources of energy within the HMA.

In light of the Government's statement of intent to abolish Regional Plans, made in 2011, which at the time identified the scale of South Derbyshire's housing provision and its distribution between the Principle Urban Area and the remainder of the District, it was necessary for the HMA Local Authorities to identify the extent of their housing need independently, based on evidence. For this purpose, further work was undertaken and an additional consultation stage arranged.

The East Midlands RSS provided the housing provision figure for the Principle Urban Area and for the remainder of South Derbyshire. As mentioned above the East Midlands RSS was abolished in 2013, therefore the Authority undertook additional work to establish the proportion of new housing to be located around the edge of Derby, and the rest of South Derbyshire whilst considering locations for new housing development.

Further work on the HMA evidence base was undertaken to establish the types of homes needed, in terms of proportion of affordable dwellings needed – and provision for specific groups, including older people and those with disabilities. This evidence was then used to help shape policies within the Local Plan.

Further work was required and undertaken regarding the provision of affordable housing within the district. The evidence collected has informed the affordable housing policy within the Local Plan.

It was decided not to pursue a uniform policy for residential density in the Local Plan Part 1 as it was considered that an area-based approach would be more beneficial in terms of ensuring appropriate housing delivery and protecting the natural and built environment.

With regards to improvements to transport schemes/routes, further evidence was required to identify the transport impacts and any mitigation measures needed to support potential strategic development sites. The evidence collected has helped influence the mitigation measures and transport schemes within future consultations and within the Local Plan Part 1.

Further work was required to establish the extent of any need for new employment development and the availability of potential strategic employment sites. The evidence collected has helped influence employment policies within the Local Plan.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Work was also required to establish whether the areas of Green Belt within the District still fulfilled their intended purpose and whether any alterations to the boundaries could be justified.

All the additional work identified above contributed toward the identification of strategic development sites and the formulation of policy, which formed the basis of further stages of public consultation.

Responses received that referred to specific parts of the District were summarised and incorporated into the Area Profiles and Summary Profiles in the “Your Neighbourhood: Talk to Us” consultation exercise.

Consultation on Issues and Alternative Options (January 2010 – 28 May 2010)

In January 2010 the District Council started consultation on its “Issues and Alternative Options” document. Views were sought on:

- key issues to be addressed
- a draft Vision for South Derbyshire
- a number of Strategic Objectives for guiding future change
- a number of alternative options for how the District might grow in the future, including potential development locations.

Consultation on Issues and Alternative Options ran until 28 May 2010. The initial deadline for the consultation was the 31 March 2010. However due to the high interest it was decided to extend the consultation period across the HMA.

The “Issues and Alternative Options” document and responses to the consultation can be found on the Council website [here](#).

Who was invited to be involved at this stage and how?

Different methods of public consultation were used to maximise community and stakeholder engagement, including:

- a) All organisations and individuals including statutory stakeholders, interest groups, developers and agents and other individuals whose details were on the LDF consultation database, were contacted by letter or email (where provided), with an enclosed or attached summary leaflet, to inform them of the consultation and explain how to find further information and make representations. In total 414 **emails** and 789 **letters** were sent (Appendix B1 and B2).

All South Derbyshire Councillors and Parish Councils were sent a hard copy of the “Issues and Alternative Options” document, a summary leaflet and a questionnaire. A further letter was distributed to the Councillors regarding the public exhibitions (Appendices B3, B4 & B5). South Derbyshire’s MP was also sent a letter and hard copy of the consultation document (Appendix B6).

A further email was sent to those on the LDF database to remind consultees of the current consultation and inform that public exhibitions within the District had been organised (Appendix B7).

A further letter was sent to those on the LDF database on the 26 March 2010 informing consultees of the extended consultation deadline (Appendix B8).

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- b) **Posters** advertising the consultation were distributed to all Parish Councils and libraries. Posters were also located on notice boards within Swadlincote Town Centre; Sharpes Pottery Museum and Tourist Information Centre; Sir Nigel Gresley Pub, Swadlincote; Green Bank Leisure Centre; Adult Education Centre; Hilton Village Hall and South Derbyshire District Council offices (Appendix B9).
- c) Posters, reference copies of the full document, summary leaflets and questionnaires to take way were distributed to all South Derbyshire **Libraries**, to the Willington and Chellaston post offices and to two mobile libraries. They were also distributed to the following libraries outside the District: Burton upon Trent, Derby Central, Blagreaves Lane (Littleover), Mickleover, Alvaston, Borrowash, Ashbourne and Sinfin. .
- d) **Consultation leaflets** were distributed to the Connexions Office within Swadlincote (Appendix B10).
- e) A paper **reference copy** of the consultation document and questionnaires were made available at South Derbyshire District Council offices.
- f) During the consultation period an advert publicising the consultation was added to a rolling presentation on the **screens** within the Council office's **Main Reception**.
- g) The consultation was advertised on the **publicly accessible computers** in the Main Reception at the Council offices.
- h) A **banner** advertising the Issues and Alternative Options document was uploaded on the South Derbyshire District Council website home page, during the consultation period. A **hotlink** on this banner connected directly to the "Issues and Alternative Options" webpage, which provided further information and contained the main document and questionnaire to download.
- i) **Questionnaires** were produced soliciting thoughts on the consultation document. These were available at all drop in events, all South Derbyshire Libraries (and the other venues listed in point "c", above) the Council office Main Reception and on the Council's website (appendix B11). Consultees could also register and submit comments online.
- j) Drop-in events were publicised on the **District Council's website**, along with the consultation document and questionnaire to view online or download.
- k) Five **drop-in events**, were held in various locations, with the aim of reaching different sections of the community. Planning officers were at the events to explain the purpose of the consultation and answer any questions.

Planning officers also attended five Derby City public meetings at Mickleover, Chellaston, Sinfin, Littleover and Alvaston.

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

The drop-in events were held at the following venues:

Venue	Date	Time
Melbourne Leisure Centre, Melbourne	23 February 2010	10am –7pm
Swadlincote Town Hall, Swadlincote	24 February 2010	10am –7pm
Hilton Village Hall, Hilton	4 March 2010	10am – 7pm
Stenson Fields Primary School, Stenson Fields	19 March 2010	3pm – 6pm
Mickleover	31 March 2010	4pm – 8pm

Details on the number of attendees at each event can be found in Appendix G1.

- l) The consultation events were announced three times on **Twitter** during the consultation period.
- m) The Derby HMA local authorities issued a joint **press release** advertising the consultations (Appendix B12) and South Derbyshire District Council issued two further press releases to publicise the Council's public exhibitions (Appendix B13 & B14).
- n) An **article** regarding the consultation was published online in the Derby Evening Telegraph on the 26 January, 2010 (Appendix B15).
- o) At the request of Woodville Parish Council and Etwall Parish Council, the Development Management and Planning Policy Managers attended a Woodville Parish **Council meeting** on 16 February, 2010 and the Planning Policy Manager attended an Etwall Parish Council meeting on 15 March, 2010. The purpose of these engagements was to discuss the consultation and any potential development which could impact upon these locations.
- p) Planning Policy officers attended a **Mickleover Public Meeting** on the 3 March, 2010 and the **Chellaston Residents' AGM** on the 24 March, 2010. The officers explained the purpose of the current consultation and responded to questions.
- q) A presentation was made to the South Derbyshire **Parish Liaison Group** on 17 February, 2010.
- r) A presentation was given to the **Local Strategic Partnership Sustainable Development Group**.
- s) A meeting was held on on the 28 January 2010 with Planning Policy Officers and the **Local Strategic Partnership Board** to discuss the consultation.
- t) Councillor Heather Wheeler, Leader of the Council at the time, was interviewed on Touch FM on 20 February, 2010. A Derby City Planning Policy Officer was also interviewed on BBC **Radio**.
- u) A **Member workshop** was undertaken on the 16 March, 2010 to inform Elected Members of the purpose and content of the consultation exercise and the Local Plan preparation process.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- v) A **Developers Forum** was held at the Council Offices on 13 July, 2010.
- w) Presentations were given at the following **Area Forums**: Swadlincote (26 January, 2010), Repton (27 January, 2010), Linton (1 February, 2010), Melbourne (2 February, 2010), Melbourne (3 February, 2010) and Newhall (8 February, 2010) (Appendix B16).
- x) The **Community Voluntary Service** (CVS) emailed those on their consultation database to publicise the consultation exercise, including details of public exhibitions.

What were the main issues the representations raised?

4174 Individual comments were registered from 891 respondees during the consultation. The main issues raised were as follows?

- The consultation provided three housing growth options in South Derbyshire. Option 1: make provision for the Regional Plan 2006-2026 requirements; Option 2: anticipate the review of the Regional Plan and extend the end date of the Core Strategy to 2031; and Option 3: make provision for an amount in excess of the Regional Plan requirement. From the representations received, Option 1 was the most popular.
- Three options were provided in regards to how much new employment land should be provided in the Derby HMA. Option 1: provide a total amount of new employment land across the HMA in line with the recommendation of the employment land review; Option 2: provide a total amount of new employment land across the HMA below that recommended in the employment land review and; Option 3: provide a total amount of new employment land across the HMA above that recommended in the employment land review. From the representations received, Option 1 was the most popular.
- Five main spatial options or broad areas for housing growth were suggested around the PUA. The options can be seen below in order of preference:
 - Option 5: Boulton Moor (66 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 4: Chellaston (59 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 3: Sinfin (51 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 1: Mickleover area (51 respondees chose this options)
 - Option 2: Littleover (49 respondees chose this option)All of the options received both positive and negative comments.
- Two options were provided in regards to housing delivery within the PUA: Option 1: multiple locations or Option 2: a single location. Option 1, received the most support by a substantial margin.
- Three options were presented regarding where employment provision could be allocated in the PUA. Option 1: mixed use urban extensions to Derby; Option 2: within Derby and Option 3: within South Derbyshire and Derby. Option 2 was the preferred option followed by Option 3. Option 1 received substantially less support.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- Four options were presented in regard to managing existing and future travel demands and behaviours in the PUA and non-PUA. Option 1: minimum intervention; Option 2: demand management; Option 3: measures to increase use of alternatives to the car and; Option 4: highways based improvements. In the case of the PUA and non-PUA Option 3 was the preferred choice.
- Four options on housing distribution outside the PUA were presented. These are listed in order of preference:
 - Option 4: Swadlincote and redevelopment of a major brownfield development site in the vicinity of the former Drakelow Power Station (144 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 1: Swadlincote Focused Growth (101 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 2: Swadlincote and limited development in named villages (41 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 3: Swadlincote and maximum development in named villages or rural locations where potential development exists (32 respondees chose this option)
- Five options were presented on the direction of growth in Swadlincote and are listed in order of preference:
 - Option 4: A combination of locations (54 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 1: Extensions to the west and south west (24 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 3: Extensions to the south (10 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 2: Extensions to the east (8 respondees chose this option)
- Two options were presented on employment land provision outside the PUA. Option 1: no additional provision and Option 2: increased provision. Both received a similar level of support, with Option 1 receiving slightly more with 47 responses in support to 41.
- Two options were presented on regeneration in Swadlincote and Woodville. Option 1: employment led regeneration and Option 2: mixed use regeneration. Both received a similar level of support with Option 1 receiving slightly more with 32 responses in support to 27.
- Four locations (with an additional option of no sites) were presented on a strategic distribution (logistics) facility. The options are listed in order of preference:
 - Option 3: Drakelow Power Station (56 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 2: Willington Power Station (39 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 5: no sites (35 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 1: A38/A50 area (31 respondees chose this option)
 - Option 4: Sinfin Moor (28 respondees chose this option)
- The majority of consultees agree with the use of Building For Life in guiding design quality.
- With regards to delivering improvements to energy efficiency in developments, three options were presented. Option 1: use building regulations; Option 2: set targets and; Option 3: higher targets on specific sites. Option 2 was the most popular.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- The consultation sought views on whether development should be allowed in the flood plain. Two options were provided: Option 1: no development in the flood plain and Option 2: a special exceptions policy. Option 1 received the majority of support.
- With regards to water supply the consultation asked whether the Core Strategy should require water consumption rates in new homes to be below 125 litres per person per day, set out in building regulation's or whether higher standards should be set. Setting higher standards was the preferred option.
- Two options were presented on how Sustainable Urban Developments (SUD) could be delivered through the Core Strategy. Option 1: business as usual (seek sustainable drainage systems wherever practical in accordance with PPS25 and the East Midlands Regional Plan) and Option 2: higher standards (specification of high environmental standards relating to surface water management. Option 2 was preferred.
- Two options were presented on increasing the provision of affordable housing. Option 1: set a lower thresholds size for qualifying sites and Option 2: increase the provision of affordable housing required on sites which exceed the qualifying site size threshold). Option 1 was the most popular.
- Two options were presented on housing density. Option 1: set a minimum density and Option 2: an area-based approach. Option 2 was the most popular option by a substantial margin (85 responses in support to 28).
- The consultation sought views on whether there was a need to seek a proportion of Lifetime Homes in advance of the introduction of national standards in the Core Strategy. Three options were presented. Option 1: use building regulations; Option 2: set targets for lifetime homes in advance of statutory building regulations; and Option 3: set higher targets for lifetime homes on specific strategic/exemplar sites. Option 1 was preferred.
- Two options were presented on the extent to which non-retail uses should be resisted in the central shopping street in Swadlincote; Option 1: priority to A1 uses and Option 2: mixed use approach. Option 2 was preferred.
- With regards to how infrastructure should be funded, four options were presented. Option 1: wider developer contributions; Option 2: S106 contributions; Option 3: introduce levy and Option 4: introduce levy and S106. Options 1 and 2 were the preferred choices.

A full summary of representations received for this consultation can be found in Appendix B17.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The consultation provided a vision and strategic objectives for the Derby HMA. These were not carried forward into future consultations as it was considered that having two separate visions and strategic objectives for the Derby HMA and South Derbyshire was not helpful.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Regarding housing provision, due to the Government's decision to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies and the revocation of the East Midlands RSS in 2013, (which resulted in local authorities having to set the amount of new housing provision within their administrative area), it was necessary to consult on the District's housing provision in more depth and produce further evidence to establish the Derby HMA and South Derbyshire housing requirements over the plan period.

The three options in regard to how much employment land should be provided in the Derby HMA were based around the employment land provision identified in the Derby Housing Market Area Employment Land Review, published in 2008. However, due to the passage of time and the review of the Derby HMA and District housing requirement, it was necessary to update the employment land forecasts. The Derby HMA Employment Land Review: Forecasts Update, 2013 provided evidence on the level of employment provision needed for the Derby HMA and the three constituent local authority areas from 2008-2028 and helped inform the policies of the Draft Local Plan and Pre-Submission Local Plan.

In regard to broad spatial options for housing growth in the Derby Principle Urban Area (PUA) and non-PUA, a range of options were provided. The Boulton Moor Area was the most popular choice for the PUA and a combination of locations was the most popular choice for the directions of growth in Swadlincote. All options, however, received a degree of support. Further evidence was obtained in regards to locations for housing growth and was used to help finalise the housing sites within the Draft Local Plan and Pre-Submission Local Plan.

Multiple locations for housing delivery in the PUA have been carried forward into the Preferred Growth Strategy, Draft Local Plan and Pre-Submission Local Plan.

Regarding managing existing and future travel demands and behaviour, both within and outside the PUA, Option 3 (measures to increase use of alternatives to the car) was the most popular. The transport evidence suggests that such measures alone would not be sufficient to effectively mitigate the anticipated transport impacts of proposed development. Based on modelling undertaken to date, it has been concluded that to support the scale of growth proposed, transport mitigation measures should comprise a combination of new public transport services, the creation of new walking and cycling routes, demand management measures and new highway infrastructure.

The Council no longer intends to formally allocate Woodville Regeneration Area for development, as there is no certainty as to the mix of uses that will be needed to ensure viability. However the Draft Local Plan and Pre Submission Local Plan contain a policy identifying the site for redevelopment supported by the delivery of the Woodville to Swadlincote Regeneration Route.

The consultation presented four potential locations (and an option for no sites) for the development of a strategic distribution facility. No sites for such a facility have been allocated within the Draft Local Plan or Pre Submission Local Plan, even though this was only the fourth least popular option. Prior to March 2010 applications for rail freight interchanges would have been submitted to and determined by the District Council. However, following this date applications for infrastructure projects of regional or national significance were required to be submitted directly to the Planning Inspectorate and determined by the Secretary of State. As a result of this change, and coupled with the fact that some of the sites previously identified are no longer available for this type of development, the Council considered that this type of development could be most effectively addressed through the use of a criteria-based

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

policy. Such a policy could help ensure that where proposals come forward, developers will have certainty as to the Council's minimum planning requirements.

Policy BNL1 Design Excellence in the Draft Local Plan and Pre-Submission Local Plan emphasises the importance of good design within development. Building For Life is not specifically mentioned within the policy however is alluded to by stating "All proposals for major development shall perform highly when assessed against current best practice and standards for design, sustainability and place making". Further design guidance which incorporates Building For Life is likely to be set out in a later Supplementary Planning Document.

The use of Building Regulations along with national standards to deliver improvements to energy efficiency in new development, was the approach carried forward in the Draft Local Plan. However within Pre Submission Local Plan Policy SD1 and SD2 (of the Draft Local Plan) have been amalgamated and amended. Amendments have been made to these policies to reflect the government preferred mechanism to deliver zero carbon building and more sustainable developments through building regulations and a 'nationally described standards set' which will deal with issues such as accessibility, space, domestic security, water efficiency and energy subject to viability. The Council will keep this policy under review as the outcome of the governments Housing Standards Review becomes known.

Option 2: a Special Exceptions policy, was carried forward into Draft Local Plan and Pre Submission Local Plan, despite Option 1 being the preferred option by consultees. It was considered that the social and economic benefits of allowing limited growth could, in some cases, outweigh the negative impacts in respect of health and wellbeing and objectives to reduce flood risk and climate change impacts. By incorporating Option 2, the Council will be able to be more flexible in delivering growth in areas of identified flood risk where there are clear benefits in doing so.

In regards to water supply the consultation asked whether the Core Strategy should require water consumption rates in new homes to be restricted to below 125 litres per person per day, as set out in Building Regulations, or whether higher standards should be set. Setting higher standards was carried forward into a Draft Local Plan policy. However within the Pre Submission Local Plan policy wording has been amended to reflect the Governments Housing Standard Review consultation.

The Authority has incorporated a "business as usual" approach to how Sustainable Urban Drainage could be delivered through the Local Plan, despite the option to set higher standards being preferred by consultees. Since the Council undertook the "Issues and Alternative Options" consultation, the Government has introduced the Flood and Water Management Act. Schedule 3 of this Act is likely to be implemented in 2014 (although its implementation has been delayed several times to date) and will require developers to integrate SUDS into new developments - including small scale schemes. National requirements will be implemented within the plan period and, over time, will provide a level of protection to the District's watercourses, which in respect of onsite flood risk, will be comparable with any enhanced policy for South Derbyshire. It is therefore considered that there is no longer a need to pursue improved SUDS provision through the Local Plan. Instead the Authority will seek to work with developers and the County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority and SUDS Approval body, to implement proposed changes effectively.

The most popular option regarding affordable housing was Option 1: increasing the provision of affordable dwellings by setting a lower size threshold for qualifying sites. This option was not carried forward into the Draft Local Plan or Pre Submission Local

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Plan as it was considered to be unlikely to be viable in the current economic climate. Small sites that have come forward in the recent past have been reviewed and of these, many are on previously developed land within existing urban areas (i.e. Swadlincote or the villages). By setting a low threshold the Authority could potentially undermine the reuse of small previously developed sites which often have abnormal costs associated with demolition or remediation. Failure to secure the reuse of such sites could have detrimental impacts on surrounding communities and would undermine Government objectives to reuse brownfield sites ahead of greenfield locations. Option 2 (increase the provision of affordable housing required on sites which exceed the qualifying site size threshold), supported by a criteria based policy to allow affordable housing exceptions sites, has been carried forward into the Draft Local Plan and Pre-Submission Local Plan.

The Draft Local Plan and Pre-Submission Local Plan reflect an area-based approach to housing density.

On Lifetime Homes, the Council incorporated Option 3 (high targets on specific sites) in the Draft Local, despite Option 1 (use building requirements for the provision of lifetimes) being preferred by most respondents. However from the Pre Submission Local Plan this was removed as Lifetime Homes will be addressed through Building Regulations.

The Pre Submission Local Plan contains a strategic policy on retail, which amongst other requirements supports the role of Swadlincote Town Centre. The Local Plan Part 2 will contain further retail policies

With regard to the means by which infrastructure should be funded, Option 4 (introduce Community Infrastructure Levy and negotiate Section 106 contributions) is the District's preference, subject to viability testing. This was not the most popular option chosen by respondents, however changes to legislation in England and Wales which will stop Councils pooling contributions from more than five sites, which could potentially hamper the delivery of larger infrastructure items through S106.

“Your Neighbourhood: Talk to Us” Consultation (8th February -3rd May 2011)

Introduction

During 2011 the Coalition Government was beginning to make major changes to the planning system through the proposed Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework. The HMA Local Authorities therefore decided to proceed in a way which better supported localism. South Derbyshire District Council decided to divide the District up into 11 areas and put together a profile for each area. During 8 February to 3 May, 2011 these Area Profiles were published for consultation. The consultations sought members of the public and stakeholder's views on the whether they agreed with the Council's understanding of the issues facing each neighbourhood.

The Area Profiles and summary leaflet can be found [here](#) and consultee responses can be found [here](#).

Who was invited to be involved at this stage and how?

Different methods of public consultation were used to maximise community and stakeholder engagement in the process.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

The consultation methods used included the following:

- a) All organisations and individuals including statutory stakeholders, interest groups, developers, and agents and other individuals whose details were included on the LDF database were contacted by **letter** or **email** (where provided) to inform them of the upcoming consultation, where to find documentation on “Your Neighbourhood: Talk to Us”, and how to get involved. An enclosed sheet/attached document provided details of the dates, times and venues of the drop-in events; whilst a map on the reverse helped consultees identify which neighbourhood area they lived within, or closest to. In total approximately 2000 letters and emails were sent (Appendix C1 & C2).

An individual letter was sent to South Derbyshire's MP informing her of the upcoming consultation and South Derbyshire Councillors were emailed a copy of the letter sent to consultees included on the LDF database (Appendix C3 & C4). All South Derbyshire Parish Councils were sent hard copies of the Area Profile document, a summary leaflet, poster, an Area Profile map and technical appendices for the relevant neighbourhood area (Appendix C5).

Following the conclusion of the drop-in events, a follow up email was sent to inform consultees that the consultation events had now ended, however comments were still welcome until the 3th May 2011 (Appendix C6).

- b) Each **primary school** and **secondary school pupil** within the District received a letter (7,363 and 7,552 letters respectively) to inform parents of the upcoming consultation, indicating where to find the Area Profile documents and how to get involved (Appendix C7).
- c) **Flyers** advertising the consultation were distributed at all **Area Forums**. Area Forums were held on the 25 January, 2010 (Repton), 26 January, 2010 (Linton), 31 January, 2010 (Etwell), 1 February 2010 (Swadlincote), 1 February 2010 (Newhall and the 7 February 2010 (Melbourne) (Appendix C8).
- d) **Posters** were distributed to all Parish Councils, all South Derbyshire libraries, Derby City libraries, post offices and the Hatton Centre. A generic poster was created providing details on all the consultation events along with specific posters targeted to the 11 profile areas. These posters publicised the nearest consultation event (or, where relevant, two events) to the area in which the poster would be displayed (Appendix C9, C10, C11).
- e) A **banner** advertising “Your Neighbourhood: Talk To Us” was located on the South Derbyshire District Council's website homepage during the consultation period. A **hotlink** on this banner lead directly to the “Your Neighbourhoods: Talk to Us” page, which provided further information on the consultation, Area Profiles and a questionnaire to download.
- f) Area Profiles documents, specific to each of the 11 profile areas, were produced. Reference copies of these, summary leaflets, Area Profile maps and technical appendices were available to view at South Derbyshire and Derby City **libraries**.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- g) A paper **reference copy** of the “Your Neighbourhood: Talk To Us” documents was made available to view in South Derbyshire District Council’s Main Reception along with questionnaires.
- h) A **questionnaire** was produced which asked consultees whether they agreed with the District’s understanding of the issues facing their neighbourhood and what they thought their neighbourhood needs were, be it more affordable housing, new play areas or better community facilities etc. A copy of the questionnaire was distributed to all Parish Councils and was available at all South Derbyshire & Derby City (Mickleover, Sinfin, Derby Central, and Blagreaves) libraries. Details of consultation events and a digital version of the questionnaire were made available to download from the Council’s website (Appendix C12).
- i) **Drop-in events**, which numbered 13 in total, were held in various locations within South Derbyshire, with the aim of reaching as many different sections of the community as possible. The events included information panels explaining the purpose of the consultations, and explaining what was being sought in terms of feedback from the public and stakeholders. Reference copies of the Area Profiles and Conservation Area character statements were on display along with a map showing the areas’ main services and other points of interest. Attendees were invited to stick post-it notes on maps, with comments about their area. A summary leaflet and questionnaire were also made available to take away. A Powerpoint presentation specific to the area being consulted upon was displayed at each event (Appendix C13 & C14).

