

153 homes, 293 villagers – ONE VOICE



Hazelwood Parish Neighbourhood Plan

2016–2039



Hazelwood Parish Council

www.hazelwoodpc.org.uk

CONSULTATION HISTORY & CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Hazelwood
Neighbourhood Plan

five year
review

Submission 2023

HNP Revision Group Consultations Record

On 7th December 2020 Hazelwood Parish Council (PC) announced by e-mail, hard copy mail and on their website, that a group had been appointed to carry out a Five Year Review of the Hazelwood Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) in line with the commitment made in para 148 of the HNP. The PC provided the Review Group with a broad Mission Statement, and its objectives were announced in the Parish Magazine "*Jottings*" of December 2020. The Group met formally for the first time on January 25th 2021, and between then and May 2022 met on a total of 37 occasions either by Skype or face to face.

In April 2021 the Group created a Survey to be used to canvas opinion in the Parish regarding changes to the natural and built environment since the HNP was "made" in 2016, and also aspirations for further changes going forward. Bespoke stationery was designed to create a "brand image" for the Review, and the Survey was mailed to every household in the Parish by first class post together with a s.a.e. for responses. Funding for this exercise was based on a grant from Locality. The Survey documents are available on the HPC website under "[Documents: Hazelwood Parish 5-year plan Questionnaire LR 24.5.21](#)"

A total of 152 surveys was mailed, and 58 (38%) were returned, plus one letter. There was a strong affection expressed for the rural character and tranquility of the Parish, and for the "friendly and neighbourly" community. Among the major dislikes were the threat from developers, the infilling of large gaps, speeding traffic, the tendency of new-build to be inappropriate in size and design, lack of public transport and the limited access to the use of the Parish playing field.

A detailed summary and analysis of responses is included in the Survey Consultation Summary which is posted on the website under Documents: [2021 HNP Survey Highlights](#)

On September 21st 2021, a review meeting was held between AVBC (at Planning Manager level), the Revision Group and the PC. The meeting considered the likely directions for change to the HNP arising from the Review, and also the procedure to be followed during and after the Review. It was concluded that the Parish boundaries might be better protected if they were defined as "continuous or contiguous" in line with the wording in the AVBC Local Plan 2006, and that the proposals for "Red Line" maps to protect large gaps along road frontages were positive but needed to be accurate. Advice regarding the effectiveness of NP3 and its use of the number of bedrooms as a method of controlling the size & scale of new development was also received.

In late January and early February 2022, following consideration by the Review Group of the Survey results and the AVBC meeting, two public meetings were held to present the initial proposals for the modification of the HNP to Parishioners (the use of two meetings was to offer a timing choice).

A summary of the comments received is also included in the Consultation Summary which is posted on the website under Documents: [\(Final\) HNP 5YR Review Reg 14 Consultation Statement Summary \(Sept '23\)](#).

Finally on March 28th 2022, a Postal Pack was mailed to every Parish household, recording the history of the Review, Survey results, key recommendations including modified Policies, the next steps in the Review process and the upcoming opportunities for further comments from the Parish.

Following the responses to the Postal Pack, the Revision Group made a number of very minor (largely textual / grammatical) changes and then in September 2022 handed the revised document over to the HPC.

Throughout this period, updates on the Review were a standard agenda item at Parish Council Meetings, and also standard inclusions in the Parish Magazine “*Jottings*” creating a monthly update / reporting pattern out to the Parish.

On October 31st 2022, the PC published the Revised NP for statutory consultation under regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2021. The consultees included Parishioners and “near neighbours, local landowners and businesses, neighbouring Parish, Borough and Town Councils, Utility suppliers and other interested statutory authorities.

