

SUMMARY OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION - HNP Revision Drafting Phase				
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 tranquillity and the open views to all directions	
		152 households were mailed, a total of 58 (38%) responded plus one other letter	There was however 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, excessiveley 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 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 rponses arer 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 imporant 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 a 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 has this proposal ever been discussed with a Planner?. I'm just conscious that the Draft Pln might be requesting what is in Planning terms simply not possible. 3. I was involved with the Belper NP and in the Plan there there is a form for developers to engage with the NP group, 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 rearding 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...examplng issues with the responders own property. It goes on to criticise "Derby Cty'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.

SUMMARY OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION - HNP Revision Drafting Phase					
WHO	WHEN	HOW	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	ACTION / COMMENT	
	06.04.2022	E-mail 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 <i>demonstrate</i> how their proposal was <i>necessary in order</i> 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	E-mail 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 voters 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	E-mail 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	E-mail with <i>HPC Householder Letter</i> filed on HPC website 28.10.22	*****		
Dept. for Levelling Up Hsing & Comm's	23.10.2022		No response		
Clinical Comm Group	23.10.2022	1st. Class Mail	No response		
Derbyshire County Cncl	23.10.2022		*****		
Derby City Cncl	23.10.2022		No response		
Derbyshire Dales District Cncl	23.10.2022		No response		
Erewash Boro' Cncl	23.10.2022		No response		
South Derbyshire Distr. Cncl	23.10.2022		No response		
Broxtowe Boro' Cncl	23.10.2022		No response		
Bolsover Distr. Cncl	23.10.2022		No response		
Beiper Town Cncl	23.10.2022		No response		
Wirksworth Town Cncl	23.10.2022		No response		
Duffield PC	23.10.2022		No response		

SUMMARY OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION - HNP Revision Drafting Phase				
WHO	WHEN	HOW	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	ACTION / COMMENT
Hulland Ward PC	23.10.2022		No reponse	
Kirk Ireton PC	23.10.2022		No reponse	
Shottle & Postern PC	23.10.2022		No reponse	
Turnditch & Windley PC	23.10.2022		No reponse	
English Heritage	23.10.2022	first class mail	No reponse	
National Trust	23.10.2022		No reponse	
Natural England	23.10.2022		Natural England does not have any specific comments 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 coments 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 on 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 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			
Coal Auth.	23.10.2022		Our records do not indicate the presence of any recorded coal mining features 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 you to our letter of 13th June 2016. Historic England has no comments on the amended Plan.	
Derbyshire WildLife Trust	23.10.2022		No reponse	
Eccles'brne Valley Railway	23.10.2022		No reponse	

SUMMARY OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION - HNP Revision Drafting Phase					
WHO	WHEN	HOW	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	ACTION / COMMENT	
Chatsworth Estate	23.10.2022		No response		
Strutt Estate	23.10.2022		No response		
Local land owners (5)	23.10.2022		No response		
Fringe N'bour's (5)	23.10.2022		No responses		
Local Businesses (2)	23.10.2022		No responses		
Belper Library	28.10.2022	Hard copy of HNP pre Submission Consultation + Household letter	No responses		
Duffield Library	28.10.2022	Hard copy of HNP pre Submission Consultation + Household letter	No responses		
Bluebell P.H. Farnah Green	28.10.2022	Hard copy of HNP pre Submission Consultation + Household letter	No responses		
Puss in Boots PH	27.10.2022	Hard copy of HNP pre Submission Consultation + Household letter	No responses		
Hazelwood Community Café	29.10.2022	Hard copy of HNP pre Submission Consultation + Household letter	No responses		
Parish'r - 1	04.12.2022	Parishioner letter	We are happy with the draft in it's 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 "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 & potential expansion of the site in the future. "PC engagement" is insufficient defence, the HNP needs to be strengthened as here 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, "L 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. My main concern is with regard to alterations to outhouses, barns, stables and other nesting sites for birds and bats. I would propose that there is a NP requirement that where possible, access to existing nesting sites is not obstructed or, if this cannot be avoided, that alternative provision for nesting sites is built into any development design. This should not incur any material cost to the developer and will protect the wildlife into the future. There used to be yellowhammers every spring near Wallstones. I have not heard them for at least 10 years and they are sorely missed.		