Planning officers attended the drop-in events to explain the purpose of the consultation and answer attendees’ questions.

The drop-in events took place at the following venues:

Community Area	Venue	Date	Time
Willington and Findern area	Findern Village Hall, Castle Hill, Findern	8 February, 2011, Tuesday	3.30pm – 7.30pm
Repton area	Repton Village Hall, Askew Grove, Repton	10 February, 2011, Thursday	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Melbourne area	Bill Shone Leisure Centre, Melbourne	15 February, 2011, Tuesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Hilton and north west area	Hilton Village Hall, Peacroft Lane, Hilton	22 February, 2011, Tuesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Stenson area	Stenson Field Primary School, Stenson Fields	24 February, 2011, Thursday	3pm – 7.30pm
Etwall area	Frank Wickham Hall, Portland Street, Etwall	2 March, 2011, Wednesday	3pm - 7.30pm
Etwall area	Mickleover Country Park Social Club, Merlin Way, Mickleover	4 March, 2011, Friday	3pm – 7.30pm
Hatton area	Hatton Centre, Station Road, Hatton	9 March, 2011, Wednesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Swadlincote area	Old Post Centre, High Street, Newhall	11 March, 2011, Friday	3pm - 7.30pm
Swadlincote area	Swadlincote Town Hall, The Delph, Swadlincote, DE11 9DA	15 March, 2011, Tuesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Southern Villages	Rosliston Village Hall, Main	17 March, 2011,	3.30pm –

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

area	Street, Rosliston	Thursday	7.30pm
Aston area	All Saints' Heritage Centre, Shardlow Road, Aston on Trent	22 March, 2011, Tuesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Woodville area	Woodville Youth Centre, Moira Road, Woodville	23 March, 2011, Wednesday	3pm – 7.20pm

Attendee numbers for each event can be found in Appendix G1.

- j) The consultation event was usually announced on **Twitter** on the day (Appendix C15).
- k) Details of the drop in events were advertised in the **Community Voluntary Service (CVS) newsletter**. CVS staff attended four consultation drop-in events (Findern, Hilton, Stenson and Swadlincote) to promote their services.
- l) The “Your Neighbourhood: Talk To Us” page on Council’s **website** provided a map of South Derbyshire showing the profile areas. Each profile area has its own webpage containing an Area Profile document, summary leaflet, technical appendix and profile map. The consultation questionnaire was also made available to download and the drop-in events were advertised.
- m) Two **press releases** were published (31 January 2011, 24 February 2011) promoting the drop in events. A tailored press release was sent to the Melbourne Village Voice (April 2011) (Appendix C16, C17 & C18).
- n) An **article** explaining Localism, the Big Society and publicising the next round of consultation was published on the 6 February 2011 on the Burton Mail community page (Appendix C19). For the January edition of the Derbyshire First newspaper, an article was published on behalf of the Derby HMA authorities advertising the consultation (Appendix C20).
- o) The “Say No to Mickleover Sprawl” website publicised the Mickleover drop-in event (Appendix C21).
- p) On 26 January, 2011 an HMA-wide training event was held for Elected Members at Pride Park, Derby. The event covered changes to the plan-making context, an indicative work programme for the Local Plan and community engagement (Appendix C22, C23 & C24).
- q) On 14 April, 2011 discussions were held with the Local Strategic Partnership Sustainable Development Group regarding the consultation.
- r) In February, 2012 a Parish Liaison meeting was held to update Parishes on in Core Strategy progress (Appendix C25).
- s) Attending the Values and Attributes group in April 2011 to update them on the Core Strategy progress (Appendix C26)
- t) A **short URL code** was created for the District Council’s webpage, which contained information on the consultation.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

What were the main issues raised by respondents?

958 Individual comments were registered from 98 contributors during the consultation. The main issues raised were as follows:

- Across the District, respondents were relatively consistent in terms of the key things that they liked about their neighbourhood and what they would like to see preserved. Across the District residents valued the open and rural character of South Derbyshire's landscape, the character of villages; village life and the sense of community. Areas such as Repton and Melbourne were treasured for their historic character. In addition, access to services, facilities and the road network were mentioned by numerous residents.
- The aspects of South Derbyshire that respondents would like to see improved were more spatially varied. However issues raised in relation to large parts of the District included car parking provision, improvements to/additional footpaths and cycle links, improvements to existing local community facilities including recreational facilities and, predominantly in the rural areas, improvements to public transport. There was an aspiration for the provision of affordable housing in some parts of the District including the Etwall, Repton, Woodville, Willington and Findern and the Aston areas.
- Consultees were asked whether there was sufficient provision for leisure activities within their neighbourhood. There was a mixed response, some residents suggesting that there is enough to do and others identifying a need for additional or improved provision.. This mixed response applied to all the areas, with the exception of Hilton which received two responses to this question, both of which expressed satisfaction with the current range of provision. Appendix C27 provides further information on the responses to this question.
- Suggested improvements to local sport and leisure facilities, were specific to each profile area in questions. These can be found in appendix C27. It was however There was a widespread view that further sports activities/clubs were needed for children/teenagers.
- In response to the question 'what type of sport and leisure facility do you like?' a wide range of activities were stated. Most frequently mentioned among these was walking, which received 37 comments, followed by swimming, with 33 comments. The third most popular was cycling, with 20 comments, followed by tennis (10 comments); yoga (seven comments), badminton (six comments); football (five comments); gym (five comments); cricket (three comments) and gardening (three comments). Appendix C27 provides a table showing how many respondents from the 11 areas within South Derbyshire stated they liked each of the main sports/activities.
- Respondees gave reasons as to why they did not take part in sport and leisure activities. The main reasons given include age(10 comments); high costs (9 comments); time availability of activities/leisure facilities (4 comments); childcare responsibilities (4 comments); limited public transport (4 comments); distance (3 comments); lack of facilities (4 comments) and limited time/other commitments (4 comments). However, 34 responses indicated that nothing stopped them taking part in sport and leisure activities. Appendix C27 provides a table showing how many respondents from the 11 areas within

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

South Derbyshire stated which factor restricts them from taking part in sport and leisure activities.

- Across the 11 neighbourhood areas a range of community facilities and services were identified as being in need of improvement. Across large parts of the District these included improvements to bus services, medical services and local shops. Suggested improvements to community facilities or services within the 11 areas can be found in appendix C27.

A full summary of representations received for each Profile Area can be found in Appendix C27.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The consultation provided the District Council with a broad understanding of the issues facing each of the 11 profile areas and these were taken into consideration when determining housing and employment allocations.

The premise of the 11 areas of the District was incorporated into the Draft Local Plan. Area based chapters were created which provided an overview of the area in question, objectives for the area over the plan period, and policy for the area to help achieve the objectives. The policy within the area based chapters included: the amount and location of strategic housing and employment development; any opportunities to enhance the environment and leisure, recreation and tourism; any alterations to the greenbelt and; improvement to transport within the area over the plan period.

In producing the Pre-Submission Local Plan Part 1, it was considered that the Planning for Places section comprising the 11 area based chapters, would sit more logically in the Local Plan Part 2, rather than the Part 1. The Local Plan Part 2 will include non-strategic sites to meet comparatively smaller scale development needs and will propose any detailed amendments to settlements and Green Belt boundaries.

Consultation on Options for Housing Growth (12 July – 30 September 2011)

Introduction

During 2011 the Localism Act was being proposed and it was expected that the rigid regional targets setting out the amount of new homes to be built within the East Midlands Regional Plan was to be abolished. The Council therefore needed to consider afresh how much development should take place in the Derby Housing Market Area up to 2028 and where it should be located. In July 2011 the Council published 'Options for Housing Growth' to consult on this matter. The consultation was carried out from the 12 July 2011 to 30 September 2011.

The Options for Housing Growth document can be found on the Council's website [here](#) and consultee responses can be found [here](#).

Who was invited to be involved at this stage and how?

Different methods of public consultation were used to maximise community and stakeholder engagement in the process.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

The consultation methods used included the following:

- a) All organisations and individuals, including statutory stakeholders, interest groups, developers and agents on the LDF consultation database were contacted by letter or email (where provided) to inform consultees of the consultation, where to find the Options for Housing Growth document and how to get involved. A black and white copy of a poster was enclosed/attached, together with information regarding the dates, times and venues of the upcoming drop in events. In total 1,069 **letters** and 779 **emails** were sent (appendix D1 & D2).

All South Derbyshire's Councillors, Parish Councils and South Derbyshire's MP were informed of the consultation either by letter or email (appendix D3, D4 & D5).

A follow up email was sent to those on the LDF database on the 23 September 2011, reminding consultees of the consultation closing date (appendix D6).

- b) Each **primary school pupil** within the District received a letter (7,363 letters in total) to inform parents of the upcoming consultation, where to find the document and how to get involved (appendix D7).
- c) **Posters** advertising the dates and locations of the drop in events were distributed to all Parish Councils and were displayed on notice boards at the Delph and High Street, Swadlincote (appendix D8).
- d) 200 **flyers** advertising the dates and locations of the drop in events were distributed to members of the public at the Festival of Leisure on the 25-26 June 2011 (the flyers were an A5 version of the poster).
- e) Flyers advertising the consultation were distributed at the first three **Area Forums** during the consultation, after this, summary leaflets were circulated. At all Area Forums a statement was read out under 'Chair Announcements' explaining the consultation and to refer to the flyers/leaflets for more information. The Area Forums were held on 5 July 2011 (Linton), 14 July 2011 (Repton), 9 July 2011 (Melbourne), 26 July 2011 (Etwall), 27 July 2011 (Newhall) and 28 July 2011 (Swadlincote).
- f) A reference copy of the main document, posters advertising the drop in events and copies of the questionnaire were distributed to all South Derbyshire **Libraries** and libraries at Sinfin, Blagreaves Lane (Littleover) and Mickleover.
- g) A paper **reference copy** of the Options for Housing Growth document was available to view in South Derbyshire District Council's main reception along with questionnaires to complete.
- h) A **questionnaire** was produced which asked consultees their thoughts on the amount of housing required within the District and broad locations for housing development. A paper copy of the questionnaire was available at all South Derbyshire Libraries, and consultation events. An electronic copy of the questionnaire was available to download from the Council's website and was available to complete online. The Options for Housing Growth document contained a link to the District's online consultation system. When consultees clicked on the text contained in each question on page 17 of the document,

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

consultees could submit their comments online, once registered (appendix D9).

- i) **Drop in events**, which numbered 16 in total, were held in various locations within South Derbyshire with the aim of reaching as many different sections of the community as possible. The exhibitions included information panels explaining: the reason for the consultations, why more housing is needed within South Derbyshire, four possible growth options and potential distributions of future housing growth. Reference copies of the main document were on display along with a coloured A3 summary leaflet and questionnaires, which consultees could take away with them. Members of the planning policy team were at the events to talk through the consultation document and answer any questions members of the public and other stakeholders may have (appendix D10 & D11). A PowerPoint presentation relevant to the area in which the drop in event was being held, was repeated on loop.

The drop in events took place at the following venues:

Venue	Date	Time
Findern Village Hall, Castle Hill, Findern	12 July 2011, Tuesday	3.30pm – 7.30pm
Frank Wickham Hall, Portland Street, Etwall	13 July 2011, Wednesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Repton Village Hall, Askew Grove, Repton,	14 July 2011, Thursday	2.30pm – 7.00pm
Swadlincote Town Hall, The Delph, Swadlincote,	15 July 2011, Friday	10am – 2.30pm
Mickleover Country Park Social Club, Merlin Way, Mickleover	15 July 2011, Friday	3.30pm – 7.30pm
The Mease Pavilion, off The Mease Hilton	18 July 2011, Monday	6pm – 7.30pm
Bill Shone Leisure Centre, High St, Melbourne	19 July 2011, Tuesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Woodville Youth Centre, Moira Road, Woodville	20 July 2011, Wednesday	3pm – 7.30pm
All Saints' Heritage Centre, Shardlow Road, Aston on Trent	21 July 2011, Thursday	3pm – 7.30pm
Sinfin Moor Social Club, Arleston Lane, Stenson Fields	26 July 2011, Tuesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Rosliston Forestry Centre, Rosliston	27 July 2011, Wednesday	12pm – 5pm
Rosliston and Cauldwell Village Hall, Main Street, Rosliston	27 July 2011, Wednesday	6pm-7.30pm
Hilton Village Hall, Peacroft Lane, Hilton	1 August 2011, Monday	3pm – 7.30pm
Hatton Centre, Station Road, Hatton	3 August 2011, Wednesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Old Post Centre, High Street, Newhall	4 August 2011, Thursday	3pm – 7.30pm
Swadlincote Library, Civic Way, Swadlincote	9 August 2011, Tuesday	3pm – 7pm

Details on the number of people who attended each drop in event can be found in Appendix G1.

- j) The consultation events were usually announced on **Twitter** on the day of the consultation (appendix D12).

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- k) The Planning Policy Manager undertook a **radio** interview on Touch FM on 25 July 2011, with the aim of informing listeners of the consultation.
- l) Two **press releases** were published (7 July 2011 & 21 July 2011) detailing the consultations and listing the drop in events (appendix D13 & D14).
- m) Specific **press releases** written for local magazines were sent in time to advertise the local drop in event(s). The press releases were sent to the following local magazines: Hilton and Dove Valley Life; Repton magazine; Hatton News; Etwall Express; Melbourne Village Voice and Willington magazine (appendix D15, D16, D17, D18, D19 & D20). The Council also posted on mickleoverpeople.co.uk (appendix D21) and Hilton South Derbyshire Village Forum regarding Mickleover and Hilton consultation events.
- n) An **article** explaining and publicising the Options for Housing Growth consultation was published on the 2 July 2011 on the **Burton Mail community page** (appendix D22).
- y) **A Banner** advertising the consultation was uploaded to South Derbyshire District Council's website from the 12 July 2011 throughout the 'drop in stage' of the consultation period (appendix D23). **A hotlink** on this banner took consultees directly to the Options for Housing Growth webpage, which provided further information on the consultation, and contained the main document and questionnaire to download.
- o) Details of drop in events were advertised on the **Community Voluntary Service (CVS) blog and newsletter**. CVS staff were invited to attend events, however were unable to do so due to staffing constraints.
- p) Drop in events were publicised on the Derby Housing Market Area website from the 8 July 2011, the additional event at Swadlincote Library was later added to the HMA website (8/07/2011).
- q) On the 21 July 2011 (9.30-11.30am) the Derby HMA local authorities held a consultation event at Pride Park Stadium, Derby. The HMA invited representatives from the business community and other key stakeholders across the HMA to provide consultees with an opportunity to comment on how the HMA was taking forward planning and localism over the coming months. The event included a PowerPoint presentation on the authorities' aligned core strategies and provided different scenarios on the amount of new housing required across the HMA and where it should be located. This was followed by a question and answer session (appendix D24).
- r) Drop in events were publicised on **South Derbyshire District Council website**, once the subsequent event at Swadlincote Library was booked, the website was updated to include this addition. The Options for Housing Growth document along with the questionnaire was also available to view online from the Councils website
- s) Member training was undertaken on the 25 May 2011, which included a presentation on The Options for Housing Growth consultation which was forthcoming at the time.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- t) A presentation was given to the Sustainable Development Partnership, Sustainable Development Group on the 18 July 2011 regarding this consultation and the Local Plan (appendix D25).
- u) **Parish Council Training** was undertaken in May 2012. A PowerPoint presentation was given to parish councils on the planning application process, the local plan progress and stages, the introduction of Localism, the NPPF and Duty to Cooperate (appendix D26).
- v) A Derby HMA Housing Requirement Study **stakeholder workshop** was held on the 6th March 2012 (appendix D27).
- w) A Derby HMA Local Development Framework **newsletter** was published in February 2012 regarding South Derbyshire District Council and Derbyshire's County Council webpage. The newsletter provided an overview on the Government's localism reforms to the planning system, headline results to the Options for Growth consultation and a timetable for the HMA Core Strategy publication (appendix D28).
- x) A **short URL code** was created for the District Council's webpage, which contained information on the Options for Housing Growth consultation.

What were the main issues the representations raised?

734 individual comments were registered from 107 contributors during the consultation. The main issues raised were as follows:

- A clear divide was received between developers and residents on the amount of housing that should be provided within the District. The majority of local residents wanted as a maximum 'balanced migration (30,000 per annum) or lower, whilst the majority of developers/agents suggested higher levels of growth, scenario 3 (Regional Plan Targets) and scenario 4 (Government Projections).
- A mix of opinion was received on whether the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) housing figure was the most acceptable housing figure to take forward into the local plan or whether the ONS figures should be used. Those that were in support of the RSS figure state that the figure has been subject to background evidence and examination in public. However concern has been raised as to whether the figure is out of date, as at the time the Government projections were new and some suggested offer a more reliable source of information for housing need. It was also suggested that the ONS figures complies with the Governments pro-growth agenda, therefore using this figure would help the local plan be in line with emerging policy and legislation.
- Mixed views were received on the distribution of new housing within the Derby HMA. Option 2 (a greater role for other towns) received the most support, followed by option 1 (concentrating most development in and adjoining Derby). Option 3 (a greater role for rural settlements) was the third most popular option and Option 4 (new settlement) received the least support. Numerous negative comments regarding a new settlement were received.
- Widespread agreement was received from consultees on the redevelopment of brownfield land within Derby City. However there was a split between

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

developers and residents on whether 10,000 new homes could be delivered in Derby City between 2008-2028. Residents were in the main of the opinion that this could be achieved, whereas developers/agents raised concern about this. Reasons given for this concern include: brownfield sites have viability issues (for example through previous contamination of sites), other uses such as leisure may develop on brownfield sites, cannot assume that all sites identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will be delivered within the 15 year period.

- As a generalisation developers submitted comments in support of urban extensions, while there was not large support from urban extensions from residents. A range of locations for urban extensions were suggested by consultees. The locations which were suggested more than once include: Mickleover, the north side of the A50) and developing to the south west of the city. Locations which should be avoided were also suggested. Development in and around the Mickleover area received the most opposition followed by the Stenson Field, Sinfin area. Other locations also received support and opposition; these can be found in appendix D29.
- The majority of responses received do not agree with identifying sites for development within the Green Wedge and Green Belt. However some locations for development within the Green Wedge and Green Belt were suggested, these suggestions can be found in appendix D29.
- Regarding development within Swadlincote the majority of responses were positive; however some negative comments disagreeing with further housing development were received. Locations suggested for housing development within Swadlincote include, Woodville area, Cadley Hill and Church Gresley Industrial Estate.
- The majority of responses received were positive in regards to development - taking place within villages. Reasons given for this included: keeping communities alive, schools growing and making areas more capable of supporting local services. Specific villages were suggested for development. These suggestions can be seen in appendix D29. Comments were however received which disagree with development in villages. Reasons given for this include, rural areas have had enough new development; it's vital to preserve villages; development in villages will result in longer car journeys to employment.
- The idea of a new settlement was not a preferred option for most respondents. Specific locations for a new settlement were however suggested, these locations included, Drakelow Power Station, expansion of Hilton, east of Nottingham, between Hatton and Hilton, north west Derby, north of Derby, west of Swadlincote, between Repton and Swadlincote, expansion to Heatherton village and Findern to re-join with its local school.
- Highway improvements were the most suggested key investments required in communities, followed by the provision of leisure and recreational facilities, open space provision and school provision. Specific locations where these requirements are necessary were suggested. These can be seen in appendix D29. Locations for housing development were also suggested in response to key investments requirements.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

A full summary of representations received from this consultation can be found in appendix D29.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Due to the mixed response received from consultees on the amount of housing that should be provided within the Derby HMA, it was decided that the Derby HMA needed to commission work to determine a precise Derby HMA housing figure based on robust evidence. It was considered that due to the upcoming abolishment of the East Midlands RSS, the RSS figure could not be brought forward into the Local Plan unless evidence proved otherwise. The Housing Requirement Study was commissioned, and provided the evidence base and housing figure which the Derby HMA consulted upon within its Preferred Growth Strategy consultation.

Regarding the location of proposed housing development within the Derby HMA and South Derbyshire, the majority of its housing sites proposed within its Preferred Growth Strategy, Draft Local Plan and Pre Submission Local Plan are around the edge of Derby City, followed by housing development within Swadlincote. This is despite receiving opposition from residents to urban extensions; conversely however, in general urban extensions received support from developers. The majority of responses favoured a greater role for other towns regarding the distribution of new housing, followed closely by support for option 1 – concentrating most development in and adjoining Derby. It is important to accommodate housing needs which arise as a result of South Derbyshire's proximity to Derby City; therefore the District proposes a significant proportion of its housing need physically adjacent to the City of Derby.

Further work was undertaken after this consultation to determine the preferred and non-preferred housing sites within South Derbyshire's Preferred Growth Strategy and housing allocations within the Draft Local Plan and Pre Submission Local Plan.

Development within some villages within South Derbyshire is proposed within the District's Draft Local Plan and Pre Submission Local Plan. Care has been taken to allocate sites which will not detrimentally affect the character of the villages.

In regards to development taking place within the Green Belt, the District Council decided to submit Boulton Moor Phase 3 as a preferred site within its Preferred Growth Strategy and proposed allocation within its Draft Local Plan and Pre Submission Local Plan, notwithstanding that the majority of responses to this consultation did not agree with identifying sites within the Green Belt. The District Council made this decision based on evidence and the NPPF. The NPPF states that changes to the Green Belt boundary can occur through the preparation or review of the Local Plan in exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt study 2012 (Technical Assessment of the Derby Principal Urban Area Green Belt Purposes) states the construction of the A50 and the A6 now forms a physical feature in the landscape and the area now bounded by London Road and A6 spur is landlocked and does not contribute to the openness of the Green belt. The study suggests that there is opportunity to consider whether the Green Belt boundaries in this location could be amended through minor changes and states that the land to the south west of Thulston "now appears to preforms a Green belt role and could therefore be incorporated into it."

Following the Options for Housing Growth consultation, the idea of a new settlement within South Derbyshire was not progressed any further.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Further work was undertaken on the highway improvements required to help mitigate any significant transport implications caused by development. These highway improvements were consulted upon in the Preferred Growth Strategy and the Draft Local Plan.

Consultation on Preferred Growth Strategy (October – 21 December 2012)

Introduction

The next stage of the process was for the District Council to produce a Preferred Growth Strategy for South Derbyshire. The document sought to expand on and address issues raised in previous consultations and included:

- spatial vision and spatial objectives for South Derbyshire
- the amount of new housing needed within the District
- the location of preferred and non preferred strategic sites to deliver housing development
- the location of two potential strategic employment sites
- how we should deal with the Nottingham – Derby Green Belt.

Consultation on the Preferred Growth Strategy ran from October 2012 until 21 December 2012. The Preferred Growth Strategy document can be found on the Council's website [here](#) and responses to the consultation can be found [here](#).

