

Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan
Summary and analysis of comments received on the Draft (Regulation 14) Neighbourhood Plan
September 2018

| ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| No. | Policy/Section | Respondent | Summary of Comments | Response | Amendment to Plan |
| General | | | | | |
| 1 | GENERAL | Dronfield Civic Society | I write, on behalf of the Committee of the Dronfield Civic Society, to say that we are supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan, believing that It covers issues of importance for Dronfield and its residents. | This general support for the Plan is welcomed. | No. |
| 2 | | Gladman Developments Ltd | Gladman requests to be added to the Town Council's consultation database and to be kept informed on the progress of the emerging neighbourhood plan. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy. | We would be pleased to add Gladman's to the Town Council's database. | No. |
| 3 | | Gladman Developments Ltd | Gladman would like to offer their assistance in the preparation of the neighbourhood plan for the submission version of the neighbourhood plan and invite the Town Council to get in touch regarding this. | We welcome your offer of assistance and would be pleased to get in touch in due course. | No. |
| 4 | | Resident | I think that you have done a really good job! | This general support for the Plan is welcomed. | No. |
| 5 | | Resident | I have read the plan and commend the authors. | Your commendation of the plan's authors is noted and welcomed. | No. |
| 6 | | Gladman Developments Ltd | Paragraph 214 of the revised Framework makes clear that the policies of the previous Framework will apply for the purpose of examining plans where they are submitted on or before 24 th | Thanks for drawing this to our attention. We are aware of the need to ensure that the policies contained within the DNP | No. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|--|--|-----|
| | | | January 2019. As such the Town Council will need to ensure that the policies contained within the DNP are consistent with the appropriate version of the NPPF. Further, the Town Council will need to be aware that the revised NPPF is considered a material consideration which will need to be taken into account in dealing with any planning applications. | are consistent with the appropriate version of the NPPF. | |
| 7 | | Gladman Developments Ltd | <p>It is clear from the requirements of the previous Framework that neighbourhood plans should be prepared in conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider area as confirmed in an adopted development plan.</p> <p>The requirements of the previous Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG. These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take to review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention</p> | Thank you for this guidance, which is duly noted. | No. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|---|---|-----|
| | | | <p>which includes a detailed explanation outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard. Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded.</p> | | |
| 8 | | Gladman Developments Ltd | <p>To meet the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, neighbourhood plans should be prepared to conform to the strategic policy requirements set out in the adopted Development Plan. The adopted Development Plan relevant to the preparation of the Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan consists of the saved policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan, saved with a Direction from the Secretary of State in 2008. It is important to note that work is progressing on the North East Derbyshire Local Plan. The NEDLP Proposed Submission was submitted for examination on 24th May 2018, with North East Derbyshire District Council hopeful of being able to adopt the plan by the end of 2018. This document is seeking to ensure that in compliance with the Framework an up to date Local Plan is in place for North East Derbyshire. The Town Council should be mindful as to the progress of the NEDLP examination, ensuring appropriate flexibility and adaptability is drafted within the DNP, so it can positively respond to changes in circumstances which may arise as part of the examination process.</p> | <p>This is noted. The Group recognise the development of the NP is complicated by delays in preparation of the NEDLP.</p> | No. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|------|
| 9 | | Gladman Developments Ltd | Gladman make a general objection to the wording within the DNP and suggest that this does not take a positive approach to planning in the neighbourhood area. This is highlighted by the use of the terms 'protecting' and 'maintain'. We suggest the overall wording of the plan is revisited to ensure a positive approach to planning in the neighbourhood area | It is agreed that the overall wording of the plan is revisited to ensure a positive approach to planning in the neighbourhood area | Yes. |
| 10 | | Natural England | We have reviewed the attached plan however Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. | That Natural England does not have any specific comments on the draft plan is noted. | No. |
| 11 | | Coal Authority | As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined coalfield. According to the Coal Authority Development High Risk Area Plans, there are recorded risks from past coal mining activity. We note that the Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate any sites for development and therefore we have no specific comments to make. | That the Coal Authority does not have any specific comments on the plan is noted. | No. |
| 12 | | Unstone Parish Council | The matter was discussed at the last UPC meeting on 19* July. Cllrs had no comment to make, on the matter. | That Unstone Parish Council does not have any comments on the draft plan is noted. | No. |
| 13 | | Resident | Overall we support the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. | This support for the Plan is welcomed. | Yes. |
| 14 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Overall, the draft Plan is well presented, and in the main, scoped appropriately, dealing with relevant local issues, relying on surveys from the local populace to highlight local concerns, and create the policies and objectives of the plan. There are, however, some significant areas of concern areas where changes will be needed to be compliant with regulations in | We are pleased and welcome that the plan is well presented, and in the main, scoped appropriately, dealing with relevant local issues. We note that you have significant concerns with aspects of it. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|------|
| | | | general and to be in conformity with the Local Plan. | | |
| 15 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | As described in para. 8 below, the Plan must either demonstrate general conformity with, or take account of the emerging Local Plan policies. It should not therefore contain views or make statements that run counter to the emerging Local Plan. The Town Council is advised that on submitting the Plan it will need to provide a statement explaining how the Plan meets basic conditions' which include that the Plan "is in general conformity with the strategic policy of the development plan for the area or any part of that area". This has to be demonstrated in order for the Plan to progress to consultation and examination. | It is noted and that NEDDC consider that the Plan should contain views or make statements that run counter to the emerging Local Plan. It is agreed to review any views and statements to ensure this. | Yes. |
| 16 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | There are also several instances where the plan goes beyond its remit with statements that are inappropriate in what is to be a development plan document. In particular the text is peppered with categorical statements or remarks which are a view of the Town Council which are critical of or depart from the District Council's emerging Planning strategy and policy. It is recognised that issues are raised which are of significant concern to the Town Council and evidenced in the community consultation evidence presented. However, many of these are matters for the Local Plan, and to be the subject of the forthcoming Local Plan Examination. In particular, in paragraph S3 certain issues are set out, and such views contradict the Submission Draft Local Plan, thus will need to be removed in the next draft Neighbourhood Plan. | It is noted and that NEDDC considers that the Plan several instances where the plan goes beyond its remit with statements that are inappropriate in what is to be a development plan document. In particular the text is peppered with categorical statements or remarks which are a view of the Town Council which are critical of or depart from the District Council's emerging Planning strategy and policy, In particular, Section S3. It is agreed to review these. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|------|
| 17 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | There are also statements in the Plan which go beyond the scope of a neighbourhood plan. Examples of these are:- On page 20, paragraph 53, which page 34, where paragraphs 123 & 124 include misleading statements that are also contrary to the strategic policies of both the adopted and emerging Local Plans, in para 137 the Plan describes 'weak enforcement' of conservation policies; a statement both critical and inappropriate in a development plan document, which relates to planning policy rather than development management practice. In para 138 the Plan requests that NEDDC undertakes a conservation area review, again, beyond the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan | We disagree that these go beyond the scope of the NP. They reflect local preferences and priorities, provide context for the Plan and the policies it contains and relates to development. It is agreed to review the specific statements | Yes. |
| 18 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | The Plan would benefit from a clearer demarcation of the Policies as currently they are not distinct from the wider plan text. | It is agreed that the Policies could be more clearer demarked. | Yes. |
| 19 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | The Draft Plan correctly states (par. 4) that it has to be in general conformity with the 'saved' policies of the 2005 Adopted North East Derbyshire District Local Plan. Also that a revised North East Derbyshire Local Plan, which will replace the saved policies of the 2005 Plan, is being developed; the evidence base and the policies contained within this emerging District Local Plan has been considered in preparing the Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan. The Draft Plan covers the period from 2016 to 2033, which aligns with the (emerging) North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2014-2034 and the associated evidence base. | This general support for these aspects of the Plan is welcomed. | No. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|-----|