A total summary of those consultees and their responses can be found on the HPC website under Documents: [\(Final\) HNP 5YR Review Reg 14 Consultation Statement Summary \(Sept '23\)](#)

HNP 5YR REVIEW REG 14 CONSULTATION STATEMENT				
WHO	WHEN	HOW	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	ACTION / COMMENT
Parishioners	01.04.2021	Survey by mail shot to all Parish addresses with SAE for response	95% valued the rural character of the Parish, its tranquility and the open views to all directions	
		152 households were mailed, a total of 58 (38%) responded plus one other letter	There was no feeling of isolation; access to the amenities of Duffield and Belper was judged to be straightforward	
		Survey Template and responses analysis are in Appendix 1		
			The community was considered generally to be "open and friendly"	
			There were several "dislikes" including excessive traffic speeds, excessively large and inappropriate new-builds & extensions, general threats from developers and a poor public transport system locally	Plan to set up Parishioners Forum to review options for speed mitigation on Parish roads. A "Speedwatch" group is already established and operating regularly in Blackbrook
			53% of respondents felt that the Parish was "largely unchanged" when viewed against the situation in 2016, and that any changes during that time were "not yet detrimental"	
			There were 30% of responses which referenced the benefits of attracting more young people	
			A majority (74%) felt the Hazelwood Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) had been effective in safeguarding the vision for the Parish which had driven the Plan. There was, however, concern that pressure from development would intensify in the future.	
			Almost half of respondents felt that the Parish did not provide for an "all age" community, due to local prices.	Acknowledged to be the case...lack of amenities in the Parish is also an issue preventing opportunities for starter homes etc.
AVBC Planning Manager & Team	21.09.2021	Face to face meeting with Parish Council and HNP Revision Group	Clarification provided regarding the three options for the HNP revision, i.e. a) Minor, not requiring examination or Referendum, b) Significant but not changing the nature of the Plan, requiring re-examination only, c) Changing the nature of the Plan, requiring examination and Referendum	
			Clarification regarding next steps (Regs 14 and 15) in the process	
Parish and near neighbours	26/01/2022 - 3/2/2022	Two open meetings for parishioners and fringe neighbours, same agenda to present initial proposals for the modifications to the HNP and receive feedback	The presentations and the proposed revisions to the HNP were received positively, and there were no requests for changes to the policy revision received during the meetings themselves, (see later for responses received subsequent to the meetings)	
		Presentation documents pack and responses are in Appendix 2	Comments included concerns around traffic safety in the Parish, as many of its semi-rural roadways are subject to the national speed limit of 60mph and this is considered too high given their narrow nature.	See "Speedwatch" reference in line 17, PC is also participating in national "20's Plenty" campaign
		A total of 24 parishioners and "near neighbours" attended	Consideration of the management of the tree population in the Parish and its future development was seen as an important part of the local environmental strategy	
			The PC was urged to consider the wider landscape as well as the local one when considering Planning Applications, particularly the roadside gaps between settlements and those between the more isolated dwellings in parts of the Parish such as Hob Hill / Nether Lane, and Over Lane	The HNP features those view corridors which enhance the wider landscapes, and the proposed "red line" maps also seek to protect the more distant views
			There was an expression of concern by one Parishioner which was shared by others regarding the future expansion of the Lubrizol business campus on Nether Lane and its potential impact on the local environment	The PC maintains quarterly meetings with Lubrizol to review local issues of mutual interest. Lubrizol's new conference centre was established and positioned following intensive discussions with the PC.
	02.02.2022	E-mail response to Meeting 1	1. I fully support the proposed changes. 2. I listened with interest to the desire to get more information at the outline planning stage. However, this proposal has never been discussed with a Planner as I'm just conscious that the Draft Plan might be requesting what is in Planning terms simply not possible. 3. I was involved with the Belper NP and in their Plan there is a form for developers to engage with the NP group and to engage with the council pre-formal submission. The HNP Group might want to look at this.	The HNP encourages developers to consult with the PC and Parishioners at the pre-application stage. Considerable discussion occurred during the Revision process regarding including consultation in policy. It was not considered enforceable.
	21.02.2022	E-mail response to Meeting 1	E-mail on file records a lack of confidence in "AVBC Planning Department" to do anything sensible or logical...examining issues with the responder's own property. It goes on to criticise "Derby City's so-called need to spread itself all over its neighbouring boroughs when it uses its own available land so prodigally..." and that "we should not assist Derby in any way whatever". Further, "the natural place for development is infill around the Church area, the natural centre for Hazelwood, if you must develop."	St. John's Church is a listed building and as such development around the church would threaten its setting.