Who was invited to be involved at this stage and how?

Different methods of public consultation were used to maximise community and stakeholder engagement in the process.

The consultation methods used included the following:

- a) All organisations and individuals on the LDF consultation database were contacted by **letter** or **email** (where provided), informing them of the consultation, how to find further information and how to make a representation. A black and white copy of a poster was also enclosed/attached which provided details of the dates, times and venues of the upcoming drop in events (appendix E1). In total 580 **emails** and 1,364 **letters** were sent.
- b) All South Derbyshire Councillors, Parish Councils, and South Derbyshire's MP were sent a hard copy of the Preferred Growth Strategy document, a questionnaire and a colour copy of a poster advertising the drop in events across the District (appendix E2). All Parish Councils were also posted a copy of the Preferred Growth Strategy document (appendix E3).

Two follow up emails were sent to those on the LDF database. The first was emailed on the 24 October 2012, with an attached updated poster, which included additional consultation events. The second was emailed on the 5 December 2012 informing consultees that the drop in events were coming to an end, but there was still time to comment (appendix E4 & E5). A follow up letter was also sent on the 24 October 2012 to Parish Councils with an updated poster, informing of the additional consultation events (appendix E6).

- c) **Flyers** advertising the dates and locations of the drop in events were distributed to those who attended South Derbyshire Area Forums at the time of the consultation (appendix E7).

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- d) **Posters** with dates and locations of the drop in events were distributed to all Parish Councils, and all South Derbyshire libraries and libraries at Burton upon Trent and Derby Central (see appendix E8).
- e) A reference copy of the main document, a poster advertising the drop in events, copies of the questionnaire and summary leaflets were distributed to all **South Derbyshire Libraries** and libraries at Burton upon Trent and Derby Central.
- f) A paper **reference copy** of the PGS was available to view in South Derbyshire District Council's main reception along with questionnaires to complete.
- g) An advert regarding the Preferred Growth Strategy was added to a rolling presentation on the **screens** within South Derbyshire District Council **main reception**, during the consultation period (appendix E9).
- h) A **banner** advertising the Preferred Growth Strategy was uploaded onto South Derbyshire District Council's website homepage during the consultation period. A **hotlink** on this banner took you directly to the Preferred Growth Strategy webpage which provided further information on the consultation (appendix E10).
- i) **Questionnaires** were produced which asked consultees their thoughts on the PGS. The questionnaires were available at all drop in events, all South Derbyshire Libraries, and a copy was posted to all Parish Councils. The questionnaire was also available to download from the Council's website and available to complete online through Survey Monkey. The link to which could be accessed from the Preferred Growth Strategy webpage (appendix E11).
- m) The District undertook 14 **drop in events** across South Derbyshire with the aim of reaching as many different sections of the community as possible. Derby City Officers attended three of these events at locations, which are in close proximity to the boundary of Derby City (Aston on Trent, Stenson Fields Primary School and Mickleover Country Park). South Derbyshire Officers also attended two consultation events organised by Derby City at locations, which again are in close proximity to the boundary of South Derbyshire (Chellaston Academy and Littleover Methodist Church). This ensured that those residents/consultees within South Derbyshire and Derby City who live/work in close proximity to the boundary of the two authorities were informed of both authorities PGS and had an opportunity to talk to officers at both authorities.

The exhibitions included information panels explaining the purpose of the consultation, proposed scale of housing development, maps showing the Council's preferred and non-preferred locations of housing development and potential employment sites (appendix E12). Reference copies of the main document were on display along with copies of a coloured A3 summary leaflet (appendix E13) and questionnaire, which consultees could take away with them. Members of the planning policy team were at the consultation events to talk through the PGS and answer any questions members of the public and other stakeholders may have.

Letters to the parents of pupils attending primary and secondary schools within the District were not distributed as part of the Preferred Growth Strategy consultation; the letters distributed during the previous two

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

consultations had yielded no notable increase in either the turnout at drop in events or in the number of representations received.

Once the consultation had begun it was apparent from feed back from members of the public and local councillors that there was demand for additional consultation events in three locations within the District, given the importance of the proposed consultation to the future of South Derbyshire. Three additional events were added at Newhall, Church Gresley and Elavston once the consultation was underway.

Information regarding the additional events were uploaded onto the District Council's website, emails informing those on the LDF database of the additional drop in events were sent and updated posters were sent to Parish Councils (appendix E14).

No time extension for the consultation was demanded due to the additional drop in events being organised early on in the consultation process, allowing sufficient time to advertise the events and for consultees to comment after the last drop event at Elvaston on the 6 December 2012.

The drop in events took place at the following venues:

Venue	Date	Time
Frank Wickham Hall, Portland Street, Etwall,	15 October 2012, Monday	3pm – 7.30pm
Hilton Village Hall, Peacroft Lane, Hilton	17 October 2012, Wednesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Swadlincote Market, High Street, Swadlincote	19 October 2012, Friday	10am - 2.00pm
Swadlincote Market, High Street, Swadlincote	20 October 2012, Saturday	10am – 2.00pm
Hatton Centre, Station Road, Hatton	22 October 2012, Monday	3.15pm - 7.30pm
All Saints' Heritage Centre, Shardlow Road, Aston on Trent	23 October 2012, Tuesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Littleover Methodist Church (<i>Joint Derby City Event</i>)	1 November 2012, Thursday	3.30pm - 7.30pm
Old Post Centre, High Street, Newhall	5 November 2012, Monday	3pm – 7.30pm
Stenson Fields Primary School, Heather Close, Stenson Fields, Derby	7 November 2012, Wednesday	4pm - 7.30pm
Findern Village Hall, Castle Hill, Findern	9 November 2012, Friday	3pm – 7.30pm
Woodville Youth Centre, Moira Road, Woodville	12 November 2012, Monday	4pm – 7.30pm
Mickleover Country Park Social Club, Merlin Way, Mickleover	14 November 2012, Wednesday	3pm – 7.30pm
Melbourne Assembly Rooms	16 November 2012, Friday	3pm-7.30pm
Church Rooms, adjacent to St George and St Mary's Church, Church Street, Church Gresley	19 November 2012, Monday	3pm – 7.30pm

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

Chellaston Academy (<i>Joint Derby City Event</i>)	21 November 2012, Wednesday	3.30-7.30pm
Elvaston Village Hall	6 December, Thursday	3pm-7.30pm

Details on the number of people who attended each drop in event can be found in Appendix G1.

- n) The summary leaflets and notice boards used at the consultation events incorporated a **QR code**, which when scanned with a smart phone, took you directly to the District Council webpage with information on the Preferred Growth Strategy (PGS). The QR code was used 30 times during the consultation.
- o) The drop in events were announced on **Twitter** on the day of the consultation and tweets were made throughout the drop in events with how the events were progressing, consultees' views on the PGS and quotes from planning officers. If consultees tweeted a question, planning officers sought to respond swiftly. During the course of the 16 consultation events, more than 600 tweets covering a diverse range of subjects were sent out, with a quarter retweeted to 34,340 more followers. (Appendix 13 provides a case study of the social media used by Northgate Public Services to promote the Preferred Growth Strategy.)
- p) A **short URL code** was created for the District Council's webpage, which contained information on the Preferred Growth Strategy. This URL code was used 665 times during the consultation.
- q) **Press realises** targeted to specific media outlets were sent to Etwall Express, Hatton News, Hilton Dove Valley Magazine, Melbourne Village Voice, Repton Parish Magazine, Walton Newsletter, Willington Resource 2012 and Derbyshire First (appendix E15 - 23). Five further press releases regarding the Preferred Growth Strategy were sent to those on the South Derbyshire's press mailing list on the 10 October 2012, 12 October 2012, 21 September 2012 and 7/December 12 (appendix E24-28).
- r) **Articles** regarding the PGS were published in the Melbourne Village Voice (November 2012), Swadlincote Post (30 November 2012), and Derby Telegraph Online (14 November 2012), all of which can be found in appendix E29 to E31.
- s) An **HMA stakeholder event** took place at Derby County Stadium on the 17/10/2012. The event was particularly aimed at infrastructure and utility providers, house builders and housing associations. Appendix E32 provides a list of stakeholders who attended the event.

The event was split into two sections. The first section welcomed the stakeholders to the event and a planning policy officer from each HMA Authority presented each authorities preferred employment and housing sites and how the sites connect on a HMA wide basis. A0 maps showing the Authorities preferred housing and employment sites were on display at the event.

The second section of the event provided stakeholders with the opportunity to discuss the PGS and any concerns they may have with planning officers on a one to one basis.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

This structure was then repeated in the afternoon, with further stakeholders attending the afternoon session.

- t) The Planning Policy Manager attended **Chellaston Neighbourhood Forum**. A verbal presentation was given on the PGS followed by a question and answer session on the proposals.
- u) An event was organised to discuss **Western Power Distribution's** capacity to accommodate the preferred sites within Derby City, Amber Valley and South Derbyshire. Planning officers from each Authority and Western Power Distribution attended the event and discussed this issue.
- v) During the consultation period the **Local Plan Blog** was updated to provide further information on the PGS. The Blog could be accessed from the PGS page on the District Council's website. The Blog included a video (of the Planning Policy Manager) explaining the District's PGS, an update on how the consultation events were progressing, a PowerPoint presentation on the PGS (available to view online or download), an electronic copy of the PGS document to view online, a link to the questionnaire, a table showing the dates and locations of the consultations, contact information and pictures from consultation events. Through the Blog we sought stakeholder's views, ideas and questions on the proposed local plan and responded to questions posted on the Blog. During the consultation period the Blog was viewed 3,580 times. Appendix E33 provides a copy of the content of the Blog during the consultation period.
- w) A presentation was given to the **Local Strategic Partnership, Sustainable Development Group in November 2012** on the PGS (appendix E34).
- x) **Member workshops** were undertaken to update South Derbyshire Members of the progress of the LDF and inform on the PGS.
- y) The video was uploaded onto **You Tube** which discussed the District's Preferred Growth Strategy (appendix E35).
- z) On 23 November 2012, GL Hearn held a **workshop session** to share their draft findings on employment land requirements with a Project Steering Group comprising local authority officers, land agents and development interests.

What were the main issues the representations raised?

Around 1500 Individual comments were registered from 197 Contributors during the consultation. The main issues raised were as follows?

- A mixed response was received on whether consultees agreed with the Preferred Growth Strategy vision. Further analysis of the responses regarding the vision can be found in Appendix E36.
- A controversial issue was the scale of distribution proposed: 33,700 dwellings in the Derby HMA and 12,700 dwellings across South Derbyshire. There were numerous responses that questioned the proposed housing figure for the Derby HMA and South Derbyshire's appointment. In general the majority of residents considered that the scale of growth proposed would be too large for South Derbyshire, whereas developers and planning consultants suggest that

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

the proposed housing figures (for the HMA and South Derbyshire) should be increased further. A group of planning consultants and associated clients led by Pegasus Planning jointly produced a critique of the Housing Requirements Study and concluded that an HMA figure of 54,482 dwellings would be more appropriate up to 2028.

- Positive and negative responses were received for all of South Derbyshire's preferred and non-preferred housing sites. The two sites which received the most comments were Wragley Way and Church Street. The main concerns for Wragley Way are the quantity of housing proposed together with concerns for the existing road infrastructure, including the country lanes that run south from the site. With regards to Church Street, the main concerns raised were where the access points to the site would be, the loss of greenfield land and concern from existing residents of the present drainage problems. A summary of the responses received for each preferred and non-preferred site can be found in appendix E36.
- Regarding housing development one of the main issues raised was the lack of capacity within schools, particularly within secondary schools and sites which may affect John Port, Chellaston Academy and Sinfin Moor Community School.
- Whether the existing road infrastructure is able to cope with the proposed housing and employment development was another issue regularly mentioned by respondents and what the possible mitigation might be.
- It was apparent from the responses that there was some confusion over the meaning of the Government's policy of 'safeguarding' Green Belt land. As a result, it was difficult to draw a definitive conclusion from the responses received. The majority of the public however suggest that the land should not be safeguarded for development and should instead continue to be protected as Green Belt. The main reasons given for this include: leaving the land for agriculture use, Green Belt land is required to prevent urban sprawl and protect the character of villages, and that developing a site within the Green Belt would affect wildlife.

There were however some members of the public who agreed with safeguarding Green Belt land for development. A mixed response was also received from developers and agents on this matter.

- The majority of responses received agree that land should be allocated for strategic employment purposes south of the Global Technological Cluster at Sinfin Moor and a northwards extension of the Dove Valley Park. Some of the reasons for agreement on this matter include: further employment is necessary, the region is already being used for employment purposes, Dove Valley Park has good links to major roads, the Global Technology Cluster is close to the existing population and infrastructure and the proposed A50 junction would be useful to this development.

However comments of opposition were also received for both allocations. Some of the main reasons for the objections to the proposed allocations include: the impact on the area and traffic being too large and putting strain on local resources. There was also some concern about the proposal at Dove

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Valley Park, given its scale, the fact that the location is rural, and the effect it would have in the area.

A full summary of representations received for this consultation can be found in appendix E36.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

As discussed the scale of housing proposed was a controversial issue, with most residents considering the number to be too high and most consultants/developers considering the number to be too low. Further work was undertaken by GL Hearn on the Derby HMA housing requirement (Housing Requirement Study). This work took into account the most recent Government projections. The additional work produced a slightly higher HMA housing requirement (35,354) than the 33,700 stated with the PGS and is considered to be based on a robust and sound evidence base. This housing requirement was then distributed across the three Derby HMA authorities, which increased South Derbyshire's housing requirement to 13,454. The updated housing requirement for the Derby HMA and South Derbyshire's provision was carried forward into the Draft Local Plan and Pre Submission Local Plan.

Due to the increase in housing figure for South Derbyshire (as a result of the increased HMA housing requirements), additional housing sites were required to meet this requirement. Some of the additional sites proposed within the Draft Local Plan were non preferred sites within the PGS and have received some negative comments in regards to development from previous consultations including the PGS. It is considered however, that the chosen sites are the most sustainable for development out of the options available to the Authority.

Regarding lack of capacity within schools, further joint working between South Derbyshire, Derby City and the Education Authorities for the City and the County has been undertaken to help determine where additional school capacity or new schools could be suitably located, to ensure that there is sufficient school capacity to cater for the number of pupils arising from the proposed housing allocations.

With regard to concern that road infrastructure would be unable to cope with future employment and housing development, further joint working between South Derbyshire, Derbyshire County Council, Derby City and the Highways Agency was initiated to determine the likely impacts and potential mitigation solutions. This on-going work has been used to identify the transport impacts and mitigation measures (for proposed development) within the Draft Local Plan and Pre Submission Local Plan).

The principle, general extent and permanence of Green Belt within South Derbyshire is supported, subject to small scale alterations to reflect existing development on the ground (removal of Boulton Moor Phase 3 site from the Green Belt and the inclusion of a 13ha piece of land to the south west of Thulston into the Green Belt), to reflect development which has taken place since the adoption of the Green Belt in 1983.⁴ A Technical Assessment of the Derby Principal Urban Area Green Belt states that construction of the A50 and the A6 now forms a physical feature in the landscape and the area now bounded by London Road and A6 spur is landlocked and does not contribute to the openness of the Green belt. The study suggests that there is

⁴ This alteration was/proposed within the Draft Local Plan and Pre Submission Local Plan.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

opportunity to consider whether the Green Belt boundaries in this location could be amended through minor changes. In addition the Pre Submission Local Plan proposed small scale changes to the Green Belt within the Local Plan Part 2, where anomalies exist since the adoption of the Green Belt and where more appropriate defensible boundaries can be made.

At this stage South Derbyshire will not safeguarding any Green Belt land. The NPPF states the general extent of 'Green Belts across the country is already established' and 'once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan'. The NPPF goes on to add that where necessary land can be safeguarded 'between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period'. It is considered that further evidence is required to justify the removal of Thulston Fields from the Green Belt.

Within the Draft Local Plan and Pre submission Local Plan land to the north of Dove Valley Business Park is identified for employment development in exceptional circumstances where the needs of a single large end-user cannot be met on any of the allocated employment sites and the land to accommodate the proposed Global Technology Cluster extension is safeguarded for employment development in the longer term, beyond the plan period. This approach will ensure that investment is not diverted away from the Global Technology Cluster within Derby City, whose successful delivery will be of critical importance to the future of Derby's economy.

The **workshop session** held by GL Hearn to share their draft findings on employment land requirements informed the Derby HMA Employment Land Review Forecasts Update, published in March 2013.

Consultation of the Draft Local Plan Part 1, Draft Sustainability Appraisal, Draft Consultation Statement, Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (September – 22nd November 2013)

Introduction

This consultation sought views on four consultation documents, the Draft Local Plan Part 1, Draft Sustainability Appraisal, Draft Consultation Statement and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

The Draft Local Plan Part 1 sought to expand upon and address issues raised in the Preferred Growth Strategy (PGS) consultation and included:

- Spatial vision and objectives for South Derbyshire.
- The amount of new housing needed for South Derbyshire and location of strategic sites to deliver housing development.
- The amount of new employment provision required in South Derbyshire and the location of sites to deliver this.
- Development Management Policies.

The Draft Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been prepared to accompany the Draft Local Plan Part 1, to adhere to the national and European legislation. The SA assesses the environmental, economic and social impacts of the Plan. Planning Authorities are required to consult upon their SA report before the Local Plan

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

submission. It was therefore necessary to add an additional stage of consultation after the PGS and before the Local Plan submission, to adhere to legislation.

The Draft Consultation Statement, outlines the consultations that have been undertaken, how we consulted and presents a summary of the main issues raised.

The Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan outlines the infrastructure that is required across the District and identifies the likely funding streams to implement it.

The Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation ran from the 27th September 2013 until 15th November 2013. Due to short delay in uploading the Draft Consultation Statement onto the Council's website, the consultation for this document was extended until the 22nd November 2013. The consultation documents can be found on the Council's website [here](#) and responses to the consultation can be found [here](#).

Who was invited to be involved at this stage and how?

Different methods of public consultation were used to maximise community and stakeholder engagement in the process, including:

- a) All organisations and individuals including; statutory stakeholders, interest groups, developers and agents and other individuals whose details were on the LDF consultation database, were contacted by letter or email (where provided) to inform them of the consultation, how to find further information and how to make representations. In total 1028 **emails** and 1596 **letters** were sent (appendix F1 and F2).

All South Derbyshire Parish Councils and Meetings were sent a hard copy of the Draft Local Plan Part 1 and Draft Infrastructure Deliver Plan (appendix F3, F4 and F5). The MP for South Derbyshire was also sent a letter which advised of the consultation. Paper copies of the Draft Sustainability Appraisal and Draft Consultation Statement were not sent to Parish Councils due to size of the documents. The documents were however, available to view on South Derbyshire District Council's website.

Unlike previous years, South Derbyshire Councillors did not receive a hard copy of the consultation documents. This was due to the provision of hand held electronic devices for Councillors to view documents online.

An additional email was sent to inform consultees that the deadline to submit comments on the Draft Consultation Statement had been extended from 15th November until 22nd November, due to a delay in uploading this document onto the website (appendix F6).

- b) **Posters** advertising the consultation were distributed to all Parish Councils and libraries (appendix F7 and 8).
- c) Posters, reference copies of the Draft Local Plan Part 1 and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan and questionnaires to take way, were distributed to all South Derbyshire **Libraries** and libraries located within: Burton upon Trent, Derby Central, Blagreaves Lane (Littleover), Mickleover, Alvaston, Borrowash, Sinfin and two mobile libraries.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- d) A paper **reference copy** of the Draft Local Plan Part 1 and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, summary leaflets and questionnaires to complete, were available at South Derbyshire District Council.
- e) During the consultation period, an advert regarding the Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation was added to a rolling presentation on the **screens**, within the Council Office's **main reception** (appendix F9).
- f) A **banner** advertising the Draft Local Plan Part 1 consultation was uploaded on the front (home) page of South Derbyshire District Council's website, during the consultation period. A **hotlink** on this banner took you directly to the Draft Local Plan Part 1 webpage, which provided further information on the consultation, contained the consultation documents and questionnaire to download (appendix F10).
- g) **Questionnaires** were produced which asked consultees about their thoughts on the consultation documents. The questionnaires were available at all drop in events, all South Derbyshire Libraries (and the other libraries listed above), the District Council's main reception and was available to download from the District Council's website. Consultees could also register and submit comments online.

It was brought to the planning policy team's attention on 22nd October 2013, that there was a discrepancy regarding question 4 between the paper questionnaire and the questionnaire available to download online. This matter was addressed on 23rd October 2013. The online questionnaire was replaced with a note on the front cover of the questionnaire regarding this issue. (appendix F11, F12 & F13)

On 23rd October 2013, 13 consultees had completed the online questionnaire, 11 of which had submitted comments regarding question 4. On 24th October 2013, each of the 13 consultees were emailed advising them of the discrepancy regarding question 4 and asked whether they wished to replace their comments that were made regarding this question. The altered question was included within the letter (appendix F14).

- h) Drop in events were publicised on the **District Council's website**, along with the consultation documents and the questionnaire, to view online or download (appendix F15).
- i) Fourteen **drop in events**, were held in various locations, with the aim of reaching different sections of the community. Members of the planning policy team were at the events to talk through the consultation and answer questions from members of the public and stakeholders.

The exhibitions included information panels explaining; the purpose of the consultation, proposed scale of housing development and employment provision, maps showing the Council's preferred locations of housing and employment sites and a brief explanation of the Draft Sustainability Appraisal, Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Draft Consultation Statement (appendix F16). Reference copies of the Draft Local Plan Part 1 and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan were on display, along with copies of a coloured

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

A3 summary leaflet (appendix F17) and questionnaire, which consultees could take away with them.

The drop in events took place at the following venues:

Venue	Date	Time
Church Rooms, adjacent to St George and St Mary's Church, Church Street, Church Gresley	Tuesday 1 st October	3.30pm - 6.30pm
Elvaston Village Hall	Thursday 3 rd October	3pm – 6pm
Old Post Centre, High Street, Newhall, DE11 0HX	Monday 7 th October	3.30pm – 6.30pm
All Saints Heritage Centre, Shardlow Road, Aston on Trent, DE72 2DH	Tuesday 8 th October	3.30pm - 6.30pm
Hatton Centre, Station Road, Hatton, DE65 5EH	Thursday 10 th October	3pm - 6pm
Repton Village Hall, Askew Grove, Repton , DE65 6GR	Monday 14 th October	3.30pm – 6.30pm
Swadlincote Town Hall, The Delph , Swadlincote	Tuesday 15 th October	3.30pm – 6.30pm
Hilton Village Hall, Peacroft Lane, Hilton, DE65 5GH	Wednesday 16 th October	3.30pm – 6.30pm
Frank Wickham Hall, Portland Street, Etwall, DE65 6JF	Thursday 17 th October	3.30pm – 6.30pm
Melbourne Assembly Rooms, High Street, Melbourne, DE73 8GF	Monday 21 st October	3.30pm - 6.30pm
Findern Village Hall, Castle Hill, Findern, DE65 6AL	Tuesday 22 nd October	3.30pm -6.30pm
Stenson Fields Primary School, Heather Close, Stenson Fields, Derby, DE24 3BW	Thursday 24 th October	4pm – 7pm
Woodville Youth Centre, Moira Road, Woodville, DE11 8DG	Thursday 31 st October	3.30pm - 6.30pm
Mickleover Country Park Social Club, Merlin Way, Mickleover, Derby, DE3 0UJ	Wednesday 6 th November	3.30pm - 6.30pm

- j) Details on the number of people who attended each drop in event can be found in appendix G1.
- k) South Derbyshire District Council issued two **press releases**, advertising the consultation and drop in events on 26th September 2013 (appendix F18 & F19).