| 20 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | <p>The regulations governing the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan require it to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the (adopted) Local Plan; which in this case is the 2005 North East Derbyshire Local Plan. However, at the time of this consultation NEDDC has already prepared and submitted their Publication Draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State for examination with adoption expected within the next 6 months. The timing of the Neighbourhood Plan's submission and examination will therefore affect which strategic policies it will be examined against, with the following possible scenarios: If the Neighbourhood Plan is examined prior to the adoption of the emerging Local Plan, it will need to demonstrate general conformity with the saved policies of 2005 Local Plan, where these are consistent with national guidance in the NPPF. It will also need to take account of the emerging Local Plan policies and the evidence that underpins it if it is to remain in conformity with the new Local Plan once it is adopted. If the Neighbourhood Plan is examined after the adoption of the new Local Plan, it will only be required to demonstrate general conformity with that document.</p> <p>To ensure both scenarios are adequately covered the Council's comments on conformity have been prepared with reference to both the Adopted Local Plan and its emerging replacement, the Publication Draft Local Plan as submitted. In doing so it is acknowledged that elements of this may change through the Local Plan</p> | This guidance is welcomed and noted. | No. |
|----|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|-----|

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|--|------|
| | | | Examination as part of the modifications process. | | |
| 21 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | In general, the repetition of Local Plan or National (NPPF) policies in the Neighbourhood Plan is not necessary, as a Neighbourhood Plan policy is most effective where it provides a local input, and any conflict will be resolved by reference to the higher level policy. | This is agreed. The Plan has sought to avoid unnecessary repetition of local or national planning policies. | Yes. |
| 22 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Reference to the NPPF should be for the 2012 version, in view of the anticipated timetable for this Neighbourhood Plan | It is agreed that where the Plan refers to the NPPF, it should refer to the 2012 version. As you will appreciate, the draft was prepared prior to the release of the 2018 version of the NPPF. | Yes. |
| 23 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Where policies identify features or areas without reference to external listings (such as listed buildings), evidence for the selection of those features is needed. This is essential to underpin the policy, justify the selection, and to demonstrate to consultees and the Examiner that the Plan is based on evidence. | This is noted. The Plan has sought to provide sufficient evidence to justify any designations it may have. | Yes. |
| 24 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | The Plans (Figs 1 & 3) need to clearly define the Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan Area. The Green Belt map (Map 1) illustrates the Green Belt boundaries in the Adopted Local Plan. This should be explained by way of a footnote in the Draft Plan. It is also highlighted that the Map will be superseded if the current proposals in the emerging Local Plan are carried through to adoption, | It is agreed to more clearly define the description to the Green Belt map (Map 1) as you suggest. | Yes. |
| 25 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 5 - Para. 3.Says that "the Plan covers the whole of Dronfield as shown on Map 8." Map 8 is properly titled Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan Area and this should be used as the description; | It is agreed to make this clearer including the description of the Plan area (Map 8) as you suggest. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|--|------|
| | | | this should be the case throughout the draft Plan. Recommended text: "the Plan covers the Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan Area as shown on Map 8." And "The terms 'Dronfield, The Town' and Dronfield Parish are interchangeable. They all correspond to the Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan Area as shown on Map 8 and covered by the parish of Dronfield, unless specifically stated otherwise." | | |
| COMMUNITY ASSETS | | | | | |
| 26 | POLICY C1: PROTECTION OF IMPORTANT COMMUNITY FACILITIES | North East Derbyshire District Council | It is unclear what is meant by 'reasonable efforts' in criteria b of Policy CI (page 11), the policy would be strengthened by being more specific, with this policy requiring marketing at an appropriate price for an appropriate period of time such as 12 months, (See Ashover NP Exam report - para 100 as an example) Suggested rewording for criterion b): <i>It can be demonstrated through a viability assessment that the current use is economically unviable and all reasonable efforts have been made to let or sell the current use over a 12 month and that there is no demand for the facility as evidenced through unsuccessful marketing of the facility for a period of 12 months.</i> | It is agreed to amend the wording of the policy as you suggest. | Yes. |
| 27 | | Resident | Appendices 4 – Pubs and Clubs should include the Hyde Park Inn opposite to Hill Top Road – a real community family pub built in the mid Victoria era. A local landmark which can be seen from the countryside to the south of Dronfield. | It is agreed that the Hyde Park Inn should be identified as a key local facility. | Yes. |
| 28 | | Resident | I am surprised to find that the allotments within Dronfield and Coal Aston are not included in the above and would like to draw your attention to this oversight. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|--|---|------|
| | | | These are definitely of great benefit to the community and I feel these assets should be protected for present and future generations and as such should be given due consideration. | are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | |
| 29 | | Resident | I consider the allotments in Coal Aston and off Snape Hill Crescent important green space and local amenity. | The omission of these and the other allotments was a result of a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 30 | | Resident | As allotment holders my wife and I are concerned that there is no mention of the preservation of allotment sites in Dronfield. We feel strongly that this is a very important issue allowing and encouraging people to grow their own produce. This kind of activity needs to be encouraged for physical and mental health. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 31 | | Resident | I have searched thro the draft thoroughly and cannot find any reference to the many Allotments in the area. We are Allotment holders in Coal Aston the ones at the rear of the Village Hall. We strongly feel that these Allotments should be regarded as essential public assets and should be given protection. They provide a | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was ta drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|--|---|------|
| | | | wonderful community service and great friendship and support amongst all the Allotment holders. This precious area must be reserved. I trust that our wonderful little community will be protected for the future. | apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | |
| 32 | | Resident | I am very concerned that allotments are not listed in Appendix 4, or indeed anywhere else, as Assets of Community Value that should be protected. However you look at allotments they can be convincingly argued to provide benefits to the health of the community, particularly to the 25% of residents who are in the "older" age category. It is interesting, however, that there are also several younger allotmenters taking up plots. I see them gardening there with their children, surely very worthy of support within the plan. As well as the obvious physical benefits to health they also support mental and social wellbeing and the social interests of the community. It is notable that, on page 15 of the plan, the mention of Dronfield as a green town is supported by a photograph showing just such an allotment but the term is used only once in the entire document! At a time when virtually all newly built housing in the Dronfield area has little or no garden space, allotments provide the only opportunity for residents to stay in direct contact with food production and the natural world. I urge Councillors to insist upon the addition of allotments to the list of Assets of Community Value in Appendix 4. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 33 | | Resident | Please advise the position regarding the allotment sites in Dronfield as although there is mention of the word allotment and | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|---|--|------|
| | | | <p>a picture of one of the sites they do not appear to be specifically mentioned in the plan? Can you confirm these valuable green/recreation areas do feature and will be included within the plan? They provide green spaces, healthy activity for all ages, an incentive to healthier life styles, education, sharing of ideas and social interaction. I note within the appendix there is reference to the Dronfield Freehold Land Society and assume this covers the allotments.</p> | <p>error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft.</p> | |
| 34 | | Resident | <p>Although there is mention of the word allotment and a picture of one of the sites there appears to be no specific reference to the allotment sites forming part of the plan going forward. Why is this or have I missed something? Please confirm the allotments will continue to have a place in Dronfields recreation / activities / green space etc going forward? They promote healthy living, encourage productive outdoor activity in both young and old, provide social interaction and the sharing of knowledge, green spaces for wildlife to name but a few benefits.</p> | <p>That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft.</p> | Yes. |
| 35 | | Resident | <p>I have no major concerns with the overall plan but cannot support it entirely as it does not recognise allotments as a local asset. It is vital that these amenities which are so well used and produce so much home grown food are recognised and protected. Not only that, they are mini communities in themselves which give older people the opportunity to get together and share information and stories. I would, as every allotment holder would, like the Council to make a clear statement of intent to preserve the allotments as they are and give</p> | <p>We are pleased that you have no overall concerns with the Plan. That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are</p> | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|--|---|------|
| | | | assurances that on no account would it consider selling off the land for housing or any other building project. | included in the subsequent draft. | |
