

145 homes, 330 villagers – ONE VOICE

Hazelwood Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation summary

Hazelwood
Parish Council
2016–2031



www.hazelwoodpc.org.uk

Consultation Statement

Reaching out to residents

The success of the whole consultation process has been due to two main factors. Firstly, as per the introduction to 'Consultation' and Table 1, a recognition that this meant a dialogue with as many Hazelwood parishioners as possible. Secondly, this in turn meant using the widest possible range of media tactics to ensure that dialogue.

Table 1 shows that, from the onset, demonstrably reaching out to residents has been a key feature via the use of Open Evenings (5); personally delivering surveys (2) to every household in the parish; mailing the third, independent MRH Housing Survey; visibly making The Hazelwood Neighbourhood Plan team available for discussion, questions and feedback at the 2014 and 2015 village fêtes. Linking these activities have been emailings, newsletters, local Parish magazine advertising and editorial usage, posters to flag up Open Evenings.

From the start of the process, Steering Group meetings, whilst established as working gatherings, have also been open to parishioners. This has enabled them to raise any specific issues and obtain answers on the spot. It has also fostered a climate of openness which has been important to promote clarity and dispel any notions that the resulting Neighbourhood Plan is, somehow, tied to a house building agenda!

The resulting information has therefore been obtained via a growing confidence in and knowledge of the process – and what the ultimate goal is i.e. a shared vision for Hazelwood Parish.

Open Evenings

July & September 2013; February & November 2014; May 2015

The very first event in July 2013 was probably the first time that many residents had even been aware of a Neighbourhood Plan and what this could mean. A strong turnout (75) showed a keen interest in the intentions, as outlined. The meeting was vocal and gave a strong mandate to the nascent Steering Group for it to proceed in developing the work.

A little over two months later, the September meeting saw the Steering Group formed and the need for a clear evidence base to be established. Again, a strong gathering of 65 residents saw the need for factual information to be sought, particularly in aiming to establish what the believed housing requirements are in the parish.

The February 2014 Open Evening was a landmark in that it gave the Steering Group a very sound opportunity to feedback to residents the results of the first survey, carried out in the

previous December. Details are briefly summarised later but the clarity of the information gleaned, its overall indication of the views of residents, provided a very sound platform for moving the work forward. Overwhelmingly, residents related their tenure in Hazelwood to its rural, peaceful nature and wished to see the parish much the same in 15 years' time. This was balanced, nevertheless with a realistic attitude that some development was to be welcomed, providing that this was sympathetic to the area's landscape, existing settlement characteristics and was in tune with the stated housing need.

The November 27th 2014 Open Evening was similarly important. The break over the Summer months provided an opportunity to UPDATE (the theme for the evening). The 'Final Questionnaire' findings (See next section) were the centre piece but the impending May 2015 election added further context and urgency to progressing the Neighbourhood Plan. The relevance to the emerging AVBC Local Plan and its non-finalised status was of particular moment.

The meeting was also a launch point for the announcement that an independent MRH Housing Survey was called for. This was readily supported and the need for specific evidence of what previous questionnaires had broadly indicated.

The well attended evening was a good opportunity to show the progress that had been made, the importance of further evidence gathering and the political pressure via the election which made the Plan's production and approval as important as ever.

The most recent, May 20th Open Evening - over 50 attendees – once again showed the burgeoning interest in the Plan's progress. Whilst the keynote was the results of the MRH Housing Survey, the evening saw the Village Design Statement introduced and explained; a key tool in the intended Plan as a means of encouraging prior discussion with the Parish Council by planning applicants. This collaborative aspiration gave rise to interesting questions. It showed that, together with the Village Design Statement, it opened up a whole area of dialogue to guide and influence the need for new and altered buildings applications to be sympathetic to the rural and built environments; at the very heart of the Neighbourhood Plan's intention. This aspect then formed an important part of the subsequent newsletter, distributed prior to the village fête where the Steering Group had a stand. (See later note)

Surveys

Three surveys have been carried out; two wholly by the Steering Group and the third, independently, by Midlands Rural Housing. The initial survey sought to establish attitudes and views, primarily. Residents were encouraged to express these as fully as they wished rather than via a tick box route. A 37% return was encouraging and the full results are available on the Parish Council website (www.hazelwoodpc.org.uk). Overwhelmingly, 73%

said that the rural setting and the beauty of the surrounding area were the reasons why they enjoyed living in Hazelwood. For these same reasons, 73% said they wanted to see little change although a balance of 27% were open to some change, of a sympathetic nature.