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- l) An article publishing the Draft Local Plan Part 1 and the drop in events was published on 28th September 2013, in the Burton Mail (appendix F20).
- m) Flyers advertising the Draft Local Plan consultation were distributed at all Area Forums (Repton Area Forum 22nd October 2013, Linton Area Forum 24th October 2013, Etwall Area Forum 6th November 2013, Swadlincote Area Forum 12th November 2013, Melbourne Area Forum 13th November 2013 and Newhall Area Forum 14th November 2013 (appendix F21).
- n) A **short URL code** was created for the District Council's webpage, which contained information on the consultation.
- o) During the consultation period, the **Local Plan Blog** was updated to provide information on the Draft Local Plan consultation. The Blog could be accessed from the Draft Local Plan Part 1 page on the District Council's website. The Blog included a table showing the dates and locations of the consultations, contact information, a link to the questionnaire and copies of the exhibition boards used at the public exhibitions (appendix F22).

The Local Plan Blog was updated on 14th November 2013 to remind readers that the consultation was due to close soon.

During the consultation period, the Blog was viewed 488 times.

- p) The drop-in events were announced on **Twitter** on the day of the consultation (appendix F23).
- q) Infrastructure providers were invited to a **seminar** regarding South Derbyshire's Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 24th October 2013. Presentations were given on South Derbyshire's Draft Local Plan, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and CIL (appendix F24, F25, F26). A question and answer session followed, in which infrastructure providers could ask members of the planning policy team questions regarding any aspect of the Local Plan. The seminar gave infrastructure providers an opportunity to put forward their requirements and identify sources of funding. The information provided at the seminar was used to complete the South Derbyshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan and inform the charging schedule of the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy.
- r) During the consultation, the Planning Policy Manager undertook a radio interview, to talk through the Local Plan consultation.

What were the main issues the representations raised?

A total of 360 consultees responded to this consultation, raising around 1454 individual comments. All responses are available to view in summary at- <http://www.ldf.consultations.south-derbys.gov.uk/>

This report provides a summary of the responses received and is split into the questions asked in the Draft Local Plan questionnaire. Not every consultees response will be summarised below, however, the main responses received (generally comments which have been received more than once) have been grouped together.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Do you agree with the revised Vision for South Derbyshire?

A mixed response was received on the Draft Local Plan Vision. Amongst the responses, 44 consultees agreed with the Vision, or agreed and made further comment and 22 consultees broadly agreed with the Vision and made further comments.

The majority of consultees who agree with the Vision did not provide reasons for this, however, the reasons provided include the following:

- Fair balance of housing and employment opportunities.
- Probably best to spread the housing across South Derbyshire.
- It's important to maintain the character of villages and rural areas.
- Welcomed reference to the wealth of heritage assets within the District and the need for their protection and enhancement.
- Vision for sustainable growth, renewal and opportunity.

In comparison, 32 consultees disagreed with the vision. Reasons given for this include:

- Concern with the proposed amount of new housing development on green field land, which represents an unacceptable level of irreparable damage to the environment and surrounding countryside. The vision should consider the replacement and redeveloped of aging properties/housing stock.
- Too much impact on the environment.
- Brownfield sites should be given more attention.
- No consideration has been made to the diminishing of local amenities with an increased population.
- The proposed developments will not retain the historic heritage and distinctive character of South Derbyshire's towns, villages and hamlets.
- The vision does not refer to achieving an increase in jobs and/or economic development.

In addition, further comments were made which neither agree nor disagree with the Vision. These include the following:

- Further infrastructure and schooling provision is required.
- Prefer to see more commitment to re-using existing vacant land.
- People like to live near open spaces.
- Question whether the answer to the demand for more houses is just enlarge existing estates, before all the brownfield sites have been completed and rebuilt on.
- Against the use of green belt and agriculture land.
- There is an underlying concern that the need for houses is the overriding requirement, with resulting problems being justified and resolved later. Unless funding is available upfront for the missing essential infrastructure then simply putting more people into an area will not promote healthy and productive lives.
- Will require funding.
- The vision does not reflect the on-going infill in villages where any land that can be built on, is built on.
- Unsure why South Derbyshire have taken on extra requirements from Derby City when they have brownfield land available.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- Sport England support the reference to healthy and inclusive communities, but consider that sport facilities should be included in the list of services/facilities that local people will have access to.
- Greater emphasis should be made on the importance of potential sites within the Derby Urban Area.
- The most direct way to support Melbournes core shopping area is to increase the local customer base.
- What has happened to the concept of planned new “Garden Cites” or “Garden Communities”, if preferring to work on a more modest scale?

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

No amendments to the Vision for South Derbyshire have been made based on consultees comments. It is considered that the Vision either already contains certain aspects which consultees want included, or further details are provided within the Local Plan policies.

For example:

- The use of brownfield land, bringing disused buildings back into beneficial use and protecting heritage assets, are already contained within South Derbyshire’s Vision.
- The vision does not directly refer to achieving an increase in jobs and or economic development. However, it does provide a vision for South Derbyshire’s economy, which includes the economy growing with a more skilled workforce.
- Infill development within villages is contained within the Local Plans settlement hierarchy policy, the reasons for South Derbyshire providing for part of Derby City’s housing requirement is contained within the explanatory text of Policy S3.
- Provision of sports facilities is addressed within Policy I9.
- Infrastructure, such as schooling provision and the provision of facilities and services in association with housing development, is contained within policies of the Plan.

With regard to the comment received about Garden Cities: In a previous consultation, a question regarding whether the district should provide a new settlement was considered. The response from the consultation was not in support of this idea and therefore, not carried forward into the plan.

In addition, some comments provided were just statements, such as; will require funding, too much impact on the environment, people like to live near open spaces and against the use of Green Belt and agricultural land. The Council considers that it is not the Visions place to include these comments.

Do you agree with South Derbyshire’s Objectives?

A range of comments were received in regard to South Derbyshire’s Local Plan Objectives. 62 consultees agree or broadly agree, in comparison to 30 consultees who disagree with the objectives.

In regard to those consultees who disagree with the strategic objectives, no overriding reasons were provided for this. A few responses were received more than

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

once, however, on the main, reasons for disagreeing with the objectives were not provided.

Reasons for disagreeing with the strategic objectives, or suggested improvements which have been received more than once, include; the objectives are somewhat generic and should have a local focus, there should be an objective regarding the viability of schemes and the objectives should make reference to South Derbyshire's relationship with Burton on Trent, which could be addressed with an amendment to objective 13, or an additional 14th objective.

Individual responses received which disagree with the objectives/specific objectives, or suggest improvements include the following:

- The objectives are not clear.
- The objectives are "apple pie" statements.
- Objection to the lack of objective to secure an increase in jobs.
- There are several objectives that are not within the Council's power to directly influence.
- No consideration has been made to the diminishing of local amenities with an increasing local population.
- Like to see more provision for car free routes in to, and out of Derby City and its surrounding villages.
- Disappointing that there is no reference to the need to provide for, and seek to enhance the living conditions of disadvantaged groups.
- Could perhaps add aims for high standard education provision and to provide appropriate sites for gypsies and travellers.
- Objective 4 requires the addition of an environmental element, to ensure appropriate reference to the key elements of a comprehensive approach to sustainable development.
- Concerned that the strategic objectives do not really take into account the likely effects of climate change and global warming.
- They are strategic for South Derbyshire Council only.
- The strategic objectives should explicitly recognise the role of the area adjoining the Derby Urban area.
- Disagree with strategic objective 13.

In addition, a number of consultees question the Local Plans strategy/policies (including proposed housing allocations), to implement South Derbyshire objectives and suggest that some could be contrary to South Derbyshire objectives.

See appendix F27 for further details on the responses received regarding South Derbyshire strategic objectives.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Only two amendments to the objectives have been made in response to consultees representations.

In response to the consultees comments that the objectives are somewhat generic and should have a local focus, the objectives are strategic for the district and the Council considers that they have an adequate local focus for strategic objectives. To ensure that readers are aware that the objectives are strategic, the title of the Local Plan Objectives has been amended to Local Plan Strategic Objectives. In addition, the Local Plan will contain local objectives for the 11 areas of the district in the

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

planning for places chapter, which as previously discussed, has been removed from the Local Plan Part 1, however, will be included in Part 2 of the Local Plan.

Furthermore, a viability objective has been added in response to consultees comments that an objective regarding the viability of schemes should be included.

In regard to the other comments received, the Council considers that other amendments to the objectives do not need to be made. In some instances, the objectives already cover the aspects which the consultees consider should be included. For example, one consultee states that an objective should be included to secure an increase in jobs. However, an economic objective is already included "To enable, support and promote a robust and diverse economy". Another consultee suggests that objective four should include an environmental element, however, further objectives contain an environmental element.

In other instances, it is considered that consultees comments for the inclusion of particular objectives are covered by policies contained within the Local Plan Part 1 and do not need to be included as strategic objectives. Such as:

- Providing sites for gypsies and travellers, which is covered by a gypsy and travellers policy,
- The plans housing policies recognise the role of the area adjoining the Derby Urban Area
- The plan contains policies regarding energy efficiency and sustainable energy.
- The plan contains a policy promoting housing mix that is suitable and adaptable for different groups of people.
- The housing policies contain facilities/services to be provided alongside housing development.

The Council considers that South Derbyshire's strategy (including housing allocations) and policies are consistent with South Derbyshire's objectives.

Do you agree that the following sites should be allocated for housing development?

The suggested housing allocations received a mixed response. The Authority received the highest number of objections to the proposed allocation at Hackwood Farm, with 126 objections. Land south of Willington Road, Etwall received the second highest number of objections, with 23 objections, followed closely by Wragley Way with 20 objections.

The following table shows the number of consultees who showed support and objection to the proposed housing allocations.

Site	Yes	No
Boulton Moor Phase 2	3	5
Boulton Moor Phase 3	4	7
Chellaston Fields	3	7
Homleigh Way	4	5
Wragley Way	4	20
Primula Way	2	3
Stenson Fields	3	4
Hackwood Farm	2	126
Church Street	4	8

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

William Nadin Way	3	0
Broom Farm	3	5
North east Hatton	3	4
Hilton	3	13
Repton	5	8
Etwall	5	23
Aston	5	8
Other comments including Part 2 allocations	38	

See appendix F27 for further details on the responses received for each proposed housing allocation.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The Council considers that the proposed housing sites are the most suitable sites for strategic housing development, to achieve South Derbyshire's strategy for sustainable growth over the plan period. The proposed allocations within the Draft Local Plan Part 1 have been carried forward into the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1.

For changes made to the housing policies as a result of consultee responses to the Draft Local Plan Part 1, see below.

**Do you agree with identifying a reserve housing site within the Local Plan?
(Which reserve site would you prefer?)**

Only a few comments were received on the principle of a reserve site, with most comments offering either support or objection to individual potential reserve sites.

The majority of the responses received do not support a reserve site policy within the Local Plan. 158 consultees disagree, compared to 55 in support.

The below table provides details on the number of consultees who submitted representation in support and objection to the potential reserve sites.

Policy/Site	Yes	No
Reserve Site Policy	55*	158*
Lowes Farm, West Chellaston	12	10
Newhouse Farm, Mickleover	4	126
Woodville Regeneration Site	30	6

*Not all consultees stated that they agree or disagree with a particular reserve site. Therefore, the numbers of consultees which agree and disagree with a reserve site policy, do not tally with the number of consultees who agree or disagree with the three potential reserve sites.

See appendix F27 for further details on the responses received regarding reserve sites.

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Please see comments in relation to Housing Policy H22.

Do you agree with the proposed employment allocations?

The majority of responses received agree with the proposed employment allocations. 39 comments were received which support all employment allocations and in addition, responses were received which support individual employment allocations. The number of responses which agree and disagree with each site can be seen in the table below:

Employment Site	Number of consultees who agree with the employment site	Number of consultees who disagree with the employment site
Tetron Point (8ha)	2	0
Cadley Hill (8ha)	1	2
Land at Hilton (7ha)	2	3
Drakelow Power Station (12ha)	2	0
Dove Valley Business Park (19ha)	3	3
Extension of Dove Valley Park (exceptions site)	3	3
Extension to the Global Technology Cluster (safeguarded site for employment development)	1	3

The majority of responses received did not provide reasons for agreeing or disagreeing with all, or particular, employment sites.

Developers have submitted representation in support of particular sites and further comments are made by various respondents. These are referred to under the relevant Employment, Sustainable Development and Infrastructure headings, below.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The Council considers that the proposed employment sites are the most suitable sites for employment development, to achieve South Derbyshire's strategy for sustainable growth over the plan period. The proposed allocations within the Draft Local Plan Part 1 have been carried forward into the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1.

For changes made to the employment policies as a result of consultee responses to the Draft Local Plan Part 1, see below.

Do you have any comments to make regarding the Draft Local Plan Policies?

For your information, the below material shows how consultee responses from the Draft Local Plan Part 1 (for the below policies), have influenced policies contained within the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1. As mentioned at the beginning of the document, this consultation statement does not attempt to include every individual

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

response received from past consultations however does identify the broad issues raised.

Policy S1: A strategy for Sustainable Growth and Regeneration

A mixed response was received in regards to this policy. There was over riding issues instead individual comments were received which either support specific aspects of the policy or seek amendments to specific aspects of the policy.

The aspects of the policy which have received support from more than one consultee include:

- Numerous developers have stated their support for the inclusion of specific housing sites, such as Repton, Astom, Hackwood Farm, Broomy Farm, Etwall, Hilton, Hatton
- The policy recognises that new infrastructure such as schools and roads will be required
- The principle of the strategy for sustainable growth and the acknowledgement that South Derbyshire is well placed to serve the housing needs of Derby City, in addition to its own needs.

Suggested amendments to the policy include the following:

- Some consultees suggested that the policy should be amended to include development in other locations not allocated within the Draft Local Plan, including Overseal, Winshill and Castle Gresley
- A question was raised over why only five of the Key Service Villages are included within the Policy S2
- Drakelow Power Station should be referred to as an extension to Burton on Trent rather than Swadlincote
- The policy should make more specific reference to how climate change is being taken into account
- The policy should ensure that it doesn't restrict non employment development on sites which have been demonstrated to longer be suitable or attractive for employment uses
- The policy should include: "encouraging the reuse of previously developed site" within its second paragraph, as one of the Councils intended means of meeting the economic, social and environmental objectives of the plan
- The National Forest Company considered that while increasing woodland cover is important, it is just one aspect of the National Forest and perhaps does not fully reflect the economic, social and environmental opportunities referred to in objective 10.
- In order for the policy to be consistent with the NPPF, it is essential that the policy makes reference to environmental enhancement
- The plan should include a criteria based policy consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF. This could be included under Policy S1 or as separate policy within the Employment and the Economy section
- The majority of developers/planning agents have submitted comments in regards to the plan period and suggest that the plan period should be extended. Some state that the NPPF indicates that local plans should be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15 year time scale, and the Local Plan will not achieve this. Suggested plan periods for the Local Plan have been provided by some consultees. These are; at till at least 2030, at least 2031, to 2033 and could potentially be extended to 2035.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In regards to comments received about the policy specifically mentioning locations for housing development, this aspect of the policy has not been carried forward into policy S1 of the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1. This aspect of the policy is contained in further policies within the Local Plan Part 1 and to make the policy more concise this aspect was removed.

Policy S1 in the Pre Submission Local Plan continues to recognise the importance of the requirement of new infrastructure and that South Derbyshire is well placed to serve the needs of Derby City in addition to its own needs. To further clarify this, the revised policy within the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1 shows the split of South Derbyshire's and Derby City's assessed housing needs.

To reflect the National Forest Company concern that the policy just reflects one aspect of the National Forest, the policy has been amended to cover more than just increasing woodland cover. The policy supports the National Forests objectives including the increase of woodland cover. In addition the policy has been amended to include reference to environmental enhancements.

In response to the comment that the policy should make more specific reference to climate change, the policy has been amended to include the council seeking to ensure that new development respond to and address environmental and social issues including the need to tackle climate change.

In addition the policy has been amended to state that housing sites will be met through a mixture of brownfield and greenfield sites with brownfield land preferred.

The policy has not been amended to reflect changes requested in regards to employment development, as policies contained within the Local Plan already address these issues. Policy E3 allows for the redevelopment or change of use of existing industrial and business land and presses for other uses where a particular criteria is met and Policy E2 allows for development of employment land and sites where a particular criteria is met.

In regards to the plan period Derby's Housing Market Area (HMA) housing requirements evidence base is up to 2028. Local Plans covering the period of up to 2028 is being carried forward into the Local Plans across the Derby HMA.

Policy S2: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

The majority of responses received support the policy and state that it is consistent with the NPPF. One amendment to the policy has been requested which suggests that the policy wording within the brackets could be amended to include 'Development Plan Documents' so that the text reads "and where relevant, with policies in Development Plan Documents and Neighbourhood Development Plans". The consultee suggests that the wording in its current form would appear to include only the policies of the Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Development Plan. Further comments have been received which suggest that the policy is unacceptable as any presumption must, in the first instance, be in line with the local community and its affected residents' preference and it implies that local residents will have little opportunity for making objections if 'applications accord with the policies'.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy is considered to be in accordance with the NPPF. Only one amendment to the policy has been made, which clarifies that the planning applications that accord with policies contained within the Local Plan part 1 and 2 will be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This amendment has been made in response to the suggested alteration.

Policy S3: Housing Need

As a general rule, residents consider that South Derbyshire housing requirement is too high, whereas developers and planning agents consider that the housing requirement is too low and the district is not meeting its objectively assessed housing need. Consultees have suggested higher housing requirements for the district which range from 14,000 to 19,648 dwellings.

In addition comments have been received regarding the allocation of 600 dwellings within the Local Plan Part 2. Some have suggested that more than 600 dwellings should be allocated, due to: the potential delivery issues and timings of large sites, the faster delivery of smaller sites, and the lack of site delivery around the edge of Derby. In addition it has also been suggested that a large proportion of the 600 dwellings should be allocated now, rather than waiting till part 2.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The Council considers that South Derbyshire's housing need for at least 13,454 is based on a sound and robust evidence base. As previously discussed following the Preferred Growth Strategy consultation, further work was undertaken by GL Hearn on Derby HMA housing requirement (Housing Requirement Study) to take account of the most recent Government projections. As a result of this, the housing requirement for the Derby HMA and subsequently South Derbyshire was increased. This housing number was incorporated into the Draft Local Plan Part 1 and Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1.

It is considered that that the Districts Strategy to allocate 12,404 dwellings within strategic sites within Part 1 of the Plan, 600 dwellings within Part 2 of the Local Plan and an assumed windfall of 450 dwellings across the plan period is an appropriate strategy for the District. Allocating strategic sites within Part 1 of the Plan and small scale development within Part 2 of the Plan, continues a process which was established with the creation of Local Development Frameworks, where strategic policies were produced within the Core Strategy, which set the framework for the remaining part of the plan. The Councils strategy is consistent with the NPPF.

In addition having a Part 2 of the Local Plan allows 600 dwellings to be allocated on small scale sites across the district, instead of allocating 600 dwellings on a few large scale sites within Part 1 of the Local Plan. By accommodating 600 dwellings on small scale sites across the district (in line with the settlement hierarchy), allows South Derbyshire's settlements to grow sustainably.

Policy S4: Settlement Hierarchy

A mixed response was received in regards to this policy S4. Some consultees are in support of the policy or specific aspects of the policy and some suggested alterations. Aspects of the policy which were supported include: Linton and Castle Gresley being defined as a Local Service Villages and Repton, Overseal and Hilton being defined as Key Service Villages, preference given to previously developed and

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

underused vacant sites, appropriate sites of a local scale (up to 10 dwellings) being promoted within and adjoining the Local Service Village, appropriate sites of a range of scale up to and including sites within and adjoining Key Service Villages, any scale development including strategic being promoted at the edge of Derby and the recognition for extensions to Burton on Trent and Derby.

No main issues were received in regards to suggested alterations to the settlement hierarchy, instead a range of suggestions were received. These include the following:

- Based on service provision Barrow Upon Trent should not be classed as a Rural Village (it should be further up the settlement hierarchy), Aston Trent should be a Key Service Village, Ticknall should not be defined as a Local Service Village (disputes that the village has adequate services) and a question has been raised over the inclusion of Rosliston as a Key Service Village.
- A definition of cross subsidy exception sites is required
- Only allowing infill development and conversions of existing buildings within settlement boundaries of Rural Villages and Rural Areas could be counter to proposed policy S2 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development.
- Local Service Villages and Rural Villages should be joined together and appropriate sites of a local scale (up to 10 dwellings) should be promoted within and adjoining Local Service Villages and Rural Villages
- Development in Swadlincote should not be seen as secondary to extensions to Burton on Trent and Derby
- The settlement hierarchy has been configured upon an outdated understanding of sustainability and arbitrary rules and political pressures which attempt to classify the role of settlements.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The Council considers that the settlement hierarchy has been founded on an appropriate evidence base, based on the sustainability of each settlement in regards to its services and facilities. Further work on the settlement hierarchy has been undertaken since the consultation on the Draft Local Plan Part 1. This work alters Aston On Trent's and Roslistons location within the hierarchy. Based on the services and facilities with the settlement Aston on Trent is a Key Village and Rosliston is a Local Service Village. Barrow upon Trent remains as a Rural Village and Ticknall remains as a Local Service Village.

In addition within the Draft Local Plan Part 1 Swadlincote including Woodville and extensions to Burton Upon Trent and Derby were separated into two separate categories, Extensions to Large Urban Areas and Growth Towns. Within the Pre Submission Local Plan the two categories have been merged together, as development in Swadlincote is not intended to be viewed as secondary to development in Burton on Trent and Derby.

The policy has been amended to allow development of limited infill and conversion of existing buildings and local scale affordable and cross subsidy sites of up to 12 dwellings within Rural Settlements. However limited infill and conversion of existing buildings will be only be considered acceptable within Rural Areas. It is considered that Rural Settlements cannot sustainably accommodate the growth envisaged for Local Service Villages and Rural areas cannot sustainably accommodate the growth envisaged in Rural Villages.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

The Council has not merged Local Service Villages and Rural Villages together. As stated above it is considered that that Rural Villages cannot sustainably accommodate the growth envisaged for the Local Service Villages.

Furthermore even though appropriate sites of a local scale (up to 10 dwellings) being promoted within and adjoining Local Service Villages was supported by consultees. The Council has amended the scale of growth supported for Local Service Villages, to up to 15 dwellings and local scale affordable and cross subsidy exceptions sites of up to 15 dwellings. This amendment has been made as the Council considers that Local Service Villages can sustainably accommodate slightly higher growth than that proposed within the Draft Local Plan Part 1 settlement hierarchy policy.

More over a definition of cross subsidy housing sites have been included within the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1 glossary.

Policy S5: Green Belt

A few comments in support of amendments to the Green Belt have been received. It has been suggested that the Green Belt alteration/swap is a positive and justified approach and consistent with the findings of the Review of the Derby PUA Green Belt undertaken by officer of Derbyshire County Council, Amber Valley Borough Council, the City of Derby, South Derbyshire District Council and Erewash Borough Council.

It has been suggested by a few consultees that in some locations, circumstances have changed since the adoption of the Greenbelt and greenbelt boundaries should be reviewed/amended to take account of this.

In addition a few consultees disagree with the Green Belt swap within Policy S5. One consultee states that it is possible to deliver the housing growth requirement identified for South Derbyshire without the use of Green Belt land. The consultee goes on to state that the Council has not advanced any exceptional circumstances for altering the Green Belt boundary.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy has been amended to allow small scale amendments to Green Belt boundaries via the Local Plan Part 2, where anomalies exist since the adoption of the Green Belt.

However the green belt alteration in the Nottingham – Derby Green Belt (as stated within the Policy), is maintained within the Pre Submission Local Plan. The amendment is based on the findings of the Review of the Derby PUA Green Belt and consistent with the NPPF.

Policy H1: Land north of William Nadin Way, Swadlincote

Few responses were received which directly related to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

The Environment Agency state that the policy should be amended to “The Council will require the below listed site specifics and accordance with other Local Plan policies: ...An 8 metre wide corridor free from buildings, structures and other

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

obstructions shall be provided either side of watercourse that runs along the south of the site in order to maintain the integrity of the watercourse and it's floodplain..."