| 36 | | Resident | Having looked at the Dronfield neighbourhood plan I am in the main supportive of its objectives but disappointed that there has been no mention of the allotment sites around the town. Surely these are an asset that should be recognised and protected in and for the future. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 37 | | Resident | I feel that there is an error in the draft in that the allotments have not been listed as an asset of community value that should be protected. Particularly in this current climate, I feel strongly that these precious sites should be listed in the plan for their mental and physical health benefits, much as the sports centre has been. I for one have seen some rare blue butterflies this year on my plot at Gomersal Lane, and the opportunity to be outside, growing healthy food, teaching my children how to do the same will have great benefits. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 38 | | Resident | Please add our allotments as a Community Asset. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|--|--|------|
| 39 | | Resident | I think that the allotments should be listed as a community asset | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft.. | Yes. |
| 40 | | Resident | I don't support the fact that allotments aren't listed as a protected asset in appendix 4. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 41 | | Resident | A plea for the Dronfield allotments to be listed as a community asset. There have been peaks and troughs over the years in demand. But people must always have the chance to grow healthy food and have immunity from mass produced junk. Added to this these area are a wildlife haven as gardens become smaller and concrete patios become the norm. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 42 | | Resident | But we also need to safeguard our allotments spaces for the health and wellbeing of future generations too. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|---|---|------|
| | | | | are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | |
| 43 | | Resident | I've just learned that the Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan document makes no mention of any of the town's allotments. Indeed the Appendix "Protection of Important Community Assets" lists a variety of "assets" including bowling greens, kick about areas but not a single allotment. This is surely wrong? | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 44 | | Resident | Our allotment sites should be listed as a community asset | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 45 | | Resident | In general I would support the plan but there is no mention of protecting the allotment sites in Dronfield. The allotments provide open spaces within the town where wild life can flourish and provide an environmentally friendly place where people can take exercise while producing healthy food. The allotments | The general support for the Plan is welcomed. That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|---|---|------|
| | | | need protecting for the current and future generations of residents of Dronfield as gardening, especially fresh vegetables, is a growing pastime and should be protected. | prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | |
| 46 | | Resident | Although I support the Neighbourhood plan I feel that an important community asset has been overlooked in that there is no mention of the allotments around Dronfield that are well used and provide a valuable recreational activity to many people. | The general support for the Plan is welcomed. That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 47 | | Resident | Has the importance of the allotments in Dronfield and Coal Aston been taken into consideration? It is increasingly recognised how beneficial it is for mental health and wellbeing, in fact, the NHS are using working on allotments as an alternative therapy. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 48 | | Resident | Please incorporate allotments as being important community assets. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|---|---|------|
| | | | | included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | |
| 49 | | Resident | There is a need for allotments to be included in the plan. Their inclusion may be important in their preservation | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 50 | | Resident | Please include the Allotments in the section Protection of Important Community Assets. These are invaluable to families and need to continue in existence for the whole community. Appendix 4. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 51 | | Resident | I am incredibly concerned that no mention has been made of the 3 sites of the allotments. Dronfield Horticultural Society does not appear to have been consulted in the Local Plan. These 3 sites are of particular importance to the town and should appear in Appendix 3 as an area that is a Community Asset. They are well used and there are waiting lists for these. They act as excellent environmental areas and recreational areas for those who are | In preparing the draft plan, we have sought to consult and engage as widely with the local community, including through local magazines such as the 'Dronfield Eye, Town Council website and arranging for copies of the draft plan to be available in accessible locations. We | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>allotment holders. The allotments are a massively important and should not be ignored in the plan. The land has possibly had a mine upon it. It is unlikely the Coal Authority would have plans for this (as is the case for a lot of mining in Dronfield). The land here often throws up pieces of coal. The land was agricultural prior to being allotments. The national growth in allotments, and community led gardening of vital importance providing families with a healthy source of food at a time when the nation has issues around healthy eating. The allotments should also be seen as areas which contribute to the oxygen balance, and saving the planet. Whilst they may seem small, every bit of green is adding oxygen to the atmosphere. Housing would add carbon dioxide. The allotments mean so much to those who tend them. They provide social contact, they are a small community joined by a passion for their small plots and growing vegetables. I have seen the mental health of some of these people improve by being outside and their allotment giving them a new purpose. We are not daft, we know more housing is needed. However as someone who has studied Town Planning as part of my degree, I know there are Brownfield sites available. We do not have to expand Dronfield any more. It can stay as it is. There are spaces in Chesterfield and Sheffield I think the council should have consulted those who work this land. If it is the intention to use the land for housing, then there will be massive opposition to it. Please consider this as an area of beauty and attractiveness that breaks up the</p> | <p>shall ensure that the Dronfield Horticultural Society is added to the consultation database so that you are kept informed of future consultation opportunities. That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|---|---|------|
| | | | urban landscape, in the same way that park areas do throughout the town. Please add this area to Appendix 3. | | |
| 52 | | Resident | It has been brought to my attention that no mention is made anywhere in the plan of Dronfield's ALLOTMENTS. As an allotment holder (Birches Lane) I am concerned that if they are not specifically listed as an asset to be preserved and protected then they could be lost. It is important that they should be added to Appendices 4 and 8 as valuable assets to be protected. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 53 | | Resident | In appendix 4 Protection of Important Community assets there is no mention of allotments. This valuable community asset is important for the wellbeing of the residents of Dronfield providing exercise, wholesome food and adding to the environmental biodiversity of the area. I note that you include in your list a public house that has actually closed. Our allotments should be included in the plan | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 54 | | Resident | There is no mention of allotments in the plan. Why.? | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|---|---|------|
| 55 | | Resident | As a allotment uses I find it disheartening to find no mention of the allotment sites in Dronfield, as I feel these are very important for the community. I would like to see the future of these sites included in the plan. I also feel the people of Dronfield would benefit from land where people could keep chickens like other Derbyshire communities. I feel its important to know where food comes from and keep it as fresh and healthy as possible. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 56 | | Resident | There is no mention of the local allotments in the neighbourhood plan. Having held an allotment for 20 years it would be a huge loss to my family if they were taken away. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologies about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 57 | | Resident | Although I support the main provisions in the Neighbourhood plan, I would like to draw your attention to a serious omission. There is no mention of the various allotment sites in the town, either in Appendix 4 (Protection of important community assets), or Appendix 8 (Proposed local green spaces of particular importance). I assume that this is just a simple erroneous omission and that these sites will continue to be a beneficial asset to the local community. Not only do the allotments enable residents to grow their own fruit and veg, they also provide habitat for wildlife such as bees which are vital to our ecosystem. | The general support for the Plan is welcomed. That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|---|---|------|
| 58 | | Resident | Re :- Appendix 3 (assets of community value) I agree that a pub is an asset, but, I consider that allotments are a far more important asset of community value. Allotments contribute to an extremely healthy lifestyle both physically and mentally rather more than alcohol and possible aggression. Allotments and their owners foster a good community spirit which these days is much needed. | The general support for the Plan is welcomed. That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 59 | | Resident | No mention of any of the allotments in Dronfield. Please can they be added on. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 60 | | Resident | I have read the plan and commend the authors. However, as an allotment keeper I can find no mention of the various sites that provide so much pleasure to residents of this community. I hope they can be added to your "Protection Of Important Community Assets" Appendix 4. | Your commendation of the authors is noted and welcomed. The general support for the Plan is welcomed. That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|---|---|------|
| | | | | will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | |
| 61 | | Resident | Appendix 4 I have lived in Dronfield Woodhouse for many years, and used the Dronfield Horticultural Society, then and since (and my father before me). This is an excellent local society and should be included in other groups listed in The Plan. Another vital "Important Community Asset" are Dronfield's Allotments which must be included in the places requiring protection. The allotments provide a very important function both for leisure and as a vital asset for both health and welfare for residents. The allotments bring together people who are often on their own and create bonds within the community with people with a common interest in a great outdoor activity, and provides also green space enjoyed by all. Then there is the food they produce too! These spaces must be protected. It takes many years for an allotment to be developed into full production, and is not something that can just be moved and plonked down somewhere else. Please include them in your Important community Assets, as that is what they are. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 62 | | Resident | I don't support the fact that allotments aren't listed as a protected asset in appendix 4. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|--|--|------|