Having established the importance of the rural, peaceful setting of Hazelwood, it was deemed important to follow up with a more enquiring survey. Termed the 'Final Questionnaire', this sought to look at housing issues, primarily, but also attitudes towards a number of community aspects e.g. the community hall, local buses, traffic etc.

Although the questionnaire provided some choice options, the opportunity was still provided for respondents to go beyond these choices and offer any comment they wished.

A very heartening uplifted response rate of 54% provided a first insight into residents housing aspirations, tenure within the parish, historical and future intentions, including those of younger people. The pattern was not unlike many similar parishes across the country – residents seeing themselves as long term, housing stock fairly static as a result, smaller, quality houses being attractive to downsize to but not readily available.

Once again, the opportunity provided to offer suggestions and comments was seized upon. Well over 40 longer written responses were received.

The final, MRH Housing Survey, logically grew from the first two questionnaires. Produced to a proven matrix by Midlands Rural Housing, with input tailored to Hazelwood Parish, this sought to pin down specifics from the broader picture of the previous exercises. The resulting 72.5% response rate was regarded by Midlands Rural Housing as outstanding and significantly above the norm. It confirmed the previous indications more specifically i.e. there is a need for smaller, quality 2/3 bedroom homes, primarily for residents wishing to downsize and a small requirement for younger people wishing to get onto the housing ladder.

Church fêtes – 'Meet The Steering Group'

2014 and 2015 saw the proactive presence of the team at the church fête with its own stand. On both occasions, the 'traffic' exceeded expectations.

June 2014 was just after the second 'Final Questionnaire' was carried out. This in itself provoked lively discussion. An important part of the group's presence was speaking to residents who, perhaps, had not fully engaged before or done so in a limited manner. The opportunity to fully explain the Plan's purpose and to obtain contact details gave the fête a unique function.

Among the several graphics, the map of the parish offered a fascinating opportunity for many visitors to not only pinpoint their location, but to see how the Green Belt, areas of special landscape and other designated areas, fitted into the Plan's strategy. Many visitors were new to these aspects.

June 2015 very much built on the preceding year's activity. Following on from the May 15th Open Evening and the subsequent newsletter, timed to be put through every residents' door prior to the fête, the result was a large increase in visitors and questions. A key aspect of all the recent activity had been to show draft objectives and to welcome comments. All of this contributed to a visible heightening of interest. Further contact details were also obtained.

Summary

Since July 2013, the pace of consultation has been unremitting yet carefully planned. Initial soundings were, inevitably, against a backdrop of both lack of awareness about Neighbourhood Plans and some inertia. The Steering Group believes that the results show increasing engagement by parishioners. Attendance at Open Evenings has been maintained. More markedly, the response rate to the three surveys has increased from an initial 37% to a final, very significant 72.5%. These figures alone are testimony to the increasing importance which residents are placing on an effective Plan and their desire to have their views known.

Interestingly, specific enquiries on a number of detailed points have come through, as the Plan is increasingly seen as a likelihood. Its use as a collaborative tool is already starting to take root.

The headlines regarding the need for more housing clearly also play their part. It is obvious from the consultation process that the special nature of Hazelwood Parish's landscape and its built environment is precious to residents. The need for this to be retained became abundantly clear from the very first questionnaire. The likely need for some change also filtered through. Confirmed by the outcome of the MRH Housing Survey.

The residents of Hazelwood Parish have clearly shown, via the consultation process, that consultation needs to work both ways. Development by imposition is not wanted. Sensible, sympathetic development can have a place and the guidance tools within the intended Neighbourhood Plan show the way.

The Statutory consultation – October 1st - November 16th 2015

This part of the process has been equally robust, as can be seen in the following tables.