Natural England welcome the provision in the policy wording that land shall be protected either side of the brook that runs along the south of the site and William Nadin Way. However, they also wish that Breach Leys Farm Meadow County Wildlife Site, which is important for its wet grassland, is protected. Natural England suggest that there should be a buffer zone around this site to protect its nature conservation interests.

The Coal Authority request that the following bullet point should be added to the policy: The presence of coal mining legacy and resulting potential for unstable land will require the submission of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in support of planning applications.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed.

In response to the Coal Authority's comments, the requirement of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to be submitted alongside a planning application has been included within the policy. Furthermore, the policy has been amended to consider the developments effect on nearby occupiers, which may require buffers to be put in place.

To address Natural England's and the Environment Agency comments, that land should be free from development either side of the watercourse that runs through the site, the policy requires an appropriate easement along watercourses on the site, free of built development.

In addition, the policy now requires an appropriate buffer to be in place around the Breach ley farm Meadow County Wildlife Site, in response to Natural England's comments.

Policy H2: Land at Church Street/Bridge Street/Football Club Site, Church Gresley

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

It has been suggested that the proposed access points for the Church Street site need to be reconsidered, the traffic flow from this site should be located away from the current Thorpe Downs Road access and away from St Georges Primary School, to minimise congestion and potential road safety issues.

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy.

North West Leicestershire District Council states that there is no indication that any buffer/separation will be required between the proposed site and Albert Village.

Sport England states that although the policy states that 'consideration needs to be made for the provision of a new football ground', such provision (of an equivalent or better standard in terms of quality in a suitable location) would need to be clearly determined before Sport England accept the principle of losing the existing facility, rather than being something deferred for later consideration.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

The Coal Authority request that the following bullet point should be added to the policy: The presence of coal mining legacy and resulting potential for unstable land will require the submission of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in support of planning applications.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In response to the Coal Authority's comments, the requirement of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to be submitted alongside a planning application has been included within the policy. Furthermore, the policy has been amended to consider the developments effect on nearby occupiers, which may require buffers to be put in place.

Sport England's comments have been noted and the policy has been altered to include the consideration of the provision of a new football ground of an equivalent or better standard, in terms of quality.

It is understood that the access points proposed, are the most appropriate for the sites and no change is therefore proposed.

Policy H3: Land at Broomy Farm, Woodville

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy.

National Forest Company is pleased to note that the indicative allocation now extends to the brook and that the allocating policy refers to the need to include a significant green buffer to the north-east boundary of the site, to soften the new urban edge. This expectation could be further reinforced, and delivery of this landscaping ensured, by specifically allocating the position and width of the green buffer on the plan.

Natural England states that the site is "closely sited to the Woodville Disused Railway County Wildlife Site and suggest that a positive opportunity should be taken to extend this site linking it with a green infrastructure corridor through the proposed development".

Pegasus Planning, on behalf of Hallam Land Management supports the policy.

The National Forest Company is concerned that the proposed site has been shown to round off the urban edge, rather than using existing landscape features as a boundary. The proposed site is very visible on the landscape when approaching Swadlincote along the A514, as the land rises. If land is to be allocated in this position, the treatment of its northern boundary needs thought to mitigate any visual impact and consideration should be given to allocating land to existing field boundaries, rather than an arbitrary straight line.

The Environment Agency does not believe that there is spare capacity at Repton Sewage Pumping Station, which could have implications for site H3.

In addition, one consultee suggests that extensive landscaping should be introduced along the rear property boundaries in Hartshorne and that footpaths/cycle routes

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

could be incorporated, linking the access close to Swadlincote Woodlands along Burton Road, through the development to the access proposed along Woodville Road onto Goseley Estate and extending with additional / improved footpaths / cycleway over the land of Broomy Farm towards Hartshorne Village etc. The consultee also suggests that additional land to the North East should be landscaped.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In response to the Environment Agency's comments to the the policy, a requirement has been added for a strategy to deal with fowl water, associated with site development to be submitted alongside any development proposal. In addition, the policy has been amended to require the proposed landscaping to link into the surrounding green infrastructure, in response to Natural England's comments.

The Council considers that the policy does not need to be prescriptive in allocating the position and width of the green buffer required on the north east boundary of the site. This will be determined through a planning application.

No amendments to the policy have been made in response to the National Forest Company's comments, as the policy states that a green buffer and landscaping on the north east boundary of the site will be required to help soften the housing development impact in the surrounding rural landscape, creating a new urban edge.

Landscaping along the north east boundary of the site will help soften the housing development on the properties in Hartshorne, it is therefore considered that extensive landscaping along the rear property boundaries in Hartshorne does not need to be included within the policy, in addition to this buffer/landscaping.

Policy H4: Council Depot

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy.

The Environment Agency suggests that the Policy should be amended to read: "The Council will require the below listed site specifics and accordance with other Local Plan policies: ...An 8 metre wide corridor free from buildings, structures and other obstructions Land shall be protected provided either side of the Darklands Brook that runs along the south of the site and William Nadin Way in order to maintain the integrity of the watercourse and it's floodplain..."

Natural England state that the site would be closely sited to Breach Leys Farm Meadow County Wildlife Site, which is important for its wet grassland. Natural England suggests that there should be a buffer zone around this County Wildlife Site to protect its nature conservation interests.

The Coal Authority request that the following bullet point should be added to the policy: The presence of coal mining legacy and resulting potential for unstable land will require the submission of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in support of planning applications.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In response to the Coal Authority's comments, the requirement of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to be submitted alongside a planning application has been included within the policy. Furthermore, the policy has been amended to consider the developments effect on nearby occupiers, which may require buffers to be put in place.

To address the Environment Agency's comment that land should be free from development either side of the watercourse that runs through the site, the policy requires an appropriate easement along watercourses on the site free of built development.

In addition, the policy has been amended to require an appropriate buffer to be in place around the Breach Leys Farm Meadow County Wildlife Site, in response to Natural England's comments.

Policy H5: Cadley Hill

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

St Modwen Developments -Planning Prospects Planning states that the plan could now recognise this site as a commitment and indeed may already be accounted for in the current commitments set out in Policy S3.

The Coal Authority request that the following bullet point should be added to the policy: The presence of coal mining legacy and resulting potential for unstable land will require the submission of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in support of planning applications.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

This policy has been removed, due to the development of the site.

Policy H6: Drakelow Park

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

One Consultee states that the proposed site is on a flood plain and has been flooded repeatedly in recent years, there will need to be mitigation measures in place. In addition, traffic crossing points for the river Trent need to be considered.

Derbyshire County Council support the policy.

English Heritage welcome the reference to the refurbishment of the listed buildings on the site. However, considers that the policy should be amended to make reference for the need to protect their settings in addition to this, as they are the only surviving remnants of the original parkland and Hall.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Walton and Co on behalf of Drakelow Developments, does not consider that Policy H6 needs to make specific reference to the number of dwellings which may be occupied before the opening of the Walton Bypass (proposed as 100 dwellings), instead the policy could be reworded as follows: "The delivery of the Walton Bypass as part of the development".

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In response to English Heritage comments, the last bullet point of the policy has been expanded to include the protection of the settings of the listed buildings. In response to Walton and Co on behalf of Drakelow Developments, the policy has been reworded to state that in agreement with the Council, there will be a restricted number of dwellings to be allowed prior to the opening of the Walton Bypass.

Traffic crossing points over the river Trent have been considered with the requirement of the Walton Bypass.

Policy H7: Land at Hilton Depot, Hilton

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derbyshire County Councils supports the policy.

The Environment Agency suggests that opportunity should be taken to restore the unnamed brook running through this site to an open watercourse. An 8 metre wide corridor free from buildings, structures and other obstructions shall be provided either side of the watercourse in order to maintain the integrity of the watercourse and its floodplain.

Natural England state that the site is opposite the Egginton Junction Gravel Pit County Wildlife Site and every opportunity should be taken to protect and enhance the nature conservation interests of this site.

South Derbyshire's Badger Group states that the woodland on the site contains active badger setts and would be interested to discover what provision for the setts and the foraging grounds of these animals is to be made, should the proposed development go ahead.

St Modwen Development-Planning Prospects requests that reference to the potential for some additional retail provision should be made.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy has been amended to make reference to the consideration to retail provision on the site, the retention of existing woodland and the delivery of additional planting and habitat creation in the southern boundary of the site. In addition, in response to the Environment Agency's comments, the policy has been amended to include an appropriate easement along watercourses on site which will be free of built development.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Furthermore in response to Natural England's comments, the policy has been amended to include development reflecting the location of Egginton Junction Gravel Pit County Wildlife Site and where possible, should enhance nature conservation interests of that site.

The Policy however, has not been amended to include reference to restore the unnamed brook running through this site to the open watercourse. Further policies within the Local Plan address the restoration of watercourses.

Policy H8: Former Aston Hall Hospital, Aston on Trent

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derbyshire County Council states that the policy is supported.

English Heritage states that while grade II* Aston Hall is recognised within the supporting text, no reference is given to other assets (including a conservation area, and a scheduled monument). In addition, no reference is made within the policy to protect the setting of these. English Heritage consider that an additional bullet point requiring this is needed here.

Natural England note that the policy specifies that the woodland buffer to the north east and west of the site will be retained and wish to ensure that the intention of this wording is to protect the Long Walk Woodland County Wildlife Site. This site comprises of broad leaved woodland, which should be conserved and enhanced as part of the wider ecological network of the area.

One consultee suggests that the policy wording and site map are contradicting, as the policy seeks to retain the woodland, however, the plan shows the inclusion of the woodland.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy has been amended to make reference to the development not adversely impacting upon the setting of Aston Hall and other heritage assets, including Aston on Trent's conservation area. In addition, the policy has been amended to ensure that the existing woodland area is retained and enhanced where possible, in response to Natural England's comments.

With regard to the comment received, which suggests that the policy's requirement to retain the existing woodland and the inclusion of the woodland in the site plan is contradicting, wording has been added to the plan which explains that the site areas of the housing sites are not necessarily the developable areas of the site. The site areas include land which could be used for landscape buffers, roads, open space etc.

Policy H9: Land at Longlands, Repton

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy. However, further comments go on to add that the area has been identified as being of Secondary Multiple Environmental Sensitivity 1 and sensitivity of the site location needs to be taken into account, when considering this site for development and any site specific requirements.

English Heritage welcomes the recognition within the supporting text to designated and non-designated heritage assets. However, further comments suggest that this should be reflected in a further bullet point, in relation to these within the policy text itself.

Repton Parish Council request that developer contributions should be made towards replacing the Village Hall.

Turley Associates supports the inclusion of Policy H9.

The Environment Agency does not believe that there is spare capacity at Repton Sewage Pumping Station, which could have implications for site H9.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy has been amended to include the requirement that development of the site shall not adversely impact upon the setting of Reptons Conservation Area and other heritage assets.

In response to the Environment Agency's comments regarding the policy, a requirement has been added for a strategy to deal with fowl water, associated with site development to be submitted alongside any development proposal. In addition, the policy has been amended to require the proposed landscaping to link into the surrounding green infrastructure in response to Natural England's comments. The Council considers that the policy ensures that the site will be developed sensitively.

Developer contributions towards a replacement Village Hall have not been included within the policy, as it is not essential to the delivery of the site. Nevertheless, the Council are aware that Repton Village Hall has reached/is nearing the end of its life and have included a replacement Village Hall within the Districts Infrastructure Delivery Plan. In addition, the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1 also contains a community facilities policy.

Policy H10: Land south of Willington Road, Etwall

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

One consultee states that the policy should make reference to the cricket field pitch directly.

Another consultee states that the policy requires provision of a cricket pitch and pavilion and extension to Etwall cemetery. There appears to be no overriding reason why these facilities need to be provided at Willington Road.

One consultee states that it is sad to not see the following requirement within policy H10, which has been included in other housing developments, such as the former

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Aston Halls Hospital, Aston on Trent. “The development will embrace high quality design standards to reflect the character of Aston on Trent and the surrounding landscape’s”.

Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes requests that the site specific policy aspects of the policy be replaced with the following: Development will be expected to:

- 1) Provide a new cricket pitch and pavilion,
- 2) Facilitate an extension to Etwall cemetery,
- 3) Provide appropriate landscaping along the southern site boundary, and
- 4) Provide pedestrian connections into the village centre.

Sport England note that the policy includes a site specific requirement for a cricket pitch to be delivered. However, it is not clear from the Draft Local Plan how this proposal would relate to the existing cricket pitch in Etwall, or what the detailed rationale is for this requirement. In general, Sport England supports the delivery of on-site sports facilities constructed to appropriate design and technical standards that meet identified need, in conjunction with new development. Subject to this being the case and the requirement being supported by robust and up to date evidence of need and associated strategy, then Sport England would support the inclusion of this on-site sports facility as part of the policy requirement.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy has been amended to include the land south of Willington Road and land south of Sutton Lane, Etwall.

The plans design policy requires all new development to be well designed. Any planning application received for the site will be assessed against the plans design policy, therefore the requirement of good design does not need to be included within the policy.

No amendments to the policy have been made in response to the comments received from Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes. The council considers that the policy covers the aspects requested by the consultee.

In response to Sport England’s comments, a replacement cricket pitch is required due to allocating the existing cricket pitch site for housing. The policy requires that the replacement pitch be of an improved standard on the existing pitch, together with a pavilion within Etwall.

In addition there are cemetery capacity constraints within the district and the proposed site is considered an appropriate site for such provision, due to its location adjacent to the existing cemetery within Etwall.

Policy H11: Land north east of Hatton

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy> Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy.

The Environment Agency suggest that the policy should be amended to read: “The Council will require the below listed site specifics and accordance with other Local Plan policies: an 8 metre wide corridor free from buildings, structures and other obstructions shall be provided either side of Salt Brook that runs through the site in

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

order to maintain the integrity of the watercourse and it's floodplain..." ...Developer contributions will be made to maintain the flood alleviation works at the lower River Dove Catchment Area..."

The Highways Agency broadly welcome policy H11 and will be happy to discuss with the Council, how this may need to apply to delivery of junction improvements on the A50.

John Steedman Planning, on behalf of David Grummett suggests that the number of houses proposed at Hatton should be reduced by 100.

One consultee suggests that the introduction of effective measures to restrict or deter non-essential traffic from passing through Hatton, many of which then go on to use the "rat run" via Scropton to Sudbury, should be taken into consideration. The lack of such a policy will result in a continuing and accelerating reduction in highway safety for local residents and road users.

Savills on behalf of Taylor Wimpey agrees with the following aspects of the policy: the increase of the sites capacity from 300 to 400. The provision of pedestrian and cycle links from the site to the existing residential development to the south of site and the principle of retaining the existing trees on the eastern boundary of the site, subject to the outcome of a tree survey demonstrating that the trees are in a suitable condition,. Accepts the inclusion of wording within the policy, which states that consideration will be given to a relief road to access a large manufacturing plant in Hatton. However, the consultee objectives/ requests alterations to the following aspects of policy H11:

- Policy wording which states that retail provision will be provided on the site.
- Acknowledges the requirement to make contributions towards flood defences on the River Dove and towards education provision / expansion, but considers that the policy wording should be amended to include reference to viability considerations, in accordance with paragraphs 173-174 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which state that careful attention should be paid to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking.
- Willing to consider provision of a doctor's surgery in Hatton, subject to considerations of need and viability and the availability of funding.
- Taylor Wimpey considers that the supporting text to Policy H11 should not seek to restrict access into the site from Station Road, to solely being through the existing Salt Box Cafe access.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In response to the Environment Agency's comments, the policy has been amended to include an appropriate easement along watercourses on site, free of built development. The typing error within the fourth bullet point of the policy has been amended to state flood alleviation, rather than flood elevation.

The proposed 400 dwellings at land north east of Hatton have been carried forward into the Pre Submission Local Plan.

One amendment to the policy itself has been made with regard to comments received from Savills on behalf of Taylor Wimpy. The policy has been reworded to "consider" the provision of retail, instead of "will" be required. In addition, the supporting text has removed the comments which require the access of the site from Derby Road and/or through the existing Salt Box Café access from Station Road. No

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

amendments to the policy have been made in respect to the provision of a doctor's surgery, as the policy itself only considers such provision. In addition, the requirement that development contributions will be made to maintain the flood alleviation works of the lower River Dove Catchment Area has been carried forward into the Pre Submission Local Plan. The policy is considered to be consistent with the NPPF.

The Council considers that it is not the place of policy H11, to introduce measures to restrict or deter non-essential traffic from passing through Hatton.

Policy H12: Highfields Farm

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy.

The Highways Agency state that the Integrated Transport link may be required to enable the delivery of development. It would be helpful to clarify the relationship between the delivery of this road and proposed housing development, its phasing and any requirements for developer contributions. The Highways Agency have identified the need for junction improvements on the A50, to support housing growth on the south side of Derby, particularly at the A50/A514 junction and at the A50/A38 junction in order to safeguard the operation of the SRN. These measures are intended to be delivered through planning conditions on relevant developments, or through a contribution strategy covering significant developments on the south side of Derby. This is specifically relevant to proposed developments at Chellaston Fields, Holmleigh Way, Snelsmoor Lane, Highfields Farm, Boulton Moor, Stenson Fields, Primula Way and Wragley Way. The Highways Agency would wish to see this aspect reflected in the policies of these proposed development sites.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In response to the Highways Agency's comments, an addition has been made to the policy which requires developer contributions to be made towards improvements to the A50/A514 and/or A50/A38 junction to safeguard the operation of the Strategic Road Network.

Policy H13: Boulton Moor

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

English Heritage welcome the reference to the protection of the setting of Elvaston Registered Park and Garden within the policy text. However, English Heritage are concerned that the proposed site allocation appears to include part of the designated area of the Grade II* Park and Garden, to the south side of the B5010, which should be avoided. English Heritage also considers that the policy should make reference to the protection and enhancement of the significance of all of the assets in this location. At present, it makes reference to the Registered Park and Garden only and

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

there are a number of heritage assets within this area where consideration of their setting is required.

The National Trust suggest that the statement in the Policy: “The urban extension as a whole shall not adversely impact upon the setting of nearby Elvaston Historic Park and Garden” is welcomed in principle as it recognises the potential for harm to be caused, however as currently worded, it does appear more as a hope than an expectation. A more positive approach would be: “The urban extension as a whole shall ensure the safeguarding and enhancement of the special heritage significances of Elvaston, including its setting, in particular that part of the Registered Historic Park and Garden that is within the overall defined site for development, the approaches to Elvaston, and views to and from the Registered Historic Park and Garden.”

Natural England welcomes the provisions in the policy for improvements to existing green infrastructure, plus new green infrastructure and significant green buffers to soften the housing development, and trusts that these green areas will incorporate the Alvaston Stream County Wildlife Site. Natural England are also supportive of the introduction of high quality pedestrian and cycle routes which could also contribute to the green infrastructure network and welcome the last bullet point of the policy wording, which establishes the protection of the Elvaston Historic Park and Garden.

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy subject to an amendment relating to primary schools. Derbyshire County Council requests that the policy is reworded to “the provision of a two form entry primary school”. Derbyshire County Council suggests that further clarity is needed as it appears that part of the Boulton Moor site appears to be Green Belt land.

The Highways Agency state that the Integrated Transport link may be required to enable the delivery of development. It would be helpful to clarify the relationship between the delivery of this road and proposed housing development, its phasing and any requirements for developer contributions. The Highways Agency have identified the need for junction improvements on the A50 to support housing growth on the south side of Derby, particularly at the A50/A514 junction and at the A50/A38 junction, in order to safeguard the operation of the SRN. These measures are intended to be delivered through planning conditions on relevant developments, or through a contribution strategy covering significant developments on the south side of Derby. This is specifically relevant to proposed developments at; Chellaston Fields, Holmleigh Way, Snelsmoor Lane, Highfields Farm, Boulton Moor, Stenson Fields, Primula Way and Wragley Way. The Highways Agency would wish to see this aspect reflected in the policies of these proposed development sites.

Barton Willmore on behalf of the Chamberlain Family and Central Land Holdings has requested a number of changes to the policy which include the following:

- The development should be referred to as a sustainable urban extension
- Support the request for the provision of a district centre, subject to the approved location of the centre is justified
- Financial contributions will be made towards secondary school provision to serve new residents at Boulton Moor. However the policy wording should be expanded so that it is clear that SDDC will only seek financial contributions which will meet the statutory tests, as set out the Community Infrastructure Regulations (Reg 122) and paragraph 204 of the NPPF.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In response to the Highways Agency's comment the policy has been amended to include reference to South Derbyshire's integrated transport link phase 1.

The policy has been amended to include the provision of a two form entry primary school in response to Derbyshire County Council's comments. In addition the policy makes clear that part of the housing allocation is now allocated as Green Belt.

The Council considers that the existing policy wording is sufficient, so that development of the site does not adversely affect the setting of Elvaston Historic Park and Garden. However in response to the National Trusts and English Heritage comments the policy wording has been amended so that development of the site shall not adversely affect Evanston's Historic Park and Garden and other Heritage Assets.

In addition the policy has amended to include that any built development to the east of the A6 and west of the B5010 shall be in accordance with Green Belt policy, in response to English Heritage comments.

No amendments have been made in response to comments received from Barton Wilmore on behalf of the Chamberlain Family, the Council considers that the policy already addresses the comments received adequately.

Policy H14: Chellaston Fields

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derby and Peak District Campaign for Better Transport, request that the policy should require developer contributions for; an extension of bus route 60 to serve the site, for improvements to the difficulties of accessing this site from the A514 and the need to improve the nearby A514 junction with Glenwood Road.

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy.

English Heritage are concerned that no reference is made within the policy and its supporting text with regard to heritage assets and consider that further bullet points in relation to their protection are essential here.

Natural England state that the site is in close proximity to the Chellaston Brickworks Local Nature Reserve and recommend that there should be an undeveloped buffer zone around this site, to protect its nature conservation interests.

The Highways Agency state that the Integrated Transport link may be required to enable the delivery of development. It would be helpful to clarify the relationship between the delivery of this road and proposed housing development, its phasing and any requirements for developer contributions. The Highways Agency have identified the need for junction improvements on the A50 to support housing growth on the south side of Derby, particularly at the A50/A514 junction and at the A50/A38 junction, in order to safeguard the operation of the SRN. These measures are intended to be delivered through planning conditions on relevant developments, or through a contribution strategy covering significant developments on the south side of Derby. This is specifically relevant to proposed developments at; Chellaston

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Fields, Holmleigh Way, Snelsmoor Lane, Highfields Farm, Boulton Moor, Stenson Fields, Primula Way and Wragley Way. The Highways Agency would wish to see this aspect reflected in the policies of these proposed development sites.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy has been amended to include the protection of heritage assets, in response to English Heritage concerns and to include developer contributions towards transport provision on the site and highway improvements to the A514, in response to Derby and Peak District Campaign for Better Transport.

In addition, in response to the Highways Agency's comments, the policy has been amended to include the requirement of developer contributions towards improvements to the A50/A514 and/or A50/A38 junction to safeguard the operation of the Strategic Road Network.

No amendment was made in response to Natural England's comments, as the Chellaston Brookworks County Nature Reserve is located within Derby City and is not adjacent to the site.

Policy H15: Wragley Way

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Natural England note that the last paragraph states that there will be enhancements to a defensible boundary along the Sinfin Moor. Natural England would wish to ensure that this measure includes a buffer zone between the proposed development and the Sinfin Moor Lane Meadows Local Nature Reserve and SSSI.

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy.

English Heritage have no objections to the site. However, are disappointed that the policy text is not aligned with the text of the Derby City Plan. English Heritage consider that Derby City's draft policy is much more comprehensive, and provides safeguards in terms of ensuring the character of the adjacent settlement is respected and should be better reflected here.