| | | | | included in the subsequent draft. | |
| 63 | | Resident | I would like to have the allotments throughout Dronfield added to appendix 8. Proposed local green spaces of particular importance. I feel the allotments are very important in keeping Dronfield a green town to live in. I would support the draft plan in general if my comments were added. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 64 | | Resident | It has been brought to my attention that no mention is made anywhere in the plan of Dronfield's ALLOTMENTS. As an allotment holder (Birches Lane) I am concerned that if they are not specifically listed as an asset to be preserved and protected then they could be lost. It is important that they should be added to Appendices 4 and 8 as valuable assets to be protected. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 65 | | Resident | I support the plan, but I want to see that allotments are added to the plan (Appendix 8) as these are important places that must be kept at all costs, | Your support for the Plan is welcomed. That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|--|------|
| 66 | | Resident | Although I support the main provisions in the Neighbourhood plan, I would like to draw your attention to a serious omission. There is no mention of the various allotment sites in the town, either in Appendix 4 (Protection of important community assets), or Appendix 8 (Proposed local green spaces of particular importance). I assume that this is just a simple erroneous omission and that these sites will continue to be a beneficial asset to the local community. Not only do the allotments enable residents to grow their own fruit and veg, they also provide habitat for wildlife such as bees which are vital to our ecosystem. | Your general support for the Plan is welcomed. That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 67 | | Resident | Where is are the allotments sites on this plan? An important community asset, recognised more and more for their health & well-being benefits, as well as activity and community aspects. Appendix 8- If you can list "kick about areas", surely you can list allotments? | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in the subsequent draft. | Yes. |
| 68 | POLICY C2: SUPPORTING NEW AND ENHANCED COMMUNITY FACILITIES | North East Derbyshire District Council | Reference to the need for "transport, environmental, amenity and landscape considerations", is unnecessary, as these are already standard planning considerations. However, a similar phrase referencing 'local' has been accepted (by the examiner) in the Wingerworth Neighbourhood Plan (Policy W9). Also, while demonstrating need is not normally acceptable in a planning policy similar wording has been accepted for the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan (AP9). | It is agreed to amend the wording of this policy as suggested | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>Minor changes to the wording of this policy are recommended in light of the Examiner's recommendations on a similar policy in the Wingerworth Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Suggested rewording for Policy C2: <i>Development proposals involving the provision of a new or enhanced community facility will be supported where it can be demonstrated to North East Derbyshire District Council, in discussion including through discussions with the Town Council, that it meets a local need (for example medical, educational, police and cemetery related facilities) and respects local transport, environmental, amenity and landscape considerations.</i></p> | | |
| 69 | POLICY C3: ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE | North East Derbyshire District Council | <p>No objections in principle, however rewording is suggested to strengthen the Policy: Development proposals that support the longevity, appreciation and community value of an Asset of Community Value will be encouraged. Development proposals for a change of use that would result in the loss of an Asset of Community Value will not be supported. <i>Development proposals that will result in the loss of, or has a significant adverse effect on, a designated Asset of Community Value will not be permitted unless in special circumstances, such as the Asset is replaced by an equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in an equally suitable location or it can be clearly demonstrated that it is not viable or no longer required by the community.</i></p> | It is agreed to amend the wording of this policy as suggested. | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|------|
| 70 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 14 - Para. 33. This needs to ensure that the correct version of the NPPF is referred to. This will depend upon when the Plan is submitted (on or before 24 January 2019 use the 2012 NPPF and the 2018 NPPF thereafter (See also general point above). In the sentence: This is highly disputed by the local community, as evidenced.', the correct description is 'the District's Consultation Draft Local Plan'. | This is noted. It also agreed to amend the name of the document as you suggest. | Yes. |
| 71 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 8 - Para. 15. There is a missing word in the sentence: 'Where there are existing national district planning policies that meet the requirements of the town they are not repeated here.' Add an 'and' between 'national' and 'district'. | Thanks for drawing this to our attention. The Plan will be amended accordingly. | Yes. |
| NATURAL ENVIRONMENT | | | | | |
| 72 | POLICY ENV1: GREEN BELT | Gladman Developments Ltd | Policy ENVI supports the continued designation of the countryside surrounding Dronfield as Green Belt land and seeks to ensure a strong presumption against development that would conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt. As currently drafted the policy is a replication of both local and national policy, therefore its inclusion within the DNP is unnecessary. | It not considered that the inclusion of the policy is unnecessary. Its inclusion reflects that is of special importance to the locality, and this does not, therefore, prevent that policy from satisfying the Basic Conditions. | No. |
| 73 | | Gladman Developments Ltd | Notwithstanding this, Gladman are concerned that the policy in its current form does not accurately reflect the Local Authorities position with regards to the Green Belt land surrounding Dronfield. The emerging NEDLP allocates three parcels of Green Belt land surrounding Dronfield to be released for residential development. If as anticipated the NEDLP is adopted prior to the examination of the DNP, without reference to and support of these allocations it is highly likely that the plan | It is agreed that additional references to the emerging Local Plan allocation in the supporting text would be beneficial. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|------|
| | | | will be found to be contrary to basic condition (e). However, if the NEDLP examination encounters an unexpected delay and as a result the DNP is examined prior to the adoption of the NEDLP, in not including a reference of support to these allocations this policy would be superseded by S38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Gladman therefore suggest that this policy is revisited to include reference to the emerging Local Plan allocations and that the Steering Group use the preparation of the DNP as an opportunity to shape these developments to the benefits to the local community. | | |
| 74 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | This policy is not necessary for inclusion within the Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan, the policy does not add anything to the existing Local Plan and National Policy in regards to the protection of Green Belt land. | It not considered that the inclusion of the policy is unnecessary. Its inclusion reflects that is of special importance to the locality, and this does not, therefore, prevent that policy from satisfying the Basic Conditions. As you will be aware, the emerging Local Plan is proposing local amendments to the Green Belt. | No. |
| 75 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 15 - Para. 39: The Council's Settlement Role and Function Study 2013, has been superseded by the Settlement Hierarchy Study Update 2018. The up to date evidence should be used. | This clarification is welcomed and supported. | Yes. |
| 76 | | Sheffield City Council | We note that this policy supports the continued designation of countryside as Green Belt, however the supporting text should acknowledge that the North East Derbyshire Local Plan that was submitted to Government in May 2018 | It is agreed that additional references to the emerging Local Plan allocation in the supporting text would be beneficial. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|--|---|---|------|
| | | | proposes de-allocating some areas of Green Belt, principally to designate three site allocations for new homes. It is therefore highly likely that there will be a significant material change to the Green Belt boundary map. | | |
| 77 | POLICY ENV2: LANDSCAPE CHARACTER | Environment Agency | The Environment Agency welcomes the proposals to protect and enhance the green and blue infrastructure and biodiversity. Again reference could be made to the relevant Biodiversity policy within the submitted North East Derbyshire Local Plan. | This general support is welcomed. | No. |
| 78 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | No issues have been found with criteria a) and b) of this policy. Questions are raised over criteria c) and whether it is reasonable to conserve those specific local historic landscape features. Possible rewording of a portion of the policy in order to strengthen it is suggested: “Development proposals should contribute to the protection, maintenance and enhancement of the character of the local landscape. Development should as appropriate: wherever possible take every opportunity through design and materials to reinforce local character and a strong sense of place through appropriate design and materials:incorporate landscaping and boundary treatments local in character including the use of native tree and hedgerow species: <i>have regard to the extent to which the development would adversely affect landscape elements which contribute to the local historic landscape character, including conserve important local historic landscape features such as ancient and irregular field enclosures, ridge and</i> | It is agreed to amend the wording as you suggest. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|------|
| | | | furrow, stone walls, woodlands, mature trees and historic hedgerows”. | | |