HNP 5YR REVIEW REG 14 CONSULTATION STATEMENT				
WHO	WHEN	HOW	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	ACTION / COMMENT
	06.04.2022	Email response to meetings	I am very concerned at the proposed change of wording of NP1.2 set out in the recently circulated NP update. In my view it represents a significant lowering of the housing need requirement that applications would have to meet in order to progress a multi-dwelling development in the Parish....The proposed wording weakens the requirements in two important respects: Firstly, it would now only be necessary for an applicant to evidence that local housing needs exist when a development of more than one new build house is being proposed. There would be no requirements for an applicant to demonstrate how their proposal was necessary in order for those needs to be met. Secondly, and the somewhat bizarre consequences of this, is that there would no longer be a requirement for the development proposal to be aimed at meeting the same need as the one that had been identified. NP1.2 sets a very high bar. Rightly so given the above background. Why now make it easier for applicants to progress to multi-dwelling or "mini-estate" developments when there doesn't appear to be the parishioner appetite for this in the circulated update?"	
	05.05.2022	Email response to meetings	The proposed amendments to the HNP give rise for concern. Their intent appears to be to make it more difficult for any future development. The proposed amendments to Policy NP1 should be withdrawn. No information has been given on the number of cases where the views of the Parish have been overridden by the AVBC. The current Plan has failed to deal with the problem of housing mix. It is also in conflict with the Village Design Statement (re. NP1a, 1b, NP3 a). The problem of the creeping extensions of properties from smaller bungalows to "mini mansions" should be recognised at the initial planning stage. I assume the amendments in their final form will be put to the Village voter's approval. When is this scheduled to take place?	Future development will be based on the infill of existing settlements. There has been good alignment between the PC's support /otherwise and the eventual Planning decision by AVBC. Responses to Planning Applications are based on the information presented with the application, not on potential future activity. There is no provision in the legislation for a final referendum unless directed by the Independent Examiner.
	11.05.2022	Email response to meetings	I suggest that the PC might consider adding to NP2 a requirement that development proposals of any kind demonstrate that existing wildlife habitats are feeding locations are protected for posterity. (Listing of wildlife species follows...). My concern is with regard to outhouses and other nesting sites for birds and bats. I would propose that there is a HNP requirements that where possible, access to existing sites is not obstructed or, if unavoidable, then alternative provision is made".	It is considered that present legislation on this issue is adequate
AVBC	23.10.2022	Email with HP Householder Letter filed on HPC website28.10.2022	*****	
Dept. for Levelling Up Hsing & Comm's	23.10.2022		No response	
Clinical Comm Group	23.10.2022	1 st Class Mail	No response	
Derbyshire Cnty Cncl	23.10.2022		*****	
Derbyshire City Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	
Derbyshire Dales Dist. Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	
Erewash Boro' Cncl	23.10.2022		No Response	
Sth Derbyshire Dist. Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	
Broxtowe Boro' Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	
Bolsover Dist. Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	
Belper Town Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	
Wirksworth Town Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	
Duffield Parish Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	

HNP 5YR REVIEW REG 14 CONSULTATION STATEMENT				
WHO	WHEN	HOW	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	ACTION / COMMENT
Hulland Ward Parish Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	
Kirk Ireton Parish Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	
Shottle & Postern Parish Cncl	23.10.2022		No Response	
Turnditch & Windley Parish Cncl	23.10.2022		No response	
English Heritage	23.10.2022		No response	
National Trust	23.10.2022		No response	
Natural England	23.10.2022		Natural England does not have any specific comment on the Draft NP. Also included a copy of Annex 1 – Neighbourhood Planning and the Natural Environment: Information, issues and opportunities	
National H'Ways	23.10.2022		The modifications to the Plan, along with limited new development in Hazelwood will have no adverse impact on the safe operation of the SRN and as such National Highways has no further comments to make.	
Network Rail	23.10.2022		No response	
Severn Trent Water	23.10.2022		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation. We do not currently have any comments to make to your Plan. Please keep us informed when you are further developed. Response included a statement of general guidelines and relevant policy wording.	
Western Power	23.10.2022		No response	
Cadent Gas	23.10.2022		No response	
BT Openreach	23.10.2022		No response	
Environ. Agency	23.10.2022		We note that there are no proposed allocations within the Draft NP and therefore have no detailed comments on the updated NP other than the opportunities to strengthen NP5 with regard to enhancing biodiversity net gain. We welcome that the NP includes the requirements to preserve and enhance biodiversity in NP5.	
National Grid (Avison Young)	23.10.2022		No response	
Coal Auth.	23.10.2022		Our records do not indicate the presence of any recorded coal mining at surface or shallow depth in the identified NP area. On this basis, the Coal Authority Planning Team has no specific comments to make.	
Historic England	23.10.2022		Thank you for consulting Historic England on the review of the HNP. We refer to your letter of 13 th June 2016 and Historic England has no comments on the amended Plan.	
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust	23.10.2022		No response	
Eccles'brne Valley Railway	23.10.2022		No response	