The wider public, both within and outside the Parish boundary, were notified via a variety of mediums including local press, a newsletter distributed door-to-door, posters, Plan hard copies made available to local pubs, libraries, the Memorial Hall. In addition, drop-in sessions at the Memorial Hall were organised on four occasions to give residents an opportunity to discuss any aspects of the Plan with members of the Steering Group.

Special categories were identified as non-resident land owners, fringe interest householders and local businesses. These were contacted by a combination of individual letters and emails.

The bulk of the contact was made to the extensive list of National and regional bodies supplied by AVBC. This listing was extended following research by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to include certain local authorities contiguous with Hazelwood Parish boundary or otherwise close enough to warrant consultation.

Community Consultation Statement

An underlying principle in the Hazelwood Neighbourhood Plan is to have local people actively involved in ongoing consultation on important planning issues. Developers wishing to apply for planning permission for new or replacement dwellings are particularly encouraged to work with the Parish Council to understand local views particularly about the design of new development before planning applications are submitted. This is reflected in aspiration policy 1. Working with the Parish Council should include the following:

1. Involve and engage with local people particularly the Parish Council in consultation about any proposals before detailed plans are prepared.
2. The planning application should include a short document explaining how the proposals being submitted following this Consultation have addressed the views of and any issues or concerns raised by local people and the Parish Council(s).

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
General public	30/9/15 23/9/15 – 30/9/15	Belper News 4pp newsletter delivered to all households. Posters throughout the Parish. Both mediums publicised four informal drop-in dates at the Memorial Hall, inviting discussion. Hard copies of the Plan made available in church, Memorial Hall, Belper and Duffield libraries, three pubs	Article publicising draft Plan consultation period. <u>Drop –in sessions</u> Three of the drop-in session meetings were supportive of the vision and the need to keep the Parish ‘rural’ with its open views. Concern re; intrusive lighting and the need to ensure that street lighting would never become a feature. Community Objective 4 and the need to include specific references to ridge heights and scale in relation to new build situations, vis a viz neighbouring properties. Queries re voting procedural issues i.e. would on-line be a choice and over what period.	Noted; lighting picked up as part of VDS Specific detail is provided in the VDS the objectives are intended to be an overview Referendum is arranged by AVBC in accordance with its own protocols
			<u>Email responses</u> NP1 reference to ‘sites adjoining...’ would weaken existing AVBC Planning safeguards.	‘adjoining’ removed. Amended to ‘within or on the edge of’ (also see comment below) These are community objectives and are

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			<p>Relationship between Vision, Objectives and Policies and wording of the Objectives.</p> <p>Development should only be 'within' not adjoining to protect the landscape character and built environment</p>	<p>intended to set out in layman's words the intent of the policies. They are based on community consultation and the objectives may feed into more than one policy. Policies have to be legally worded and do require some understanding of the planning system. The vision and objectives will give residents enough information about the intent and scope of the plan for them to form a judgement at the referendum. The key matter is that the Policies have translated the Vision and Objectives into legally framed policies that pass the basic conditions.</p> <p>Policies prevail. Community objectives set out scope in layman's terms</p> <p>This supposes that development on an infill site will, overall, have less impact than a well designed and located development on the edge. One of the reasons for having an NP was that there have been poorly designed and located infill developments in recent years. Also part of the character of the settlements is that they have open space within them, large gardens etc so 'within' could erode the character more than one or two dwellings carefully sited on the edge.</p>

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			<p>The narrative preceding the policy on the reuse of empty/redundant farm buildings for residential use would be supported “<i>particularly where the existing building could be divided into smaller dwellings</i>” (a point presumably made with the appetite for smaller/affordable dwellings in mind) but this is not on the list of criteria listed in the policy 3.3 to which weight would be attached if a planning application were forthcoming.</p> <p>Will Hazelwood residents actually benefit from the development of the smaller, quality dwellings contemplated by the draft Plan?</p>	<p>NP4 amended 1g added ‘is suitable for subdivision into smaller dwellings’</p> <p>The planning system can’t ensure that market housing will go to local people; that is for the developer and the potential occupier. However, the existence of smaller dwellings makes it possible in a way that is not possible at the moment.</p> <p>Exception sites policies are a way of ensuring this link between house and occupier and AVBC has an exception policy already (the deeds are restricted and can only be occupied by local people in perpetuity. This</p>