| 79 | POLICY ENV3: THE LEA BROOK VALLEY GREEN CORRIDOR | North East Derbyshire District Council | A boundary needs to be put on the map for this policy, in order to clearly identify the corridor. The reference to rights of way is not appropriate as providing these is not a planning matter. However, referring to providing walking and cycling access through developments would be appropriate, as with Policy T&A3. | It is agreed that the specific boundary of the proposed Lea Brook Valley Green Corridor should be added as a map. | Yes. |
| 80 | | Resident | I don't support the fact that allotments aren't listed as a protected asset in appendix 4. I don't agree with the fact the Leabrook Valley is only off Gosforth Drive as specified in appendix 8. The Leabrook Valley extends from Grizedale Walk all the way under the flyover, past woodland to the west and south of the Civic and to the greenspace next to Moonpenny/Fairwinds gardens. | That allotments were not included in the list of key facilities was a drafting error. We agree that they are important and much prized local facilities. The key ones should have been included in the draft. We apologise about this and will ensure that they are included in subsequent draft. Your comments about the extent of the Lea Brook Valley are noted. | Yes. |
| 81 | POLICY ENV4: ECOLOGY | Gladman Developments Ltd | Whilst noting the intentions of the policy, Gladman do not believe the policy fully aligns with the previous Framework. The Town council should be mindful of paragraph 113 of the previous Framework which refers to the need for criteria-based policies in relation to proposals affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas, and that protection should be commensurate with their status which gives appropriate weight to their importance and contributions to wider networks. As currently drafted the policy fails to make a distinction and recognise that there are two separate balancing exercises which need to be undertaken | We while disagree that the policy does not align with the previous framework, would be pleased review the wording in this respect. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|------|
| | | | for national and local designated sites and their settings. We therefore suggest that the policy is revisited to ensure that it is consistent with the approach set out within the previous Framework. | | |
| 82 | POLICY ENV5: LOCAL GREEN SPACES | Gladman Developments Ltd | <p>Policy 5, through appendix 8 and map 7, proposes to designate 42 identified spaces as Local Green Space. The designation of land as Local Green Space (LGS) is a significant policy designation and effectively means that once designated, they provide protection that is comparable to that of Green Belt land. As such, the Town Council should ensure that the proposed designations are capable of meeting the requirements of national policy if they consider it necessary to seek LGS designation.</p> <p>Gladman have been unable to locate proportionate or robust evidence that supports the designation of these sites as LGS. Further to this, the number of proposed LGS in addition to the tightly drawn Green Belt land surrounding Dronfield could be seen as an attempt to impose an almost blanket restriction on development in the neighbourhood plan area. We suggest the Town Council revisit this policy and ensure that robust evidence is provided to demonstrate consistency with the requirements of the previous Framework</p> | The proposed LGS were put forward after careful consideration. It is considered that they are consistent with and meet the requirements of the NPPF for LGS designation. They are supported by proportionate and robust evidence. This is set out in the LGS supporting evidence paper. We would be pleased to revisit this policy and ensure that robust evidence is provided to demonstrate consistency with the requirements of the previous Framework as you suggest. | Yes. |
| 83 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | The green spaces subject to this policy are listed in Appendix 8 and illustrated in the map 7, however the precise boundaries are unclear, which would make the Policy difficult to apply at the local level. A detailed map or series of | It is agreed to include a more detailed map or series of maps illustrating the precise site boundaries should be included in the Plan. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|---|---|------|
| | | | maps illustrating the precise site boundaries should be included in the Plan. | | |
| 84 | | Resident | I would like to have the allotments throughout Dronfield added to appendix 8. Proposed local green spaces of particular importance. I feel the allotments are very important in keeping Dronfield a green town to live in. I would support the draft plan in general if my comments were added. | It is agreed that allotments meet the criteria for designation as Local Green Spaces. | Yes. |
| 85 | | Resident | It has been brought to my attention that no mention is made anywhere in the plan of Dronfield's ALLOTMENTS. As an allotment holder (Birches Lane) I am concerned that if they are not specifically listed as an asset to be preserved and protected then they could be lost. It is important that they should be added to Appendices 4 and 8 as valuable assets to be protected. | It is agreed that allotments meet the criteria for designation as Local Green Spaces. | Yes. |
| 86 | | Resident | I support the plan, but I want to see that allotments are added to the plan (Appendix 8) as these are important places that must be kept at all costs, | The general support for the Plan is welcomed. To be discussed with the TC. | Yes. |
| 87 | | Resident | Although I support the main provisions in the Neighbourhood plan, I would like to draw your attention to a serious omission. There is no mention of the various allotment sites in the town, either in Appendix 4 (Protection of important community assets), or Appendix 8 (Proposed local green spaces of particular importance). I assume that this is just a simple erroneous omission and that these sites will continue to be a beneficial asset to the local community. Not only do the allotments enable residents to grow their own fruit and veg, they also provide | The general support for the Plan is welcomed. To be discussed with the TC. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|------|
| | | | habitat for wildlife such as bees which are vital to our ecosystem. | | |
| 88 | | Resident | I consider the allotments in Coal Aston and off Snape Hill Crescent important green space and local amenity. | It is agreed that allotments meet the criteria for designation as Local Green Spaces. | Yes. |
| 89 | | Resident | Where is are the allotments sites on this plan? An important community asset, recognised more and more for their health & well-being benefits, as well as activity and community aspects. Appendix 8- If you can list "kick about areas", surely you can list allotments? | It is agreed that allotments meet the criteria for designation as Local Green Spaces. | Yes. |
| 90 | ENV6: PROTECTION & ENHANCEMENT OF TREES AND WOODLANDS | North East Derbyshire District Council | Currently this policy is worded in such a way that trees should meet all three criteria ie arboricultural, ecological and amenity value; an adjustment to the wording is suggested to make this policy more acceptable. The sentence; 'Where trees are to be felled, equivalent replacement tree planting in the town will be sought', is not enforceable, however is could be put in the Policy's explanatory text, as being the ambition of the Town Council. Suggested rewording: <i>Development proposals will be encouraged to increase tree coverage and retain existing trees and hedges by integrating them into the design of the development. Where development proposals would damage or result in the loss of trees, hedges and woodlands of arboricultural, ecological and-or amenity value, they will not be permitted unless the harm is outweighed by the benefits of the development. Development proposals which may significantly adversely affect such trees and hedgerows of good value should be accompanied by an independent survey that establishes the</i> | The revised wording is welcomed and agreed. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|--|------|
| | | | <i>health of any affected trees or hedgerows, and a management plan to demonstrate how they will be so maintained. Where trees are to be felled, equivalent replacement tree planting in the town will be sought.</i> | | |
| HOUSING & INFRASTRUCTURE | | | | | |
| 91 | POLICY HOU1: WINDFALL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT | Gladman Developments Ltd | <p>Gladman would like to raise general objections with regards to the 'Housing and Infrastructure' chapter of the DNP. In its current draft the DNP fails to address the Local Authorities position in the emerging NEDLP with regards to housing allocations and requirements in the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>Gladman are particularly concerned with paragraph 53 of the DNP which states <i>'The town is not considered to be a suitable or sustainable location for the scale of development proposed'</i>. Gladman are unsure exactly how the Town Council have come to this conclusion, especially as Dronfield has been identified within both adopted and emerging local planning documents as a highly sustainable settlement. This position is clarified in paragraph 7.4 of the emerging NEDLP which states; <i>'The Local Plan aims to direct new growth to the district's most sustainable settlements.... Dronfield is the largest of the four towns within the district and is an area of high demand for growth.'</i></p> <p>Accordingly, Gladman suggest this element of text is removed from the DNP. Further to this we note in paragraph 54 of the DNP that the Town Council does not support the housing allocations in the Green Belt, of which there are three in the emerging NEDLP. Gladman suggest the</p> | Your general objections are noted. The Plan is explicit that it is leaving it to the Local Plan to determine the precise housing requirements and allocations for Dronfield. While it is recognised that the draft Local Plan seeks to make specific allocations in Dronfield, this document is draft and may change. Para 53 reflects a clear message from the consultation. However, it is agreed to revisit this aspect of the Plan how the Plan came to the conclusion that <i>'The town is not considered to be a suitable or sustainable location for the scale of development proposed'</i> | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|------------------------|---|--|------|
| | | | Town Council revisit this aspect of the DNP and ensure the plan is in general conformity with the emerging NEDLP. | | |