The Highways Agency state that the Integrated Transport link may be required to enable the delivery of development. It would be helpful to clarify the relationship between the delivery of this road and proposed housing development, its phasing and any requirements for developer contributions. The Highways Agency have identified the need for junction improvements on the A50 to support housing growth on the south side of Derby, particularly at the A50/A514 junction and at the A50/A38 junction in order to safeguard the operation of the SRN. These measures are intended to be delivered through planning conditions on relevant developments, or through a contribution strategy covering significant developments on the south side of Derby. This is specifically relevant to proposed developments at Chellaston Fields, Holmleigh Way, Snelsmoor Lane, Highfields Farm, Boulton Moor, Stenson Fields, Primula Way and Wragley Way. The Highways Agency wish to see this aspect reflected in the policies of these proposed development sites. In addition, the Highways Agency suggest the inclusion of the following, "any development should not prejudice the construction of a potential junction connecting the site to the A50,

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

which may potentially be needed following the completion of the South Derby Integrated Transport Link", to be appropriate in the wider context of ensuring the flexibility of the Local Plan.

A consultee would like to see a bollard placed on the north end of the A50 bridge on Arleston Lane, which would restrict traffic from Derby and only allow leisure users access to Arleston Lane from the north.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy has been amended to reflect the changes proposed by Natural England. And in response to English Heritage comments, Derby City's policy and South Derbyshire's policy regarding housing development at Wragley Way have been closely aligned.

In response to the Highways Agency's comments, an addition has been made to the policy which requires developer contributions to be made towards improvements to the A50/A514 and/or A50/A38 junction to safeguard the operation of the Strategic Road Network.

Furthermore the policy has been amended to include a proposed road closure (of Arleston Lane) to through traffic and the use of this road as multiuser greenway network.

Policy H16: Primula Way, Sunny Hill

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derbyshire County Council support the following aspects of the policy: The development will have pedestrian connections into the existing residential areas within Derby City and developer contributions to be made to secondary and primary school provision, on an agreed strategy with the Council.

The Highways Agency state that the Integrated Transport link may be required to enable the delivery of development. It would be helpful to clarify the relationship between the delivery of this road and proposed housing development, its phasing and any requirements for developer contributions. The Highways Agency have identified the need for junction improvements on the A50 to support housing growth on the south side of Derby, particularly at the A50/A514 junction and at the A50/A38 junction in order to safeguard the operation of the SRN. These measures are intended to be delivered through planning conditions on relevant developments or through a contribution strategy covering significant developments on the south side of Derby. This is specifically relevant to proposed developments at Chellaston Fields, Holmleigh Way, Snelsmoor Lane, Highfields Farm, Boulton Moor, Stenson Fields, Primula Way and Wragley Way. The Highways Agency would wish to see this aspect reflected in the policies of these proposed development sites.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In response to the Highways Agency's comments, an addition has been made to the policy which requires developer contributions to be made towards improvements to

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

the A50/A514 and/or A50/A38 junction to safeguard the operation of the Strategic Road Network.

Policy H17: Stenson Fields Estate, Stenson Fields

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derbyshire County Council is in support of the policy.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

This policy has been removed. The scale of the sites development is such, that it will be carried forward into the Local Plan Part 2.

Policy H18: Land west of Homleigh Way

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

The Canal and River Trust welcomes the acknowledgement of the importance of continuing to safeguard the route of the former Derby-Sandiacre Canal within the policy. Any development should have regard to the aspirations of the Derby and Sandiacre Canal Trust to restore the canal and return it to navigable status and should not prejudice these aspirations.

Derbyshire County Council requests that the policy be amended to ensure developer contributions are made towards primary school provision and greenway construction, and that development of the site enables the provision of high speed broadband services.

Natural England are glad to note that the explanatory text included recognition of the importance of the Derby Canal County Wildlife Site.

Turley Associates on behalf of Bellway Homes request that the wording within the policy, which currently identifies the site as 'land at Wragley Way' is corrected to 'land west of Homleigh Way'.

The Highways Agency state that the Integrated Transport link may be required to enable the delivery of development. It would be helpful to clarify the relationship between the delivery of this road and proposed housing development, its phasing and any requirements for developer contributions. The Highways Agency have identified the need for junction improvements on the A50 to support housing growth on the south side of Derby, particularly at the A50/A514 junction and at the A50/A38 junction in order to safeguard the operation of the SRN. These measures are intended to be delivered through planning conditions on relevant developments or through a contribution strategy covering significant developments on the south side of Derby. This is specifically relevant to proposed developments at Chellaston Fields, Holmleigh Way, Snelsmoor Lane, Highfields Farm, Boulton Moor, Stenson Fields, Primula Way and Wragley Way. The Highways Agency would wish to see this aspect reflected in the policies of these proposed development sites

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy has been amended to refer to correct site and in response to the Highways Agency's comments, an addition has been made which requires developer contributions to be made towards improvements to the A50/A514 and/or A50/A38 junction to safeguard the operation of the Strategic Road Network.

The Council notes The Canal and River Trust comments, however does not consider that amendments to the policy are required.

In addition no amendment to the policy has been made in regards to the comments received from Derbyshire County Council. The beginning of chapter 5 has been amended to clarify that relating to all housing development/allocations; there will be a need for expanded and/or new facilities at both primary and secondary level. Furthermore the Local Plan Part 1 contains a Green Infrastructure policy, which seeks to conserve, enhance and wherever possible extend green infrastructure in the district.

Policy H19: Stenson Fields

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy.

The Highways Agency state that the Integrated Transport link may be required to enable the delivery of development. It would be helpful to clarify the relationship between the delivery of this road and proposed housing development, its phasing and any requirements for developer contributions. The Highways Agency have identified the need for junction improvements on the A50 to support housing growth on the south side of Derby, particularly at the A50/A514 junction and at the A50/A38 junction in order to safeguard the operation of the SRN. These measures are intended to be delivered through planning conditions on relevant developments or through a contribution strategy, covering significant developments on the south side of Derby. This is specifically relevant to proposed developments at Chellaston Fields, Holmleigh Way, Snelsmoor Lane, Highfields Farm, Boulton Moor, Stenson Fields, Primula Way and Wragley Way. The Highways Agency would wish to see this aspect reflected in the policies of these proposed development sites.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

This policy has been removed, due to the development of the site.

Policy H20: Land at Hackwood Farm, Mickleover

Few responses were received which directly relate to the wording of the policy. Instead, the majority of responses received regarding the site are in relation to agreement or disagreement over the allocation of the site. However, those that make reference to the policy include:

Derbyshire County Council supports the policy.

Natural England state that as well as a Sustrans route, they would like the policy to recognise that the disused railway is also a County Wildlife Site. Therefore, its nature

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

conservation interest should be protected and links maintained with the surrounding green infrastructure network.

English Heritage have expressed their disappointment that the wording of this policy is not aligned with that of Derby City. We welcome the bullet point which references the need to protect the setting of the Hall, this is a significant shortcoming of the draft wording in Derby City's policy which we will be seeking to address with the City Council. That said, a joint policy approach should be considered here, including reference to the protection of heritage assets at Radbourne Hall.

Pegasus Planning on behalf of Miller Homes broadly agrees with the requirements of the policy. However, recommends the following amendments so that the policy can accord with paragraphs 256 and 157 of the NPPF:

- "The existing landscaping elements to the south of the site should be retained, subject to highway improvement or secondary site access that would be required", this element of the policy should be deleted. It is unclear what 'landscaping elements' are being referred to, and it is not a strategic priority.
- "The site should provide links into the existing cycle route, rights of ways and also the residential area to the south, preferably through a pedestrian/cycle bridge provided across the Mickleover to Eggington Greenway". The addition of the word preferably is recommended.
- As officers will be aware, Miller Homes is committed to delivering a pedestrian/cycle bridge and have taken efforts to design and cost a suitable structure. However, it should be recognised that there are factors beyond Miller Homes' control that could prevent the bridge being delivered and this should not impede the delivery of the development as a whole.
- "Provision for a new primary school that is likely to be within the Derby City part of the site". Miller Homes is committed to providing land for the provision of a new primary school. However, the details of how the school will be delivered have yet to be determined. The school will also be required to cater for growth resulting from cumulative housing development in the local area, including Onslow Road. Other developers will therefore be expected to contribute to the school's delivery in accordance with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations.
- "The urban extension shall not substantially, adversely impact upon the setting of nearby Radbourne Hall." The test for at paragraph 132 of the NPPF is that substantial harm to Grade I listed buildings should be wholly exceptional. Rewording the policy as suggested brings it into line with the NPPF. The Environmental Statement that forms part of the existing outline planning application provides evidence that the setting of Radbourne Hall would not be impacted by the proposals.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy has been amended to include the comments received from Natural England. In addition discussions have taken place between Derby City Officers and South Derbyshire's officers to ensure that the policies are aligned to address comments received from English Heritage.

The word preferable has not been added into the policy in regards to provision of cycle route, rights of way etc. The Council considers that this requirement for the development of the site is necessary.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

No amendments to the policy have been in regards to the rewording of the policy (“The urban extension shall not substantially adversely impact upon the setting of nearby Radbourne Hall”) to bring this aspect of the policy more closely aligned with the NPPF. The Council considers that whilst the NPPF states that substantially harm to a Grade I listed building shall be “wholly exceptional” this does not imply that any harm that is less than substantial shall be acceptable.

Policy H21: Reserve Sites

Overwhelming objection was received with regard to the possibility of Newhouse Farm becoming a reserve site. However, no real regard was received on the principle of a reserve site.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The idea of a reserve site and a reserve site policy has not been carried forward into the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1. The Council considers that if South Derbyshire is not meeting its required housing target, then a plan review would be more beneficial, than a reserve site policy. It is considered that if the housing target is not being met, then other policies within the Local Plan would also need to be reviewed.

Moreover, simply releasing a reserve site for housing development does not denote that the site will be deliverable at that point in time. Smaller sites may be required to boost delivery of South Derbyshire’s housing target if delivery of sites is failing, instead of promoting a large scale reserve site.

In addition, South Derbyshire’s housing needs and part of Derby City’s housing needs will be met through allocations within the Local Plan Part1 and 2 and windfall sites. It is considered that there is no need to offer further sites, unless through a full plan review.

Further to this, one of the potential reserve sites – Woodville Regeneration Site is progressing quicker than anticipated, in regards to the sites development. The site is being progressed as an employment led scheme, with housing numbers allocated for the site within Policy SD9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan. The site can therefore, no longer be considered for a reserve site.

Logic suggests that a reserve site should be readily capable of delivering housing if one of the housing allocation sites under performs. Further information has since been received regarding Newhouse Farm and Lowes Farm, which suggests that neither site could readily be developed, due to transport and educational constraints.

Policy H22: Housing Balance

Responses have been received which support this policy, particularly in regards to housing density being considered on a site by site basis.

In addition, some consultees have suggested alterations to the policy. Some responses suggested that the policy should make reference to market needs and that market demand should be taken into account in arriving at an appropriate housing mix.

Furthermore, it has been suggested that housing mix should be evidenced by an up to date evidence base, that viability should be a consideration in the determination of a schemes housing mix and that the Council should provide additional details on the role of specialist accommodation for the elderly in meeting the wider housing needs

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

of the District, either in the Local Plan or subsequent Supplementary Planning Documents.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

No alteration has been made to the policy in regard to making reference to market needs or market demand in the determination of a schemes housing mix or housing mix being evidenced by an up to date evidence base. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has assessed the housing mix need across the Derby Housing Market Area and will be used to determine schemes housing mix. This is stated within the policy.

In regard to the Council providing additional details on the role of specialised accommodation for the elderly, the policy acknowledges that a mix of housing is required, including for the elderly and seeks to promote a mix of dwellings. It is not considered that this issue needs to be dealt with more comprehensively in the Local Plan Part 1. Further detail on this matter will be set out within a Design Supplementary Planning Document.

The policy however, has been amended to allow viability of a scheme to be a consideration in the determination of housing mix.

Policy H23: Affordable Housing

The main issue received regarding this policy is in response to the Council seeking to secure up to 40% of affordable housing (as defined by the NPPF) on new housing development on sites over 15 dwellings or 0.5 hectares. It has been suggested that the target is too high. Some consultees have suggested that the Councils policy should be in line with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which states that on an average basis 25% affordable housing could be achieved on sites across the Derby Housing Market Area over the plan period.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The percentage of affordable housing the Council seeks to achieve on new housing developments on sites over 15 dwellings or 0.5 hectares, has reduced from up to 40% to up to 30%. Viability studies show that housing development within the district has some viability if policy H23 is set as up to 30% affordable housing. This alteration has received member support.

Policy H24: Sites for gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

The consultation response on behalf of the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups raised that policy H24 was not compliant with national policy; with no reference to keeping a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment up to date, no mention of a procedure for allocating sites, failing to distinguish between making allocations and determining applications and the implication that there has to be an identified need for sites. The criteria, as set out, were considered reasonable.

The consultation response from North West Leicestershire District Council raised concerns over the lack of targets in the policy, questioned how sites were being positively planned for and provision made through the plan making process and how the supply of sites was being identified.

Other comments were received in support of the policy.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Reference has been added to Policy H24, regarding the setting of pitch/plot targets, how those pitches will be provided for through the Local Plan and keeping needs assessments up to date, thereby providing for Policy H24 to comply with 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' guidance. The reference to identified need that the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups referred to, has been removed. The distinction has been made between allocations and determining planning applications. A further criterion, regarding pedestrian access, has been added to the criteria listed in the policy.

Policy E1: Strategic Employment Land Allocations

Former Drakelow Power Station site

There is concern regarding the loss of established employment at the former Drakelow Power Station site.

Hilton Business Park

Planning and Design Group on behalf of Hallam Land Management consider that a greater proportion of the Hilton Business Park should be retained for employment use than is currently envisaged in Policy E1, to balance housing growth in the village. For the same reason, another respondent considers that land forming part of the Hilton Business Park should be retained for employment use, rather than housing-lead mixed use development.

Restriction of uses on allocated employment sites

There is concern from Gladman Developments that by restricting the uses of strategic employment sites to industrial and business uses, other legitimate ancillary and sui generis uses would be excluded.

Employment Land Provision

Pegasus on behalf of Christ Church consider that it is unclear whether the National Planning Policy Framework approach to employment land provision has been followed in regard to taking account of job growth, cross-boundary migration assumptions and qualitative needs. There is therefore, a danger of an undersupply of employment land. A revised assessment of employment needs is required to match the respondent's proposed revised assessment of housing need.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Former Drakelow Power Station Site : Planning permission for the redevelopment of the site for mixed use purposes has already been granted and the existing major employer has stated the intention to relocate within site, rather than to leave the area. No change is proposed in response to this representation.

Hilton Business Park: It should be borne in mind that besides the area allocated for new employment development in the Local Plan, part of the established Hilton Business Park is to be retained for industrial and business use. Given the fact that sufficient land has been identified elsewhere to meet the employment needs of the district, the strong national planning policy emphasis on boosting housing delivery and the lack of suitable alternative housing sites, it is considered that it would not be

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

possible to sustain a case for retaining a larger area of land at Hilton for employment use.

Restriction of Use on Allocated Employment Sites : The policies indicate that the default policy position for these sites is that they should be developed for industrial and business uses. If proposals are made for ancillary uses such as shops, crèches and power generation, they can be considered on their merits and granted where other material considerations weigh in their favour. A more loosely expressed policy could lead to non-industrial and business development, on a scale that would compromise the capacity of these sites to make an appropriate contribution toward meeting the industrial and business development needs of the District. No change is proposed in response to this representation.

Employment Land Provision

Proposed employment land provision does take account of job growth and migration trends as well as qualitative needs. Employment land needs would only need to be reviewed if housing needs were to be reviewed and the latter is not currently being proposed.

Policy E2: Other Industrial and Business Development

Rural Economy: Gladman Developments and Derbyshire County Council are concerned that the Draft Plan does not address rural economic diversification. Gladman Developments believe that the economic development policies are over restrictive and could contribute to rural economic decline. Gregory Grey Associates consider that the policy should allow for the re-use of previously developed sites in rural locations. The National Forest Company request that the policy be amended to allow well designed new buildings for employment purposes in rural areas. The National Trust is concerned that the policy could have a detrimental impact on the character and amenities of smaller settlements, as there are few requirements about the form of development.

Redevelopment of Employment Sites: The promoters of the redevelopment of the former premises of HK Wentworth, at Midland Road, Swadlincote, suggest that the Plan should be more accommodating toward the redevelopment of redundant industrial and business premises.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Rural Economy: Rural industrial and business development is addressed under Policy E2 which allows for new industrial and business development within and on the edge of Key Service and local villages and allows for the conversion and change of use of existing buildings in rural areas. A policy allowing redevelopment of such sites for employment purposes could have a detrimental impact on the character of parts of the countryside. Amenity and design considerations will be addressed with reference to other relevant policies, specifically addressing these issues, in the Local Plan. However, part (ii) of the policy has been amended to refer to these considerations alongside impacts on heritage assets. Considerations have been made to make Policy E2 less restrictive, it has been changed to allow existing buildings to be replaced by well- designed new buildings of equivalent scale.

Redevelopment of Employment Sites: Policy E3 fully addresses cases such as this. No change is proposed in response to this representation.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Policy E3: Existing Employment Areas

The promoters of the redevelopment of the former premises of HK Wentworth, at Midland Road, Swadlincote, suggest that the Plan should be more accommodating towards the redevelopment of redundant industrial and business premises.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Policy E3 fully addresses cases such as this. No change is proposed in response to this representation.

Policy E4: Small Business Space

No comments were received in respect of this policy.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

To improve the brevity of the Local Plan, the context of the policy has been moved to policy E1.

Policy E5: Strategic Location for Global Technology Cluster Extension

The promoters of land at Sinfin Moor consider that the land should be formally allocated for employment development, during the plan period. Objection has been made by Councillor David Shepherd, to the protection of land at Sinfin Moor for employment development, subject to queries as to why it should be included when it is not expected to be developed during the plan period and regarding whether transport mitigation is needed to support it, should it be released.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Formal allocation of the site for employment development would be unnecessary, as sufficient land has been identified in Derby and South Derbyshire, to meet the strategic employment development needs of the district. In addition, transport mitigation measures needed to allow the site to come forward, have not yet been identified. The land is protected, as it is important to the future economy of the area to protect potential for the further expansion of the proposed high value Infiniti Park employment site, beyond the plan period. The policy protects against development that might compromise this potential. Transport mitigation can be addressed when the site is needed and is not a concern for the emerging Local Plan. No change is proposed in response to these representations.

Policy E6: Safeguarded Employment Sites – Dove Valley Park

The proposed strategic allocations were generally supported.

The promoters of this site challenge the approach to the apportionment of employment land between the three HMA local authorities, as they consider that it pays no regard to the location and economic growth potential of employment sites. They also consider that the policy requirement, that development should only be accommodated on the site in the event that it cannot be met elsewhere, should be removed.

Concern is also expressed regarding how the site will be accessed.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

It is considered that the policy does allow for employment land to come forward on sites with growth potential. For example, plots of various sizes remain available for development at Dove Valley Business Park and have been allocated for this purpose under Policy E1. Sufficient land has been identified to meet the objectively assessed needs of the Housing Market Area. If existing plots at this site, or elsewhere, prove too small to accommodate the needs of an individual business, Policy E6 allows for the land to the north of Dove Valley Business Park to come forward, thus providing the flexibility needed to accommodate economic growth opportunities. The site will be accessed via established estate roads from the A50 and not via country lanes in the locality. No change is proposed in response to these representations.

Policy SD1: Energy Efficiency and Zero Carbon Development

The main issues raised in regard to this policy, is that it seeks to require building performance beyond that required by Building Regulations and some have suggested that the policy should be removed.

In addition, it has been stated that Central Government is critical of locally imposed standards in its latest consultation document 'DCLD Housing Standards Review Consultation August 2013' and suggests that the Council allows Central Government to deal with this matter and removes localised policy references. It has also been suggested that the requirement for zero carbon development is not sound, as there is no evidence base for the policies effect on a schemes viability. One consultee states that the identified measures to achieve energy efficient and zero carbon development does not need to be implemented through Local Plan Policy.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Within the Pre Submission Local Plan, Policy SD1 and SD2 have been merged together to form policy S3.

In regard to consultees comments, a decision has been made to not to remove the policy. Instead, the requirements set out within the policy have been amended to support the delivery of building regulation targets, rather than exceed those through gold plated local standards. In addition, the policy has been reworded to promote energy efficiency through on site measures, rather than setting requirements that go beyond wider Government proposals.

The Council has an enabling role to achieve energy efficiency and zero carbon development and whilst it is accepted that policy should stop short of requiring stricter requirements, the plan can encourage onsite provision of carbon reductions against off site delivery.

Policy SD2: Environmental performance in new homes and other new buildings

The majority of consultees question the need for this policy, as the Government proposes to remove the Code for Sustainable Homes and improvements in sustainable building is likely to be through changes to Building Regulations. It has been suggested that it is unnecessary to set any standards beyond Building Regulations and the lack of evidence to support the policy has also be questioned.

In addition, it has been stated by consultees that there is no current statutory requirements for commercial properties to meet a minimum BREEAM Good Standard by 2016 and Very Good Standard by 2019 and changes to Building Regulations will

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

secure zero carbon targets for non-domestic buildings. Consultees suggest that, the reference to BREEAM is unnecessary.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Within the Pre Submission Local Plan, Policy SD1 and SD2 have been merged together to form policy S3.

In response to the representations received, the requirement for all residential dwellings to be expected to meet as a minimum Code for Sustainable Homes by 2016 and the expectation that all commercial properties to meet as a minimum BREEAM Good Standards by 2016 and very good standards by 2019 has been removed.

The policy has been reworded to reflect this and be consistent to building standards set out in the Housing Standards review.

Policy SD3: Sustainable Energy and Power Generation

No main issues were received in regard to this policy, instead comments have been received which support the policy or make reference to specific aspects of the policy.

The National Trust suggests that the word local from 'local landscape' should be removed as it is unclear what the relevance of the word "local" is.

One consultee states that the policy is over prescriptive and that the need for sustainable energy is so pressing, that sometimes the benefits may outweigh significant detrimental impacts. Another suggests that the plan needs to be much clearer in terms of the protection of existing residential clusters, where there either is, or has previously been, or could be in the future, applications made for the development and erection of wind turbines, that are outside the local plans produced by these areas affected, in this case; Risborrow Close and the surrounding area.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

One alteration has been made; the word "local" in regards to local landscape has been removed from the policy.

Whilst the comment that the policy is over prescriptive has been noted, proposals should still be considered in the context of their impacts. The policy will allow consideration of the scale of benefits to be considered against the significance of impacts.

In regard to protecting existing residential clusters from wind turbines, it would not be appropriate to restrict renewable energy development, simply because there have been historic applications, or there could be future applications for renewable energy. All schemes should be considered on their own merits as they come forward. This policy seeks to protect local amenity as well as landscape character and will be used to control the effects of development, where schemes come forwards.

Policy SD4: Flood Risk

No main issues were received in regard to policy SD4, instead, comments were received in reference to different aspects of the policy.

The Environment Agency request that the last bullet point of the policy be amended to: "Where appropriate the council will require developers to restore watercourses

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

within regeneration or development sites to a natural state (i.e. break the channel out of culvert, remove redundant structures, replace/improve existing structures, to provide a restored watercourse profile) in order to reduce flood risk and provide local amenity and/or ecological benefits. To contribute to the enhancement of watercourses in accordance with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive, developers will be expected to work with the regulating Authorities to develop watercourse restoration schemes”

The Home Builders Federation suggested that the policy would require viability testing.

The National Trust support the policy. However, states that whilst an explicit reference to heritage exceptions within the policy would be welcomed, the current wording would enable such cases to be promoted.

Natural England state that they would expect to see some reference to the “Our City Our River” (OCOR) master plan within the policy, which aims to implement a flood risk defence scheme that delivers significant improvements along the Lower Derwent.

St Modwen Development – Planning Prospects state that the policy should make reference to the wider sustainable benefits to the community, which can outweigh flood risk. This would align the policy more closely with the exceptions test in the NPPF.