HNP 5YR REVIEW REG 14 CONSULTATION STATEMENT				
WHO	WHEN	HOW	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	ACTION / COMMENT
Chatsworth Estate	23.10.2022		No response	
Strutt Estate	23.10.2022		No response	
Local Landowners (5)	23.10.2022		No Response	
Fringe Neighbours (5)	23.10.2022		No response	
Local Businesses (2)	23.10.2022		No response	
Belper Library	28.10.2022	Hard Copy of HNP pre-submission Consultation + household letter	No response	
Duffield Library	28.10.2022	Hard Copy of HNP pre-submission Consultation + household letter	No response	
Bluebell P.H. Farnah Green	28.10.2022	Hard Copy of HNP pre-submission Consultation + household letter	No response	
Puss in Boots P.H.	27.10.2022	Hard Copy of HNP pre-submission Consultation + household letter	No response	
Hazelwood Community Cafe	29.10.2022	Hard Copy of HNP pre-submission Consultation + household letter	No response	
Parish'r - 1	04.12.2022	Parishioner letter	We are happy with the draft in its present form. We wish to support it.	
Parish'r - 2	01.12.2022	Parishioner letter	Many thanks for the work & efforts of the PC with the modifications and the questionnaire / survey of residents in Hazelwood. Good to see reflection of more modern housing requirements such as relaxing the Good to see reflection of more modern housing requirements such as relaxing the "3 bed maximum" requirements whilst concentrating on the need to maintain rurality. Also, as an aside, it is really lovely to have the Community Cafe thriving in the Memorial Hall and several of our cycling / walking friends and family have made it a destination point for their trips.	
Parish'r - 3	12.12.2022	Parishioner letter	Many comments regarding the ambitions of the company Lubrizol (Nether Lane) in terms of their growth & many comments regarding the ambitions of the company Lubrizol (Nether Lane) in terms of their growth & potential expansion of the site in the future. "PC engagement" is insufficient defence. The HNP needs to be strengthened as there is a huge threat to the community. I'm certainly no expert on what is appropriate but I was looking for wording along these lines - "would not support development by Lubrizol beyond their site footprint and certainly not any development of the agricultural fields that they own in the neighbourhood". Or, better still, "Lubrizol should not encroach beyond their existing site footprint including any development of the agricultural fields that they own in the neighbourhood".	
Parish'r - 4	11.05.2022	Parishioner letter	I have just read your circular letter regarding the HNP review which was shown to me by my mother, Mrs Cynthia Shingleton of Wallstones Farm. I am a joint owner of part of the land at Wallstones and feel that as such I am entitled to comment on the proposed review. Unfortunately, your letter is undated and so I cannot assess whether my contribution is out of time, but if not, I do hope it will receive the consideration of the Parish Council. I suggest that the Parish Council might consider adding to NP2 a requirement that development proposals of any kind demonstrate satisfactorily that existing wildlife habitats and feeding stations are protected for posterity. There is a wonderful array of wildlife in Hazelwood and I have seen: hare, kites, buzzards, kestrels amongst smaller raptors; perched owls, bats, swallows - many of which routinely return to nest in outhouses at Wallstones. will protect the wildlife into the future.	