| 92 | | Sheffield City Council | <p>The policy broadly supports windfall housing developments within the built up area, however, we are concerned that it does not reflect the up to date evidence relating to housing need, which supports the North East Derbyshire Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan does not appear to acknowledge that significant numbers of new homes are needed in the district, including Dronfield, or recognise that there are advanced proposals for growth in Dronfield which have been submitted to Government as part of the Local Plan. We are concerned that if the neighbourhood plan does not sufficiently appreciate the likelihood of growth in Dronfield by referring to the most recent iterations of the Local Plan, it has a knock- on implication for housing delivery in the wider housing market area. Currently, North East Derbyshire proposes to meet all its own identified housing needs, partly through delivery of around 475 new homes on allocations in Dronfield that are currently in the Green Belt. However, if those do not go forwards there is a risk that other local planning authorities, such as Sheffield, would need to meet the shortfall in North East Derbyshire's supply. The policy, as written, does not appear to plan positively to meet needs. The lack of references to evidence informing the North East Derbyshire Local Plan would mean that it would be hard to demonstrate that the Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan has met the basic conditions. Paragraph 009 of the Planning</p> | <p>It is considered that the Plan does take account of latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need, including that contained in the emerging Local Plan. It is agreed to amend the Plan to provide further detail on the latest position with regard to the Local Plan.</p> | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|------|
| | | | <p>Practice Guidance reiterates that general conformity with emerging Local Plan policies is not required to meet the Basic Condition, but that the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions, when there is not an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 040 of the Planning Practice requires local planning authorities to share relevant evidence, including that gathered to support its own plan-making, with a qualifying body. Neighbourhood plans are not obliged to contain policies addressing all types of development. However, where they do contain policies relevant to housing supply, these policies should take account of latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need.</p> | | |
| 93 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | <p>Page 19 - The sentence: "Taking into account this feedback, development of Green Belt land is strongly discouraged in favour of building on brownfield sites." should not be expressed as a standpoint of the Neighbourhood Plan perse, it should be clarified that this represents the Town Council's views and/or public feedback rather than being a statement of intent. The latter would not be consistent with the emerging Local Plan as currently written, aside from being an expression of existing National and Local Plan policy.</p> | It is agreed that it could be made clearer that this represents the view from consultation as well as the Town Council. | Yes. |
| 94 | | Sheffield City Council | <p>There is an obvious typo in para 54 of the Housing Chapter. We think it should read "The Plan does <u>not</u> allocate land for housing."</p> | Thanks for this clarification. It can be confirmed that this should read 'not' as you suggest. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|------|
| 95 | | Environment Agency | We note on page 20, that under the title 'Housing Allocations', para. 54, the initial wording suggests that the plan does allocate housing allocations, however after review of the document there does not appear to be any allocated sites within the document. For the purposes of our response we have assumed there are no housing allocations within this Plan. If this is not the case we ask to be re-consulted with the location of the housing allocation highlighted. | Thanks for this clarification. It can be confirmed that this should read 'not'. We apologise for any misunderstanding caused. | Yes. |
| 96 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 21 - Para. 58: This paragraph needs reviewing; Table 4.1 of the Publication Draft Plan as submitted shows that all commitments, not just those 'compatible with the strategic approach' are included within the supply to meet the requirement. | It is agreed to review the paragraph as you suggest. | Yes. |
| 97 | | Resident | Whilst generally in agreement the need for a limited amount of housing it is pleasing to see that Dronfield Town Council realises the impact on roads, schools etc. We believe 450 is too many. | Your general support and agreement for the broad thrust of the Plan in relation to housing need are welcomed. | No. |
| 98 | | Resident | With reference to paragraph 53. We fully support the concerns about the scale of the proposed housing developments, particularly the District Local plan proposals to re-designate large areas presently in the Green Belt for housing. | Your support for the Plan's position that the existing green belt should not be used for housing is welcomed. | No. |
| 99 | | Resident | There is lack of info on where the houses will be built. We agree that the existing green belt should not be used. | Your support for the Plan's position that the existing green belt should not be used for housing is welcomed. With regard to where the houses should be built, the main document determining this in detail will be the Local Plan. We will amend | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|--|---|--|------|
| | | | | the supporting text to make this point clearer. | |
| 100 | | Resident | In June 2017 an Outline Planning Application (ref17/00161/OL) was made for the construction of 6 bungalows on some scrubland west of Thorpe Avenue in Coal Aston. The 2 acre site was assessed in the 2017 North East Derbyshire Local Plan and confirmed as a potential in-fill development. See attached aerial photograph. Unfortunately our Application was refused in July 2017. Subsequent to this decision, we consider our Application ideally matches the policies set out in the Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan and so should be re-visited. | The Plan supports the principle of windfall development within the built-up part of Dronfield. It is beyond the remit of the plan to comment on the merits of specific windfall development proposals. | No. |
| 101 | POLICY HOU2: HOUSING MIX | North East Derbyshire District Council | Planning policies should not seek to impose a particular mix of housing to 'meet identified needs', however it is legitimate to seek an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes taking account evidence of existing imbalances in the housing stock, site characteristics, viability and market considerations. The Policy's reference to ' <i>taking account of the most up to date published evidence on housing needs in the town</i> ' needs to be clear that the evidence may be produced by the District Council. Town Council or at the developer's expense, in the case of the latter the evidence would need to be verified by the District Council. In addition the Policy should not prioritise a particular dwelling size or type, although this may be referred to in the supporting text or 'encouraged' in the Policy. | The proposed wording is noted and agreed. | Yes. |
| 102 | | Resident | We are particularly interested in the Housing and Infrastructure policies. We | We welcome your support on the Plan's focus on the | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|---|--|------|
| | | | agree that the Plan supports the development of housing for the elderly, and also recognises the opportunities for small scale developments of less than 10 homes. | development of housing for the elderly and also recognises the opportunities for small-scale developments. | |
| 103 | | Resident | With reference to paragraphs 59, 63 and 64, relating to Windfall Housing developments. We agree there will continue to be opportunities for small scale "windfall" developments. We support the need for smaller dwellings, which would allow older people in the town to downsize thus freeing up larger properties for new families and young people | We welcome your support on the Plan's focus on small-scale "windfall" developments and the need for small dwellings. | No. |
| 104 | | Resident | Future building projects should include retirement homes for over 60's (private ones for sale or rent). | The Plan supports the prioritisation of housing for older people in housing development proposals. It is agreed that it would be useful to make specific reference both for sale and rent. | Yes. |
| 105 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 22 - Para. 64: Although the general conclusion of this point is correct, the phrase 'will have to' is too restrictive and should be changed. For example: "This means that housing developments will have to change need to provide more smaller dwellings as well as well-designed specialist housing if <u>local needs are to be addressed</u> ". | This amendment to the text is supported and welcomed. | Yes. |
| 106 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 23 - Para. 71: Evidence should be used to Justify the claims made in this paragraph. In addition we have concerns over the prioritisation of affordable housing for those with a local connection. This is covered in more detail in relation to Policy HOU3 below. | It is agreed to look at the evidence base in support of this policy. Your concerns about the prioritisation of local people is noted (again this is covered in more detail later). | No. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|---|------|
| 107 | | Resident | We think a point should be made about couples inhabiting 4-bedroom properties (we are in that category) when you have worked and spent money to achieve a certain lifestyle it is unfair to expect to leave a more spacious property and go down to 1 bedroom. It is overlooked that grandchildren and relatives visiting and use the space including gardens. | This noted. While the Plan in principle supports downsizing, it is recognised that this may not be appropriate for every couple. | No. |
| 108 | POLICY HOU3: AFFORDABLE HOUSING | North East Derbyshire District Council | The wording of this Policy is neither required nor appropriate in a Neighbourhood Plan. Local people already receive some priority in the form of enhanced waiting time on the Housing Register if they have a community connection. This would cover applicants from Dronfield and adjoining parishes within North East Derbyshire. It is possible to apply a Local Lettings Plan to a new affordable housing development if there are grounds to do so and it is not discriminatory. This could contain clauses relating to applicants being local, however, this is not a planning matter. The restrictions given in the Neighbourhood Plan would not be easily workable in reality as there would be other groups of people with a legitimate need to live in Dronfield. This policy will need to be replaced with a more appropriate one, see the Wingerworth and Ashover Neighbourhood Plan for examples, and consult the Council's strategic housing officers. | We disagree that the policy is neither required nor appropriate. The issue was highlighted as a concern as part of the consultation. Further, it is considered that this is a land use issue. We do however agree to review it, including having references to the examples you provided. | No. |
| 109 | POLICY HOU4: INFRASTRUCTURE FOR NEW HOUSING AND OTHER FORMS | North East Derbyshire District Council | This Policy partly duplicates strategic policies In both the adopted Local Plan and emerging Local Plan and partly contradicts them to the extent that it is both unnecessary and out of conformity and should be deleted from the Plan. It | This policy was developed prior to the finalisation of the Sites and Policies document. It is agreed that further consideration needs to be given to how this | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|--|---|---|------|