Three comments have been received regarding the policy and proposed housing allocations. One states that policy SD4 means that Hackwood Farm, Mickleover cannot be developed, as houses adjoining the land to the west of Ladybank Road, already flood. The second consultee states that the 13,500 additional homes planned for South Derbyshire is excessive and the flood risk impact will be significantly increased with this scale of development, putting yet more pressure on what will be the ever decreasing greenland and wildlife habitat. This will impact on SD4. The third response suggests that Policy SD4 directs that site H7, should not be allocated within the plan, as Hilton Depot is at high risk of flooding and there are no wider sustainability benefits which have been proven to the extent, that the high flood risk of the site should be set aside.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Two policy amendments have been made as a result of the consultee responses. The changes requested by the Environment Agency have been implemented into the policy and in response to Natural England’s comment, the policy has been amended to encourage biodiversity gain and green infrastructure delivery. Specific reference to the OCOR project has not been included within the policy, as the policy could equally apply to other infrastructure projects brought forward to address flood risk within the plan period.

With regard to the concern over viability of the policy, most of the allocated sites are located outside of areas at flood risk and those which are not, are defended or could accommodate growth away from areas at flood risk. Nonetheless, the Authority will work with developers to ensure that the site which could be affected by flooding, are viable.

A reference to heritage exceptions has not been included within the policy, as the existing policy should allow heritage exceptions to be made.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

No change has been made in regard to St Modwen Developments-Planning Prospects comments, as the first part of the policy states: “The development of sites with a higher risk of flooding will be considered where essential for regeneration or where development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk.” As such the suggested clause is already included in the policy.

In regards to Hackwood Farm, the site is not at risk of fluvial flooding and surface water flood risk is limited on site. Any application would be supported by a flood risk assessment due to the scale of the proposal and this would be expected to demonstrate that the site would not exacerbate flood risk elsewhere.

Regarding the proposed housing allocation at Hilton Depot, the Environment Agency flood maps (fluvial) indicate that the site is at low risk of flooding. Moreover, the site is a previously developed former military base which would be regenerated by development of the site. In addition, development of the site would deliver a primary school within the village (for which there is an identified need).

In response to the districts housing provision and flood risk impact, South Derbyshire District Councils housing number is based on an objectively assessed need. The Council seeks to locate development in areas which will not be subject to flood risk in accordance with the NPPF.

Policy SD5: Sustainable Water Supply, Drainage and Sewerage Infrastructure

No main issue was received in regard to this policy, each consultee provided different comments.

North West Leicestershire District Council support aspects of the policy. The Home Builders Federation states that the policy will need to be viability tested. Two consultees make reference to the policy and proposed housing allocations. One consultee states that before considering the Former Aston Hall Hospital for 100 dwellings, drainage and sewerage requirements must be evaluated first and other consultees suggest that in Etwell, the sewer is at capacity.

Only one consultee (Environment Agency) suggested alterations to the policy. The Environment Agency suggested wording which could be inserted in the policy, this includes the following:

- Ensuring that new homes meet the water efficiency standards consistent with level 3/4 of the Code of Sustainable Homes and new non-residential development achieve BREEAM Very Good Standard for Water;
- Surface water from new development will be expected to be managed using SuDS, discharge to watercourse, or connection to surface water mains sewers. Only where these options are not technically feasible and in consultation with Water Companies, will surface water discharge to be a combine’s sewer be permitted.
- Foul flows generated by new development will be expected to connect to the main sewer.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In regard to the comments received concerning the policy and proposed housing allocations, both sites have been evaluated by Seven Trent Water on behalf of the Authority. Seven Trent Water have identified the need for local capacity improvements. However, there are no strategic capacity constraints.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

In response to the policy requiring viability testing, the cost of achieving higher standards proposed is given as £42 for a flat or £68 for a house. Development in South Derbyshire has been subjected to viability testing and could stand the nominal cost of this requirement.

All minor changes that the Environment Agency suggested have been made, expect the change in respect of water efficiency, as this approach is at odds with the Housing Standard Review.

Policy SD6: Contaminated Land and Mining Legacy Issues

No main issues were received in regard to this policy. Instead, each consultee provided different comments.

The Coal Authority welcomes the inclusion of the policy, however, states that it fails to make any direct reference to unstable land, focusing instead on made ground, contaminated land and rising mine water.

The Environment Agency suggested that the last paragraph of the policy should be amended to read:

the council will work with to bring forward the regeneration of derelict or contaminated sites, *and investigate options for the sustainable management* of rising mine water levels within the South Derbyshire Coalfield.

South Derbyshire District Councils (SDDC) Environmental Health Team highlights that the Council has a statutory responsibility to ensure that existing and future land contamination does not cause significant risk or harm to human, or ecological receptors and highlights the need for appropriate ground investigations and remediation, prior to development on sites, that are within or in close proximity to contaminated sites.

In addition, one consultee suggests that the plan needs to be much clearer in terms of the protection of existing residential clusters, where there has previously been, or could be in the future, applications made for the development and erection of wind turbines that are outside the local plans produced by these areas affected. In this case Risborrow Close and the surrounding area. This also covers policy SD6.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In response to the Coal Authority's comment, instability has been inserted into the title of the policy and the word unstable, has been added to the following sentence:

Planning permission for development on land which is known to be comprise made ground or which is *unstable*....

The Environment Agency's suggested alteration to the policy has been made.

It is considered that the policy already requires appropriate investigation and remediation to protect human health and the natural environment. Therefore, no amendments have been made in response to comments received from SDDC Environmental Health Team.

With regard to the consultees comment, that the plan needs to be much clearer in terms of protecting existing residential clusters from wind turbines, it is considered that there is no merit in singling out specific forms of development that this policy applies to, as it applies to all development.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Policy SD7: Minerals Safeguarding

Very few responses were received in regard to this policy. There was no main issues received, just individual comments.

The Coal Authority welcomed the inclusion of the policy and does not request any amendments. No comments were received from Derbyshire County Council (DCC) regarding this policy during the consultation. However, the forward planning team at Derbyshire County Council verbally confirmed on the 14th January 2014, that they are satisfied with the content of the policy.

One consultee suggests that the plan needs to be much clearer in terms of the protection of existing residential clusters, where there has previously been or could be in the future, applications made for the development and erection of wind turbines that are outside the local plans produced by these areas affected. In this case Risborough Close and the surrounding area. This also covers policy SD7.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

No amendments to the policy have been made in response to the consultees comments.

In response to the one consultee who suggested changes, a decision was made not to single out specific forms of development or individual locations that the policy applies to, as it applies to all development within the mineral safeguarded area, identified by Derbyshire County Council.

Policy SD8: Amenity

Only two consultees made comment on the policy. Natural England, who broadly supports the provision of the policy and the Environment Agency, who suggest three amendments: The first is that the title of the policy be altered to Environmental Quality, as the term amenity is not well defined and can be widely interpreted in planning terms. The second is that the integrity and continuity of flood defences is included within this policy rather than SD4: Flood Risk, And the third is that the policy should read:

The Council will take into consideration the following:

Ensuring there is sufficient buffer between conflicting land uses such that they do not disadvantage each other, particularly with regards to amenity issues such as noise, odour, litter/dust, (e.g. housing and waste management facility).

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

All alterations suggested by the Environment Agency have been made. The title of the policy has been amended to Environment Quality and Amenity, the integrity and continuity of flood defences has been removed from policy SD8 and inserted into SD4: Flood Risk and the following statement have been included within the policy:

The need for a strategic buffer between conflicting land uses such that they do not disadvantage each other, in respect of amenity issues such as odours, fumes, or dust and other disturbance such as noise, vibration, light or shadow flicker.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Policy SD9: Woodville Regeneration Area

North West Leicestershire District Council requests clarity as to whether any employment development in the Woodville Regeneration area would be over and above the 69 ha of employment land provision, referred to under Policy E1. They would want to see that an assessment/consideration has been given to the impact on settlements and the road network in North West Leicestershire. They would expect that the Local Plan would demonstrate that consideration has/will be given to the relationship between the Regeneration Area and adjoining land in North West Leicestershire. It is also suggested that consideration be given to the need for joint working with NWLDC to deliver the Woodville Regeneration Area, whilst protecting the amenity of North West Leicestershire and the separate identity of Albert Village.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Comments made by NWLDC have been agreed. The wording of the explanation accompanying Policy E1 has been amended to indicate that any employment land provided in connection with Policy SD9 would be additional to the identified strategic provision. The explanation accompanying Policy SD9 has been amended to indicate that development, including any that may come forward on adjacent land outside South Derbyshire, will be brought forward through joint working with North West Leicestershire District Council, to deliver regeneration, whilst protecting the amenity of the neighbouring district and maintaining the separate identity of nearby Albert Village. It has also been amended to indicate that account will be taken of the need to avoid unacceptable traffic impacts both within Derbyshire and in the neighbouring district of North West Leicestershire.

Policy BNL1: Design Excellence

There were no overriding issues received in regard to policy BNL3. Instead, consultees either stated that they supported the policy (Natural England, National Trust and Derbyshire County Council) or requested different changes to the policy.

The National Forest Company request that the policy should be amended to specifically refer to the National Forest Character.

Sport England requests that an additional principle should be added, relating to sport and physical activity, reflecting its importance in terms of design.

The Environment Agency stated that the District Council have an important role to play in; reducing water produced, implementing the waste hierarchy and maximising recycling and request that the a standalone waste policy should be developed to cover a number of elements.

Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Commercial Estates Group suggest that the policy wording is onerous it is not clear what documents would need to be considered and subsequently the standard that would need to be met in order to achieve high performance. It is suggested that the following sentence is deleted from the policy: "All proposals for major development shall perform highly when assessed against current best practice guidance and standards for design, sustainability and place making"

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Amendments have been made to the policy based on The National Forest Company, The Environment Agency and Sport England comments

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Reference to the National Forest Design Charter has been included within the policy and the policy's section on sustainability has been widened to support the provision of public open space and sports provision, in response to Sport England's comments.

In response to the Environment Agency's comments, a separate waste management policy has not been created. Instead the Agency's concerns have been addressed in policy BNL1.

The second part of the policy has not been deleted as requested by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, on behalf of Commercial Estates Group. It is considered that the policy is consistent with Section 7 of the NPPF Requiring Good Design. The Authority however, acknowledges comments regarding uncertainty about which documents would need to be considered to achieve high performance. It is proposed that a design Supplementary Planning Document would be published to help provide greater clarity in respect of this issue.

Policy BNL2: Heritage Assets

English Heritage states that it is unclear as to whether the policy also serves for development management purposes, as well as setting the plans strategic policy. If the policy serves as a development management policy, it will need augmenting to provide a more practical framework for decision making as required by the NPPF.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

No changes to the policy have been made. The Local Plan however, will make clear that existing heritage policies within the adopted 1998 Local Plan will be retained. Heritage assets policies will be included in Part 2 of the Local Plan.

Policy BNL3: Biodiversity

There was no overriding issue received in regard to policy BNL3, instead consultees requested different changes to the policy.

The National Trust suggest that the first bullet point could be interpreted to only refer to proposals to develop all, or part of one of these designated sites. Whereas in reality, often such sites are in good hands and well managed and it is often the threat from nearby new development that is the greatest concern. By adding the wording "that would directly or indirectly impact upon them" at the end of this bullet point would assist in this matter.

The Woodland Trust states that the protection of ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees and other irreplaceable semi natural habitats should be included within the policy.

The Environment Agency requests that the policy should be amended to include the Water Framework Directives.

Natural England suggest that the first sentence of the policy be reworded so that it seeks to achieve net gains for nature, to better reflect the advice in paragraphs 9 and 109 of the NPPF.

In addition, one consultee suggests that biodiversity needs to be encouraged everywhere, not just in specialised protected areas. Development should attempt to encourage biodiversity by appropriate design.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The word biodiversity has been added into the first sentence of the policy, to reflect Natural England's comment concerning the need to deliver biodiversity gain, as set out in the NPPF.

The words within and adjacent to sites have been added to the first bullet point within the policy, to reflect concern from the National Trust about the ability of sites to be affected by surrounding development.

To reflect the the Environment Agency's comments, the second bullet point of the policy has been amended to reflect that water quality, means in respect of the Water Framework Directive objectives.

To reflect concern from the Woodland Trust, a sentence has been included within the policy which seeks to protect ancient woodland and veteran trees, unless the needs for and benefits of the development would clearly outweigh the loss.

In response to the comment that biodiversity needs to be encouraged everywhere, the first sentence of the policy has been reworded to state: *"The Local Planning Authority will support development which contributes towards protecting, or improving local biodiversity or geodiversity and delivering net gains in biodiversity wherever possible by"*.

Policy BNL4: Landscape Character and Local Distinctiveness

There was no overriding issue received in regard to policy BNL4. Instead, consultees requested different changes to the policy.

The National Trust and English Heritage suggest that the policy should make reference to historic landscape character. Natural England suggests that the plan should safeguard the long term capability of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land and make clear that areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used for development, in preference to BMV land. Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Commercial Estates Group suggest that the following text should be added before the final sentence of the first paragraph, to provide more certainty for developers "This may include demonstrating that the landscaping proposed will mitigate this loss".

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The proposed changes suggested have been included within the policy. The policy has been amended to; make reference to the historic landscape, the council seeking to protect soils that are Best and Most Versatile and where possible, direct development to areas with lower quality soils. Development will not be permitted if an unacceptable impact on landscape character cannot be satisfactorily mitigated.

Policy I1: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

A consultation response from a planning consultant highlighted the changes to S106 that will come into effect as a result of the CIL regulations, and emphasised the importance of a thorough viability study to ensure CIL does not make development unviable. A Mickleover resident raised concerns over the ability of Mickleover's infrastructure to cope with further major housing development. The National Trust, whilst broadly supportive, noted that the policy and supportive text made no reference to potential heritage related works. The County Council, whilst supportive,

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

expressed that the Policy could be improved by providing more detail as to what infrastructure is required. Repton Parish Council raised the need for a new village hall and another consultation response simply supported the Policy.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

A CIL viability study has already been commissioned to ensure any CIL levy adopted by the Council in the future, has been robustly assessed. Furthermore, reference is now made to viability in the Policy when calculating how much infrastructure can be provided on site. A reference to sustainability has been added with respect to the need to provide infrastructure at the right place at the right time. The details of the infrastructure required in order to deliver the Local Plan are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, rather than in Policy INF1. A replacement for Repton Village Hall has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Policy 12: Sustainable Transport

Gladman Developments believe that Policy I2, Sustainable Transport, is overly long and prescriptive.

Another consultee considers that consideration should be given to the potential for use of canals as a form of transport.

The words “seek to negotiate” in section E(ii) should be replaced by the stronger “secure through negotiation”.

The County Council is disappointed that the transport evidence base outside the Derby Urban Area, has not been fully developed.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The policy has been drafted in such a way as to ensure that it is capable of achieving its intended purpose, although changes have been made to reduce complexity and improve clarity.

The Trent and Mersey Canal does not lend itself to use for transport purposes.

Wording change regarding negotiation agreed and policy amended accordingly.

Transport modelling for the area of South Derbyshire outside the Derby Urban Area is currently underway.

Policy 13: Strategic Rail Freight Interchange

Queries are raised as to whether and how the potential development of a strategic rail freight interchange at Egginton Common, is to be addressed in the Local Plan.

The site promoter and the Environment Agency query the fact that land at Egginton Common is not explicitly protected for this purpose in the Local Plan and that the reference, in Policy I3, to such a development leading to a requirement to review the Local Plan should be deleted. It is also requested that the lower case text be amended to indicate that an application would be determined by the Secretary of State for Transport.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Two respondents suggest that the reference to the rail gauge should be amended to read “W10”. English Heritage would like the policy to refer to all types of heritage assets, rather than just listed buildings and conservation areas.

Egginton Parish Council considers that any policy should stem from a strategic approach to this type of development, involving the relevant local authorities. There is a need for a more robust policy statement clarifying the Council's position and indicating support for such development in South Derbyshire, only if it serves the needs of the wider region. Policy criteria should stipulate that no manufacturing or service based development shall take place on site, unless directly related and forming an ancillary part of the existing operation primarily involved in the transport hub business. Evidence in the form of the AECOM report may no longer be relevant due to the withdrawal of the Regional Plan, upon which it was predicated. If it still stands, its conclusions should be checked and challenged.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

A criteria based policy, I3, against which any such proposal would be assessed is included in the Draft Plan. Any planning application would be determined by the Secretary of State for Transport. The Draft Local Plan makes provision to accommodate forecast levels of housing and employment growth within a given set of circumstances over the plan period. That set of circumstances does not include the development of a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange. Such development would generate new employment on a large scale, leading to additional population growth in the HMA, with attendant pressure for further housing development. Although there are plans to upgrade the gauge of rail lines, Government guidance on strategic rail freight interchanges indicates that the minimum acceptable gauge to serve this type of development is W8 and no change is therefore proposed. The currency and adequacy of available evidence and consideration as to whether such a facility in South Derbyshire would serve the needs of the wider region would be matters for the decision making body, should an application be submitted. It is not proposed to stipulate that manufacturing or service development should be ancillary to the transport hub business, as it would not be possible to precisely define the limits of this requirement and its enforcement would be impracticable. The policy has been amended to refer to the character and setting of all heritage assets and the lower case text has been altered to refer to applications being determined by the Secretary of State for Transport. No change has been made in respect of the other comments received.

Policy I4: New Road Schemes

Some respondents believe that the transport modelling supporting the South Derby Integrated Transport Link proposal is not credible. One respondent believes that if the link is to be built, phases 1 and 2 should be completed at the same time, as terminating at Stenson Road would be disastrous.

The plan does not refer to improved links between the new river crossing at Drakelow and Swadlincote. Nor does it refer to bringing the redundant railway line in this location back into use.

The County Council is concerned that there is as yet no evidence that the Woodville to Swadlincote Regeneration Route would be feasible, or would mitigate the transport impacts of development proposed under Policy SD9. Nor is there evidence of its environmental impacts. Development at Broomy Farm proposed under Policy H3, will involve the development of a new link road between the A511 and A514, but its value in terms of bringing relief to the rest of the highway network is unknown. The

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Local Plan ought to be seeking developer contributions from all strategic sites in the Swadlincote urban area toward the delivery of the Woodville to Swadlincote Regeneration Route. The Environment Agency ask that the alignment of the route be shown on the Area Profile map. North West Leicestershire District Council indicates that it would expect an assessment of such a proposal to consider the impact on the wider road network and the neighbouring district. Planning Prospects on behalf of Dyson Group and St Modwen Developments request that the alignment of the proposed Woodville to Swadlincote Regeneration Route be referred to as indicative.

The Highways Agency ask that Policy I4 be amended to refer to all transport schemes required to support the plan. This should include the A38 Derby junction grade separation and junction improvements at the A50/A38 and A50/A514 junctions.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In regard to the South Derby Integrated Transport Link, the Council is satisfied that the modelling methodology and outputs are credible. The outputs demonstrate that the proposed strategic site allocations in this location, as identified in the Draft Local Plan, can be adequately mitigated by the proposed package of measures, which includes the South Derby Integrated Transport Link, Phase 1.

Proposed strategic development can be accommodated without the need for improved highway links between Swadlincote and Drakelow. Policy I2 within the Draft Local Plan protects land at Castle Gresley for the development of a new railway station and at Tetron Point for a possible rail freight facility. It also protects the line for the possible establishment of a passenger rail service. No changes are proposed.

The gaps in the evidence base relating to the Woodville to Swadlincote Regeneration Route are to be addressed prior to the formal Submission of the Local Plan. It would not be feasible to require developer contributions toward the Woodville to Swadlincote Regeneration Route in relation to all strategic sites in the Swadlincote urban area, as many of these already have the benefit of planning consent. If emerging modelling evidence demonstrates that this piece of infrastructure would help to mitigate the transport impacts of the remaining strategic sites, the need for any contribution can be addressed with reference to Policy I2. The explanation accompanying the policy has been amended to indicate that in planning for the link, account will be taken of the need to avoid any unacceptable impacts on the wider road network, including highways in the adjacent District of North West Leicestershire. The Area Profiles and Area Profile maps will not be carried forward into the Pre Submission Local Plan, instead will be located within the Local Plan Part 2. For the Local Plan Part 2 it will be necessary to amend the Area Profile map to show the indicative alignment of the route and to amend the Area Plan to show indicative alignment of the Woodville to Swadlincote Regeneration Route.

In regard to Highways Agency comments, the A38 Derby junction grade separation scheme lies outside South Derbyshire and it would therefore, be inappropriate to include among the schemes listed in Policy I4. However, the policy has been amended to refer to the A50/A38 and A50/A514 junction improvement schemes.

Policy 15: East Midlands Airport

No comments received in respect of this policy

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Policy 16: Community Facilities

An Etwall resident commented that the provision of a new cricket pitch in Etwall could not be regarded as a community facility as it was not accessible to the majority of residents. A comment was made regarding the shortage of community facilities in the Blagreaves area of Derby and how there should be a requirement to provide community facilities that can serve Blagreaves and new developments. The Theatres Trust requested a firm, NPPF-compliant, definition of the term 'community facilities' within the policy text or a glossary.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

An addition has been made to the policy wording to allow for community facilities to be provided as part of a scheme, rather than only via contributions. A definition of 'community facilities' will be included in the Local Plan glossary.

Policy 17: Green Infrastructure

No overarching issues were received regarding the policy.

Natural England and the National Trust both support the policy. The House Builders Federation suggested that the policy requires viability testing and the National Forest suggested that the policy does not specify a mechanism through which Green Infrastructure will be delivered and raised concern that the policy lacks focus on other landscape scale Green Infrastructure strategies and plans.

In addition, the National Farmers Union states that they hope the third paragraph of the policy's explanatory text will apply to larger developments and not to smaller developers who will not easily be able to demonstrate how their proposal contributes to the Local Biodiversity Action Plan.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

In response to the National Forests concern that policy fails to specify a mechanism in which Green Infrastructure will be delivered, the following wording has been added to the policy: *The District Council will seek to conserve, enhance and wherever possible, extend green infrastructure by working with developers and other parties to preserve, improve and create new multifunctional green spaces within development sites and, where appropriate, through financial contribution to fund offsite works. In particular the Council will work with partners to:*

In addition, the following paragraph has been added to reflect the National Forests concern about the policies lack of focus on other landscape scale Green Infrastructure strategies and plans. *Elsewhere new developments will be expected to support and help deliver landscape scale change consistent with the strategy and priorities set out in the 6Cs Green Infrastructure Vision and Strategy and the National Forest Strategy.*

In response to the National Framers Union comments; text has been added to the policy's commentary, regarding the Biodiversity Action Plan and how developers can access further information.

In regard to the policy requiring viability testing, the conservation of biodiversity and delivery of biodiversity gain and wider Green Infrastructure is a requirement of the NPPF. Most sites include elements within a scheme needed to support delivery, such as SuDS, open space provision and strategic planning. This policy seeks to ensure

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

that such spaces which occur on sites are delivered in a multifunctional and coordinated way without increasing costs.

Policy I8: The National Forest

No main issues arose from the responses received, instead consultees either objected to the policy, suggested amendments or supported the policy.

The National Forest Company requests that consideration is given to and includes the Planting Guidelines within the body of the policy, rather than the supporting text, to give them further weight and suggests direct reference and hyperlinks should be made to the National Forests Guide for Developers and Planners. In addition, the National Forest Company states that the table within the policy is incorrect and needs amending to show the commuting sum of £20k per hectare, rather than £10k per hectare and paragraph 5 should specifically refer to the Design Principle of Policy BNL1, to emphasise the requirement to incorporate a National character into new development.

Planning Prospects on behalf of Dyson Group and St Modwen and Planning Prospect and St Modwen object to the policy. They state that the policy should acknowledge that as a policy aim, as opposed to a development mitigation, viability in provision of national forest planting is important. In addition, the consultees state that it should be recognised that rather than “exceptionally”, it may in some instances be preferable to provide for national forest planting off site, or by way of a commuted sum. Reference to viability should be acknowledged in the policy. The potential for commuted sums towards off site provision being preferable in some instances should be reflected in policy.

The Heart of the National Forest state that they support the development of tourism and leisure activities. However, this seems at odds with policy I10.