| | OF DEVELOPMENT | | also includes elements that cannot be considered in planning decisions. | policy operates in conjunction with related local plan policies. | |
| 110 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 23 - Para. 74: Comments about inadequate consideration of infrastructure requirements is inflammatory and factually incorrect. The paragraph also contains a double negative (inadequate and not). | The comments are not intended to be inflammatory. We consider that they are factually correct. It is agreed to look at the evidence supporting this and the wording more generally. | Yes. |
| 111 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Criteria b) of this policy is confusing, a rewording is suggested in order to align the policy more with the Local Plan Policy SDC2. For Criterion c), proposals are generally assessed only on their <u>own</u> impacts and cannot be assessed on cumulative impacts from other developments, a rewording is suggested. Criterion d) is already a planning consideration, so it is unnecessary for it to be included within this policy. It is suggested that this be removed. Criterion e) is not reasonable and unclear; it is also not consistent with strategic policies or the NPPF. Suggested rewording: <i>Development proposals for windfall housing within the existing urban area (the built-up area of the town not covered by the Green Belt) will be supported where in accordance with relevant policies in the Plan (especially D3) and relevant District and national policies, and where it: of is well integrated within adjoining uses and the surrounding areas; retains <u>provides protection and integration for natural features</u> such as; trees, hedges and</i> | The revised rewording is agreed. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|---|---|------|
| | | | <i>streams; provides for a safe vehicular and pedestrian access to the site, and that traffic generation and parking impact including mitigation measures does not result in an unacceptable impact on its own; or in combination with other development proposals, or road and pedestrian safety. do not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity for neighbouring occupiers by reason of loss of privacy, loss of daylight, visual intrusion or noise; and a) can be demonstrated that development on brownfield land over greenfield land has been prioritised.</i> | | |
| 112 | POLICY HOU5: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION S | North East Derbyshire District Council | This Policy is unacceptable in its current form. Developer contributions are negotiated as part of the planning application process and Councils' can only seek S106 contributions for reasons that are directly related to the impacts of the proposed development and cannot be dictated by a Neighbourhood Plan's priorities such as those listed at paragraph 78. The priorities at paragraph 78 would however be useful in prioritising the spending of any funds raised through CIL, should the Council decide to adopt CIL in the future. However at the present time the District Council has no plans to implement CIL on the basis of insufficient viability. The Neighbourhood plan should clarify this. It is entirely appropriate, however, that the supporting text of the Plan describes the intention of the Town Council to engage with developers in order to identify local priorities as described. | This policy identifies local priorities for the use of financial contributions from developments toward the enhancement or provision of new infrastructure and service provision. The provision of infrastructure, mitigating the impacts of development and providing services and facilities that reflect a community's needs are fundamental principles of national and local planning policy. The District Council's position concerning CIL is noted. It is agreed that the Plan should clarify some of the points raised. | Yes. |
| 113 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 24 - Para 77: As part of the preparations for the new Local Plan the District Council has concluded that CIL is | This clarification is welcomed. The paragraph | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|------|
| | | | not currently a viable option for the District and has no current plans to pursue it. This paragraph should be updated to reflect the latest NEDDC position. | will be amended as you suggest. | |
| TRANSPORT AND ACCESS | | | | | |
| 114 | POLICY T&A 1: HIGHWAYS | North East Derbyshire District Council | This policy is generally unnecessary in that it repeats strategic policies. If it is to be retained it should refer only to the provision of new infrastructure rather than the maintenance of the existing highway, which is the responsibility of the County Highways Authority- Criteria b) and e) would be more appropriately included in the town centres policy. Suggested rewording: <i>New developments which involve alterations to existing highways and the provision of new highways must meet the following design criteria: . to provide suitable measures to accommodate all traffic; . to improve the safety and attractiveness of the street scene; and . to integrate appropriate traffic calming measures within the development; . deliver a high level of security and safety by, for example, providing adequate street lighting and good visibility; and high quality design through, for example, street furniture; and . limit the need to cross the carriageway and make routes accessible to wheelchair users, and other people with access problems or pushchairs.</i> | It is disputed that this repeats strategic policies. Further, its inclusion reflects that the particular issue is of special importance to the community. It is agreed to revise it along the lines suggested that is except to the removal of clause relating to street lighting. | Yes. |
| 115 | | Highways England | We note that the Neighbourhood Plan identifies a minimum housing allocation of 450 dwellings for Dronfield, as set out in the draft North East Derbyshire Local Plan published in February 2017. We understand that the North East Derbyshire | We note that you consider that the housing allocation for NED it is unlikely to have a significant impact on the M1. | No. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|--|---|--|------|
| | | | Local Plan Publication Draft was published in May 2018 and highlights a slightly higher housing figure of 475 dwellings. We have taken in to consideration this higher level of housing growth but, due to the distance from the SRN, we consider it unlikely that the level of development growth proposed would have a significant impact on the operation of the MI. We have no further comments to provide and trusts the above is useful in the progression of the Dronfield Neighbourhood Plan. | | |
| 116 | T&A2: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT | North East Derbyshire District Council | Planning obligations can only be claimed when it is demonstrated that a specific development will have an impact on highway safety in a specific area and mitigation is necessary to make the development acceptable. The policy should not identify specific areas, but these may be listed in the supporting text as areas in need of improvement. The policy be removed, or be merged with HOUS: Developer Contributions. | It is agreed that to include the specific areas in the text rather than the policy. While we have some sympathy about emerging this policy with HOUS1 are concerned that the resulting policy may be too large and detailed. | Yes. |
| 117 | | Resident | Traffic Management for pedestrian safety. All residential and commercial areas should have a speed limit of 20 mph reminder signage put up at relevant junctions – automatic speed recognition signs preferably. | While we have some sympathy for your comments, it is beyond the scope (and probably fail at examination in this respect) for the Plan to require that All residential and commercial areas should have a speed limit of 20 mph reminder signage put up at relevant junctions. It is agreed to strengthen supporting text by making specific mention to the | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|---|--|------|
| | | | | benefits automatic speed recognition signs. | |
| 118 | POLICY T&A3: CYCLING AND WALKING | Resident | No comments received. | | |
| 119 | POLICY T&A4: CAR PARKING | Resident | <p>I can see that the intention is to deal with housing, shops and transport issues as raised by residents. May I draw your attention to my enclosed letter dated 6 June 2018, to which I await a reply.</p> <p>I note from the Neighbourhood Plan that parking is to be addressed but may I reiterate that the Council's views indicated to me previously are not consistent and I would strongly advise that compliance by residents with the latest Highway code must be compulsory and not optional as apparently indicated by the Council's official.</p> <p>Indiscriminate parking outside homes which have garages and drives and near schools and restrictive line marking must surely be a first step toward alleviating transport problems in the town.</p> | <p>We welcome your general support for the plan to deal with housing, shops and transport issues. It is beyond the scope (and probably fail at the examination in this respect) for the Plan to require that those aspects of the Highway Code dealing with parking should be compulsory. This would require a change in the national law. It is agreed to strengthen the supporting text in respect of indiscriminate parking outside of homes.</p> | Yes. |
| 120 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | <p>The Derbyshire County Council standards are essentially guidelines that the Highways Authority uses to assess planning applications they are consulted on. Inclusion of these guidelines as policy within the Neighbourhood Plan is not appropriate and should be removed from the wording for the policy. Suggested rewording to retain only: <i>Development proposals that result in the loss of car parking provision will only be supported where; it can be shown that the loss of parking will not have a severe adverse effect on parking and road safety in the nearby area; or adequate and convenient</i></p> | <p>Its inclusion reflects that the particular issue is of special importance to the community and that they wish to see it assertively applied. It is considered that the existing wording reflects the community's needs and aspirations.</p> | No. |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---|--|---|--|------|
| | | | <i>replacement car parking provision can be provided.</i> | | |
| ECONOMY | | | | | |
| 121 | POLICY E1: MAINITAINING AND ENHANCING THE ROLE AND ATTRACTIVENE SS OF DRONFIELD TOWN CENTRE | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 30 - Para 94: The cited Retail Capacity Study 2008 has been superseded by the 2018 Retail Study. | This clarification is welcomed, and the Plan shall be amended accordingly. | Yes. |
| 122 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 30 - Para. 99: Town Centre Boundaries were amended in the Publication Draft Local Plan as submitted, see Retail Study 2018 and Local Plan Document. | This clarification is welcomed, and the Plan shall be amended accordingly. | Yes. |
| 123 | POLICY E2: SHOP FRONTAGES IN THE TOWN CENTRE | North East Derbyshire District Council | The aims of the Policy are supported, however the term 'visually attractive from all angles' (in criterion a) is subjective and would make this part of the policy difficult to apply in practice. Use of the term 'in keeping' would be more appropriate. Similarly, the phrase 'being suitable in terms of should be replaced with 'supporting or improving'. | This support is welcomed. It is agreed to amend the wording as you suggest. | Yes. |
| 124 | POLICY E3: PROVISION OF LITTER BINS IN NEW SHOPPING DEVELOPMENT S IN THE TOWN CENTRE | North East Derbyshire District Council | This policy is likely to be ineffective and difficult to enforce and should be reconsidered. It could only reasonably be applied where it is linked to a use ordinarily associated with litter, such as a hot food take away. However the litter arising from such establishments not necessarily disposed of in the immediate vicinity of the premises, but some distance away it. | It is agreed to remove this policy and link it to the Hot Food Take Away Policy, as you suggest. | Yes. |
| 125 | POLICY E4: SHOPPING HUBS AND OTHER LOCAL | North East Derbyshire District Council | Minor rewording is suggested to strengthen the policy. Reference to "transport, environmental, parking, and amenity considerations". Is unnecessary | The revised wording as welcomed and agreed. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|------|
| | SHOPS OUTSIDE DRONFIELD TOWN CENTRE | | as these are already standard planning considerations - see comment on C2. Suggested rewording: <i>Development proposals that would result in the loss of a shopping use outside the defined Dronfield town centre will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated to the District Council, including through discussions with the Parish Council that its continued use for shopping is no longer viable and the site has been actively marketed for at least six months for shopping purposes The development of local shops to serve the day-to-day needs of the immediate community will be supported subject to transport, environmental, parking and amenity considerations.</i> | | |
| 126 | POLICY E5: HOT FOOD TAKEAWAYS | North East Derbyshire District Council | This Policy is overly restrictive and inconsistent with the NPPF. In respect of litter bins see comment in relation to above. | This policy is intended to address concerns about the impact of hot food takeaways in the Parish. It is disputed that it is inconsistent with the NPPF as it aims to control the number and location of hot food takeaway outlets and therefore reflects health and wellbeing objectives in national planning policy as well as local strategic policy It should be noted that the Policy is based on a one in an approved NP. | No. |
| 127 | POLICY E1: EXISTING EMPLOYMENT USES | North East Derbyshire District Council | No objection to the policy itself, however the policy numbering needs amending to avoid repetition of policy numbers which may lead to confusion. Policy E1 should be E6. | That you have no objection to this policy is noted. We would be pleased to look at the policy numbers. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|--|--|------|
| 128 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 34 states: "NEDDC's draft Local Plans indicates a desire to expand Callywhite Lane toward Chesterfield, providing a further 6 hectares of Industrial space. The consultation raises questions about the Impact of further development on the transport network. It also Identifies that a key piece of land, the Dronfield Nature Park, would be under threat if proposals to improve connectivity were to go ahead. Unless these factors can be resolved, the Plan would not support further expansion to Callywhite Lane.' More careful wording is suggested here as currently the text is unclear, misleading and contrary to the strategic policies of both the adopted and emerging Local Plans. The Callywhite Lane expansion area is identified for employment development in both. Matters in relation to impact upon the highways network and other receptors is a matter for the Local Plan and does not require the support of the Plan. | It is agreed to review the wording as you suggest. | Yes. |
| 129 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Para 124: As with para 123 there are several Instances in the first three sentences that are misleading and contrary to the strategic policies of both the adopted and emerging Local Plans. | It is agreed to review the wording of this para | Yes. |
| 130 | POLICY E2: NEW SMALLSCALE EMPLOYMENT USES | North East Derbyshire District Council | No objection to the policy itself. | That you have no objection to this policy is noted | No. |
| HERITAGE | | | | | |
| 131 | POLICY D1: LISTED BUILDINGS | Historic England | The area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan encompasses Dronfield, Coal Aston, Dronfield Woodhouse and Moss Valley Conservation Areas and includes a number of important designated heritage assets. In line with national planning | We can confirm that the protection and enhancement of heritage assets is a priority of the Plan and includes a | No. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|---|------|
| | | | policy, it will be important that the strategy for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets so that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area. | number of policies in support of this. | |
| 132 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | This is a statement of intent rather than a clear policy. In addition general policies for Listed Buildings are set out in the Local Plan and NPPP. Such a policy is only beneficial if it has a clear aim and is locally specific. | Its inclusion reflects that the particular issue is of special importance to the community. It is based on a policy contained in the approved Wingerworth NP. | No. |
| 133 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 38 - Para 137; The final sentence includes the text:"... in the light of current levels of weak enforcement in the existing conservation areas.' Such statements which are overtly critical of the District Council's actions have no place in an emerging development plan document, even in a draft form, and should be removed. | While it is considered that the text is fair and factually correct is agreed to amend it to reflect your concerns. | Yes. |
| 134 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Page 39 - Para 1.41: "It is, therefore, requested that NEDDC undertake a review of the conservation areas and seek the views and co-operation of owners, residents, businesses, amenity groups and other organisations in conducting such a review ' See comments relating to para 137. | It is considered that this statement is fair and appropriate to a land use document. | No. |
| 135 | POLICY D2: DRONFIELD CHARACTER BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES OF LOCAL HERITAGE INTEREST | North East Derbyshire District Council | The opening paragraph of this Policy Is unnecessary and it is suggested that the policy opens with: "Development proposals relating to the heritage assets in Appendix 7, 'Character Buildings and Structures of Local Heritage Interest' will be.. . | It is agreed to remove the opening paragraph. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|---|--|------|
| 136 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | The assets listed at Appendix 7 should also be shown on a Map, so it is clear which properties/features are affected | It is agreed in principle that these should be shown on a map. | Yes. |
| 137 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Appendix 7 includes a list of each asset and a brief description. However neither this, or the evidence base document set out how the assets perform in relation to selection criteria set out in Appendix 6. For the list to have any credibility It will need to be supported by a robust evidence base that clearly sets out the reason for each asset's selection. | It is considered that the evidence provided is reasonable and proportionate. | No. |
| 138 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Paragraph 138 indicates that the Dronfield list of Character Buildings and Structures of Local Heritage Interest is an iterative list subject to continuous revision as new assets are identified. It is wholly reasonable that the evidence base is maintained, however the list at Appendix 7 may only be updated as part of a formal revision to the Plan in order to ensure that the process is open to public scrutiny and consultation. | It is agreed that the supporting text should be amended accordingly. | Yes. |
| 139 | | Resident | Additions to the list: Examples of stone rows of Victorian workers cottages on Hill Top Road 1) on the track looking to Guide Acre; 2) near the top of Long Acre Road (no's 63-71 Hill Top Road); 3) at the junction of Salisbury Road and Hill Top Road; 4) The last buildings on Hill Top Road No's 128-132 (may be a former isolation hospital). | Thank you for your suggestions. These have been considered and its agreed that some merit inclusion to the draft list. | Yes. |
| 140 | | Resident | Also preserve and protect the old stone garden walls – relics of the farmland around Dronfield town. | Thank you for your suggestions. These have been considered and its agreed that some of the better examples merit inclusion to the draft list. It should be noted that Policy | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|------|
| | | | | Env 2 Landscape Character seeks to protect stonewalls that are important to the landscape. | |
| 141 | POLICY D3: GOOD DESIGN | Gladman Developments Ltd | Gladman are concerned that some of the criterion in the policy are overly prescriptive and could limit suitable sustainable development coming forwards. Gladman suggest more flexibility is provided in the policy wording to ensure high quality residential developments are not compromised by overly restrictive criteria. We suggest regard should be had to paragraph 60 of the previous Framework which states that; <i>"Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles"</i> | It is agreed to review the wording some of the criteria to ensure that they are not overly prescriptive and could limit suitable sustainable development coming forwards as you suggest, | Yes. |
| 142 | | Environment Agency | Flood Risk - The River Drone runs through Dronfield and therefore there are parts of the Dronfield NHP area that are in flood zones. We note that there is no mention of flood risk within the Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst no housing allocations have been suggested within the document, we would suggest that some mention of flood risk is added into the NHP document given there is a policy for future windfall sites. The currently submitted North East Derbyshire Local Plan contains flood risk policy SDC11 which could be referenced as well as the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) for development in the flood zones. This | It is agreed that it would be helpful to make specific reference to flood risk as well as the supporting documents you suggest. | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|--|------|
| | | | would ensure that any future development in the flood zones within Dronfield would have to have regard for the flood risk policies at both a national and local level. | | |
| 143 | | North East Derbyshire District Council | Criterion k) Is unclear. It would be useful to make reference to the Council's 'Successful Places 'document. | It is agreed to look at the wording of the criterion and make reference to NEDDC's 'Successful Places 'document. | Yes. |