In addition, Natural England and National Trust submitted representation in support of the policy.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

A hyperlink to the National Forest Company's Guide for Developers and Planners, has been added to the explanatory text. In addition, amendments to the table have been made to reflect the National Forest Company's requested alterations.

Planting guidelines have not been included within the body of the policy. The Council considers that planting guidelines are best excluded from the policy in order that, should guidelines change in the future, it will not render the policy itself out of date. In addition, the Design Principles of Policy BNL1 have not been included within the policy, as Strategic Policy S2 sets out that it is implicit that all developments will be assessed against the plan as a whole.

In response to the comment that Draft Local Plan policy I8 and I10 are not consistent, the policies have been amended to be consistent with each other. In regards to the comments that viability should be acknowledged with the policy, an amendment has been made to the explanatory text which addresses schemes viability issues... *where it can be demonstrated that it would be preferable to deliver planting off site, for example due to lack of land or viability issues, a commuted sum will be negotiated.*

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

No amendments have been made to the policy in response to the following comment; the policy should acknowledge that as a policy aim, as opposed to a development mitigation, viability in provision of national forest planting is important. The policy does not state that policy creation is for mitigation. Further, it is explicit in the explanatory text that where viability is an issue, alternative forest contributions will be sought on a guideline rate.

Policy I9: Open Space, Sport and Recreation

No main issues arose from the responses received. However, alterations to the policy were suggested by consultees. These alterations are:

- Cemeteries are a typology of open space, their need is not related to open space, sport and recreation need. If cemeteries are needed, then a separate policy would be required to address this need.
- The Woodland Trust would like to see more commitment to woodland creation in association with new development in part of the district, not covered in the National Forest.
- Sport England suggest that the wording of the policy needs to be reviewed in order to ensure that it fully aligns with the NPPF and Sport England's playing fields policy, the use of the term good provision does not fully correspond to the supporting text which correctly refers to the robust assessment of needs and opportunities etc. underpinning the policies. Reference should be made to identifying sites for sports facilities and not just allotments and cemeteries.

In addition Natural England offers their general support to the policy.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

Woodland creation has been included within the policy, the term good provision has been removed from the policy, reference has been made to identify sites for sports facilities and the policy wording has been amended to be further aligned to the NPPF.

The Council considers that the reference to the Council working with developers and stakeholders to identify suitable sites for cemetery's where there is an identified lack of provision locally, can be included within the policy and a separate policy is not required.

Policy I10: New Permanent Self Catering Accommodation

The Heart of the National Forest Foundation has asked that Policy I10 be amended to allow the development of any form of self-catering tourist accommodation throughout the Heart of the National Forest area. Mercia Marina considers that overnight accommodation in marinas should be addressed by Policy I10 and that marina development should also be addressed by Policy E2. Mercia Marina should be identified in the Local Plan for mixed use rural diversification. The National Trust considers that the policy should be amended to make clear that development that has an adverse impact on heritage assets will not be approved.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The wording of Policy I10 has been amended to refer to all tourism development, including overnight accommodation, in respect of which a less restrictive approach has been taken, whilst the lower case text now specifically refers to marinas. It is

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

considered unnecessary to address marina development in Policy E2, which deals with development in Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 (industrial and business uses). Any potential impact on heritage assets will be addressed with reference to Policy BNL2 “Heritage Assets”.

Planning for Places

There was no overriding issue received in regard to the Planning For Places chapter of the Local Plan Part 1. Instead a few comments were received in support of the chapter and others were received which suggested some alterations. The suggested amendments include:

- The Southern Village Area does not appear to take account of the Burton on Trent HMA, within which the area falls and the close physical connection with the Burton on Trent Urban Area.
- Objective 2 for the Hatton area is too strong and should be reworded to “seek to alleviate”.
- Environmental objectives should include the safeguarding of Calke Abby, its Registered Historic Park and Garden and their wider setting and the safeguarding of the National Nature Reserve at Calke, including from adverse external impacts upon it.
- The Registered Historic Park and Garden at Calke is not shown on the Repton Area plan.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

As previously discussed in producing the Pre-Submission Local Plan Part 1, it was considered that the Planning for Places section of the Draft Local Plan Part 1 would sit more logically in the Local Plan Part 2. The Local Plan Part 2 will include non-strategic sites to meet comparatively smaller scale development needs and will propose any detailed amendments to settlements and Green Belt boundaries. The Planning for Places section has therefore, not been carried into the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1.

Additional Policy Comments

One consultee has stated that there is no town centre and retail policies within the Local Plan and considers that the District Council should incorporate an appropriate criteria based policy in the plan for town centre and retail developments, consistent with the NPPF.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The retail element of the strategic policy S1 has been removed and a strategic retail policy has been created in its place that focusses the direction of retail within the District. Further retail policies, including town centre boundaries will be addressed within Part 2 of the Local Plan.

Do you have any comments on the scope and findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA)?

17 consultees stated no to this question and 5 responded that they had not seen the SA.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

In regard to housing allocations and the SA, development in Etwall received the most comments. The comments raised questions regarding the SA analysis of the impacts of development in Etwall. The comments that were received included: Consultees suggest that the SA is incorrect by stating that development is unlikely to have a significant impact on the village road infrastructure, the site appraisal states that there will be beneficial effects in reducing flood risk and the release of surface run off. However there is nothing within the IDP that suggests that this is being addressed and consultees state that the development will not reduce flood risk and surface water run-off.

In addition, a few consultees state that the John Port is currently at capacity, that it is unlikely that there will be improved accessibility other than by car and development will not provide access to healthcare, which the SA states will be the case.

A further consultee states that drainage and sewage requirements must be evaluated first.

Comments regarding flooding concern have also been received in regard to Etwall and the following settlements: Aston/Weston on Trent, Hilton and Wragley Way.

Comments were also received regarding the SA and other settlements within the District. One respondent states that land at Broomy Farm represent one of the more sustainable options for growth around Swadlincote. A further respondent questions Hackwood Farms negative scoring compared to other sites, particularly in regards to protecting the existing landscape character and the protecting and enhancing the setting of historic cultural, architectural and archaeological features in the District. An additional consultee states that unless the proposed increase in housing is supported by equivalent local employment opportunities, the result may be significant increase in travel by car, which is contrary to a sustainability objective in the Local Plan (to reduce the need to travel and encourage sustainable travel modes). One consultee suggests that the sustainability appraisal does not go far enough into looking at whether the level of growth proposed for one of the broad locations, Sinfin (Stenson Fields) can be delivered.

Further comments have been received regarding site assessments. One consultee states that no site level consideration of proposed allocations has been made and the SA contains no such explanation of the consideration of alternative sites. A further response suggests that detailed site assessments need to be undertaken for the SA to fully comply with the NPPF and another states that housing development in the rural villages has been assessed at a village level, rather than a site level. However, in light of the need for the Council to allocate additional housing in order to meet its full and objectively assessed housing needs, rural sites should be appraised at this stage rather Part 2 of the Local Plan.

Additional comments have been received which refer to specific aspects of the SA, however, have not been mentioned more than once. These include:

- It does not appear that the Lea Farm site is considered in the SA. This needs to be included in order to comply with the SEA Regulations.
- Regarding housing options, the Government housing projections is the highest performing option in terms of delivering sustainability objectives. The Councils justification of their lower growth option does therefore, not sit comfortably with the board mix appraisal.
- The SA will need to be revisited to consider the implications of planning properly to meet its full and objectively assessed housing needs.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- Under Section 5.4 renewable energy is identified as a Themed Option. However, by 5.62 it is downgraded simply to energy efficiency.
- Would like to see an explanation of sustainable within the documents.
- One consultee questions particular indicators/targets within the SA.
- One consultee questions the SA conclusion that a criteria based policy for the determination of Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges would be appropriate. The Consultee goes on to add a list of changes which should be made to the SA regarding the Ewtall Common analysis.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The Council considers that a large majority of the comments received do not materially relate to the Sustainability Appraisal, instead are objections the proposed housing allocations.

However site assessments have now been undertaken for potential development sites of over 5ha or would be able to accommodate over 100 dwellings.

Do you have any comments regarding the Draft Consultation Statement?

The majority of responses received do not have any comments to make regarding this question. Those consultees that did make comments make reference to how South Derbyshire has consulted stakeholders. There was no main issues received, instead individual comments were received which can be seen below:

- The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups states that the Draft Consultation Statement reinforces their concern that no serious attempt has been made to engage with the Gypsy population in the area.
- According to the document, efforts have been made to involve communities. However, it needs to be recognised that despite numerous methods of communication being employed, many individuals within communities have great difficulties accessing information and therefore, cannot feedback.
- Those without internet access are “handicapped” in commenting.
- It supports South Derbyshire’s demonstration that the District Council have followed due process, whilst allowing the District Council to ignore those views of residents that are opposed to the intended relentless urbanisation of South Derbyshire.
- The Draft Local Plan consultation events were not published or timed well enough to allow all local residents to attend.
- Documents for feedback were not promoted correctly and were not user friendly.
- One consultee does not understand the lengthy process and is not clear of the next steps.
- The Draft Consultation Statement is ok.
- Unable to find, or has not seen the document to comment.
- Consultation seems to be set for everyone to agree, not taking on board the worries of residents.
- It seems to ask people to rubber stamp decisions that they are not qualified, or experienced enough to judge.
- There have been meetings for local residents, which were informative.
- On Page 23 (21 of the document) there is an indication that Etwall residents, again favoured affordable housing which supports the validity of their original parish plan.
- Cannot find any reference in previous consultations to the District Council identifying any Etwall sites for consultation, prior to the Bloor Homes proposal

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

to develop the Willington Road site. It would appear that this proposal is driven by private commercial interest rather than democratic process.

- Central Government need to be aware of local feelings and not be allowed to force unwelcome building prospects in Derby.
- Too much detail within documents for us to enable us to comment.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The responses received regarding the Draft Consultation Statement make reference to how South Derbyshire has consulted stakeholders, not the soundness of the document. No alterations to the content of the document have been made based on the result of consultees comments.

Although not directly related to the content of the Consultation Statement in terms of its soundness, a comment has been raised that the Draft Local Plan consultation events were not published or timed well enough to allow all local residents to attend. To address this issue for the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1 consultation, Parish Councils and Parish Meetings have been emailed or sent a hard copy (for those without an email address) of a poster advertising the upcoming consultation events. The poster was sent out 18 days before the start of the consultation period. In addition, the Pre Submission Local Plan Part 1 consultation events will carry on later into the evening than the drop in events for the Draft Local Plan Part 1.

Do you have any comments regarding the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)?

In response to asking for comments on the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, 23 consultees stated that a replacement of Repton Village Hall should be included within the IDP, this was the most recurring comment received. 11 consultees simply stated “no” in response to this question.

Further to the above, the majority of residents who responded made specific comments regarding issues within their village or neighbourhood, which they consider need addressing. The main concerns raised were road infrastructure capacity and issues, school capacity and provision, healthcare capacity and provision and sewerage and drainage problems.

In addition, the following comments have been received from statutory consultees and other interested parties:

- The Theatre Trust referred to the quote in the IDP of paragraph 162 from the NPPF, specifically the reference to social care, and commented that the term social care does not appear anywhere else in the document and is therefore, not consistent. The Theatre Trust also state that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should also include community and cultural facilities to reflect one of the 12 Core Planning Principles of the NPPF at item 17.
- The Royal Mail stated that the scale of the proposed growth may place a significant burden on the existing delivery offices and consequently, may require a new delivery office. The representation goes on to state that Royal Mail may require the allocation of a new site for a new delivery office or developer contributions through Section 106 or community Infrastructure Levy, as a valid receipt of infrastructure funds.

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

- Sport England queried the absence of entries in the Social Infrastructure Delivery Schedule and queried the background to social infrastructure.
- The Highways Agency was satisfied that the Draft IDP addressed key transport issues and welcomed the inclusion of "A50 Junction Improvements Local Mitigation to the south of Derby". The cost of this scheme is shown as > £1 million. The Highways Agency suggested this be changed to > £3 million. With regard to the ranking system adopted in the IDP, the Highways Agency were content with the majority of the rankings but considered that the South Derbyshire Integrated Transport Link and A50 Junction Improvements could be regarded as "high" rather than "medium" priority.
- The Environment Agency asked to be involved in discussions with Severn Trent Water Ltd in regard to wastewater treatment infrastructure, as a constraint to growth as identified in the Water and Flooding chapter of the IDP, and listed the sites affected by inadequate sewerage infrastructure.

A number of comments regarding the IDP from developers and planning agents included specific reference to particular sites and alterations to the IDP. These comments included:

- The Transport Delivery Scheme is lacking any reference to potential SFRI development.
- The IDP states that "the proposed development at Hackwood Farm will require a new high voltage cable running from Derby City to the west of the City" and indicated that a Section 106 agreement is a potential funding source. The planning agent/developer wants to make clear that funding for such infrastructure improvements would be agreed in a contract between Miller Homes and Western Power Distribution.
- The IDP identifies a need for a new temporary double classroom at Hilton Primary School and that funding for this has been committed. The IDP does not refer to the need for a new primary school, yet housing allocation H7 is in part justified on the basis for a site for a new primary school.

How, where necessary, these issues were addressed

The replacement of Repton Village Hall has been included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Road infrastructure requirements, school capacity and provision and healthcare capacity and provision are covered by Policy INF1: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions and in producing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the Council continues to work with the Highways Agency, Highways Authority, Education Authority and Healthcare providers to establish where new provision is, or will be, required. The provision of sewerage and foul water drainage is a statutory requirement for water companies.

The term 'social care', quoted from paragraph 162 of the NPPF in the Infrastructure Plan is not considered to be the same thing as social infrastructure. Rather, it is considered that social care falls under the banner of health infrastructure. The twelfth Core Planning Principle, as listed in paragraph 17 of the NPPF has been included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

The existing Royal Mail delivery offices and Royal Mail's possible requirements as a consequence of future growth are now referred to in the text of the Infrastructure

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Delivery Plan. A new delivery office has not been included in the Schedule at this stage, particularly because the requirement is not a definite one.

As part of continuing work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the 'Social' infrastructure delivery schedule has become 'Sport, Recreation, Open Space and Social' infrastructure and now includes several infrastructure projects which fall under that banner.

Following the Highways Agency response, the cost of delivering 'A50 Junction Improvements Local Plan Mitigation to the south of Derby' has been increased from >£1million to >£3million. The ranking used within the IDP has been removed, instead prioritisation will be resolved as the Local Plan is implemented.

The infrastructure concerns highlighted by the Environment Agency have been included in the IDP.

With regard to the SRFI, the Council is not promoting the development of an SRFI in the District and any decision would be for the Secretary of State for Transport to make. No assumptions can be made as to whether an SRFI will be developed in the District, nor concerning measures that may be needed to support such development. The IDP has been amended to reflect the comment regarding the high voltage cable, in relation to the proposed development at Hackwood Farm. The IDP now includes a new primary school at Hilton in the Schedule.

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

List of appendices

Issues and Ideas appendix

Appendix A1:	Letter sent to statutory consultees
Appendix A2:	Letter sent to general amenity consultees
Appendix A3:	Letter sent to South Derbyshire Councillors
Appendix A4:	Letter sent to Parish Councils
Appendix A5:	Summary leaflet
Appendix A6:	Email to Local Strategic Partnership Board Members
Appendix A7:	Emails to Partners of Local Strategic Partnership
Appendix A8:	Follow up email to consultees
Appendix A9:	Questionnaire
Appendix A10:	Press release (6 th February 2009)
Appendix A11:	Burton Mail news article
Appendix A12:	Poster advertising Etwall public meeting (produced by residents)
Appendix A13:	Notes from Etwall consultation meeting
Appendix A14:	Burton Mail news article
Appendix A15:	Burton Mail news article
Appendix A16:	This is Derbyshire article
Appendix A17:	PowerPoint slides presented to the Local Strategic Partnership (09/01/2009)
Appendix A18:	PowerPoint sides presented at the LFF Member Workshop (17/03/2009)
Appendix A19:	PowerPoint slides presented at the member priorities seminar (14/07/2009)
Appendix A20:	Burton Mail article
Appendix A21:	Burton Mail article
Appendix A22:	Issues and Ideas consultation summary report

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

Issues and Alternative Options appendix

Appendix B1:	Letter to consultees
Appendix B2:	Email to consultees
Appendix B3:	Email to South Derbyshire Councillors
Appendix B4:	Letter to South Derbyshire Councillors
Appendix B5:	Letter to Parish Councils
Appendix B6:	Letter to South Derbyshire's MP
Appendix B7:	Further email to consultees (10 th February 2010)
Appendix B8:	Further letter to consultees (26 th March 2010)
Appendix B9:	Poster
Appendix B10:	Leaflet
Appendix B11:	Questionnaire
Appendix B12:	HMA joint press release
Appendix B13:	South Derbyshire press release
Appendix B14:	South Derbyshire press release
Appendix B15:	Derby Telegraph news article (26 th January 2010)
Appendix B16:	Example of presentation given to the Area Forums – example from Swadlincote (26 th January 2010)
Appendix B17:	Issues and Alternative Options consultation summary report

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Your Neighbourhood: Talk to Us appendix

Appendix C1:	Letter to consultees
Appendix C2:	Email to consultees
Appendix C3:	Letter to South Derbyshire MP
Appendix C4:	Email to South Derbyshire Councillors
Appendix C5:	Letter to Parish Councils
Appendix C6:	Follow up email to consultees
Appendix C7:	Letter to school pupils
Appendix C8:	Flyers
Appendix C9:	Poster with all consultation dates on
Appendix C10:	Example of poster targeted to specific neighbourhood area (Swadlincote and Woodville)
Appendix C11:	Example of poster target to specific neighbourhood area (Aston)
Appendix C12:	Questionnaire
Appendix C13:	Exhibition Boards
Appendix C14:	Example of a PowerPoint presentation used at exhibitions targeted to specific neighbourhoods area (Swadlincote and Woodville example)
Appendix C15:	Example of Twitter posts
Appendix C16:	Press release 31 st January 2011
Appendix C17:	Press release 24 th February 2011
Appendix C18:	Melbourne Village Voice Press Release (April 2011)
Appendix C19:	Article in the Burton Mail community page (6 th February 2011)
Appendix C20:	Derbyshire First Newspaper article (January Edition)
Appendix C21:	Say no to Mickleover Sprawl webpage screenshots
Appendix C22:	Invite to HMA training events for elected members
Appendix C23:	HMA training events for elected member's agenda
Appendix C24:	PowerPoint presentation used at HMA training events for elected members

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

- Appendix C25: PowerPoint slides used at Parish Liaison meeting
- Appendix C26: PowerPoint slides used in values and attributes group
- Appendix C27: Your Neighbourhood: Talk to Us consultation summary report

Draft

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Options for Housing Growth appendix

Appendix D1:	Letter to consultees
Appendix D2:	Email to consultees
Appendix D3:	Email to South Derbyshire Councillors
Appendix D4:	Letter to Parish Councils
Appendix D5:	Letter to South Derbyshire's MP
Appendix D6:	Follow up email to consultees
Appendix D7:	Letter to primary school pupils
Appendix D8:	Poster
Appendix D9:	Questionnaire
Appendix D10:	Exhibition boards at the drop in events
Appendix D11:	Summary Leaflet
Appendix D12:	Twitter announcements
Appendix D13:	Press release 7 th July 2011
Appendix D14:	Press release 21 st July 2011
Appendix D15:	Hilton and Dove Valley Life press release
Appendix D16:	Repton magazine press release
Appendix D17:	Hatton News press release
Appendix D18:	Etwall Express press release
Appendix D19:	Melbourne Village Voice press release
Appendix D20:	Willington Magazine press release
Appendix D21:	Posting made by Council on mickleoverpeople.co.uk
Appendix D22:	Article – Burton Mail Community Page
Appendix D23:	Banner on South Derbyshire's District Councils webpage
Appendix D24:	PowerPoint slides from Derby HMA Business Community ACS Phase 2 Consultation Event
Appendix D25:	PowerPoint slides used for presentation to the Sustainable Development Partnership, Sustainable Development Group
Appendix D26:	PowerPoint slides used for Parish Council Training

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

- Appendix D27: PowerPoint slides used at the Derby HMA Housing Requirement Study stakeholder workshop
- Appendix D28: Derby HMA Local Development Framework newsletter
- Appendix D29: Options for Housing Growth Consultation summary report

Draft

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

Preferred Growth Strategy appendix

Appendix E1:	Letter/email to consultees and Parish Councils
Appendix E2:	Letter to South Derbyshire's MP
Appendix E3:	Letter to Parish meetings
Appendix E4:	Follow up email to consultees (24 th October 2012)
Appendix E5:	Follow up email to consultees (5 th December 2012)
Appendix E6:	Follow up letter to Parish Councils (24 th October 2012)
Appendix E7:	Flyer
Appendix E8:	Poster
Appendix E9:	Advert on screens in main reception
Appendix E10:	Banner
Appendix E11:	Questionnaire
Appendix E12:	Display Boards used in drop in events
Appendix E13:	Summary Leaflet
Appendix E14:	Updated poster
Appendix E15:	Case study of the social media used by Northgate Public Services to promote the Preferred Growth Strategy consultation
Appendix E16:	Etwall Express press release
Appendix E17:	Hatton News press release
Appendix E18:	Hilton Dove Valley magazine press release
Appendix E19:	Melbourne Village Voice press release
Appendix E20:	Repton Parish Magazine press release
Appendix E21:	Walton Newsletter press release
Appendix E22:	Willington Resource 2012 press release
Appendix E23:	Derbyshire First press release
Appendix E24:	Press release 10 th October 2012
Appendix E25:	Press release 12 th October 2012
Appendix E26:	Press release 21 st September 2012

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

- Appendix E27: Press release 21st September 2012
- Appendix E28: Press release 7th December 2012
- Appendix E29: Melbourne Village Voice article (November 2012)
- Appendix E30: Swadlincote Post article (30th November 2012)
- Appendix E31: Derby Telegraph Online article (14th November 2012)
- Appendix E32: List of stakeholders who attended HMA stakeholder event
- Appendix E33: Content of Local Plan Blog
- Appendix E34: PowerPoint presentation Slides used at Local Strategic Partnership, Sustainable Development Group
- Appendix E35: Print Screen of You Tube Video
- Appendix E36: Preferred Growth Strategy Consultation summary report

Draft

South Derbyshire District Council Consultation Statement (Draft)

Draft Local Plan Appendix

Appendix F1:	Letter to consultees
Appendix F2:	Email to consultees
Appendix F3:	Letter to Parish Councils and meetings
Appendix F4:	Letter to Parish Council
Appendix F5:	Letter to Parish meetings
Appendix F6:	Additional email to consultees
Appendix F7:	Email to Parish Councils with attached poster
Appendix F8:	Poster
Appendix F9:	Advert on screens in main reception
Appendix F10:	Banner
Appendix F11:	Paper Questionnaire
Appendix F12:	Online Questionnaire with discrepancy
Appendix F13:	Online questionnaire uploaded on website on the 24 th October
Appendix F14:	Letter to consultees regarding online questionnaire
Appendix F15:	Screenshots of South Derbyshire District Council website
Appendix F16:	Exhibition Boards
Appendix F17:	Summary Leaflet
Appendix F18:	Press release 26 th September 2013
Appendix F19:	Press release 26 th September 2013
Appendix F20:	Burton Main Article, 28 th September 2013
Appendix F21:	Flyers
Appendix F22:	Screenshots of Local Plan Blog
Appendix F23:	Screenshots of South Derbyshire District Council Twitter posts
Appendix F24:	Email regarding attendance of Infrastructure Planning Briefing
Appendix F25:	Invitation to Infrastructure Planning Briefing
Appendix F26:	Infrastructure Planning Briefing Programme
Appendix F27:	Draft Local Plan consultation responses

**South Derbyshire District Council
Consultation Statement (Draft)**

Miscellaneous appendix

Appendix G1: Number of people attending each drop in events in each consultation

Appendix G2: List of consultees

Draft