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			<p>Overall, the writer believed <i>‘that the drafted Policies, Objectives and much of the narrative reflect a more permissive regime for new housing development than this Vision infers.’</i></p>	<p>affects the land value and is usually an option for landowners with an interest in providing housing for a local i.e. family member)</p> <p>The NPPF brought a change of emphasis to planning. There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and the NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of neighbourhood plans. Although AVBC do not have an up to date local plan (they do not have a 5 year land supply) the NPPF is clear that this relates to the housing supply policies, not the other adopted policies in the 2006 Local Plan. District policies provide protection through conservation and heritage designation that is supported in the NPPF. However, the NP is far more specific showing view corridors and detailed analysis in a Village design statement. The NP policies require any development to show how it has considered a range of specific landscape and design issues in any application. Equally, the NP showed a predominance of larger family houses of which more than 1/3 were occupied by people over 65 and there was support from local residents to seek ways to provide a few smaller dwellings. The NPPF requires neighbourhood plans to meet local need and this Plan is an approach supported by local</p>

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			<p>Use of 'must' in policy wording preferred</p> <p>The interpretation of the Housing Needs Survey questioned, in particular 'needs', reference to 'affordable housing' and its possible Social housing connotation. All thought to wrongly reflect the actual situation.</p> <p>Lots of 'design' guidance; too little detail on where development might happen.</p>	<p>people.</p> <p>The NP is tested against the NPPF and the Local Plan (see Basic conditions statement)</p> <p>Restrictive language like 'must' is not in accordance with the NPPF. To reflect concern about 'permissive tone', wording in NP6 development 'should be supported if ...' rather than 'will be supported if ...'</p> <p>The Housing Needs Survey was not looking at affordable housing needs but the overall housing needs of local people. The results reflected census data that there is a need for smaller market dwellings primarily for downsizing but these could also be suitable as first time buyer homes. These findings are reflected in the NP.</p> <p>The NP is not allocating sites but setting criteria based policies. The criteria are drawn from detailed analysis of the built and natural environment of the Parish. The policies require applicants to show how they</p>

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			<p>Policy to encourage smaller size housing will not guarantee local people benefit by acquiring these houses</p> <p>licence to build outside present curtilages' concern and its relationship to 'Social Housing'</p> <p>Lubrizon support overstated.</p> <p>Objective 8 traffic speed restrictions preferred not to be</p>	<p>have taken these into account in the proposals</p> <p>The Planning System cannot 'guarantee' the allocation of market housing to local people. A wider range of house types will, however, be suitable for a wider age range of people. This may provide the opportunity for older people to live in the Parish longer and/or for younger people seeking to move into or stay in the area.</p> <p>There is no link made in the NP to 'social housing' (in planning terms this is part of the affordable housing offer). This NP is not concerned with affordable housing policy inside or outside the curtilage. Affordable housing will continue to be decided in accordance with district policy.</p> <p>Agreed and amended</p> <p>Traffic issues are only aspirations in the NP as the issues raised are outside of the scope of the NP. Any progress will be done by the</p>

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			mandatory but warning. Policy 7 re; business support thought to be important for the future. All other aspects of the Plan supported.	PC in consultation with the community.
2 Non- resident landowners	25-27/9/15	1 st class letters	Nil response	
8 Fringe interest householders	25-27/9/15	1 st class letters and e-mail	Nil response	
3 local businesses	25-27/9/15	1 st class letters	Nil response	
Alderwasley PC	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Ashfield District Council	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Bolsover District Council	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Broxtowe Borough Council	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Historic England	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
NHS Clinical Commissioner Group	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
Coal Authority	27/9/15	Email	No specific response	
Derby City Council	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Derbyshire County Council	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Derbyshire Dales District Council	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust	27/9/15	Email	Appendix H does not include plan to monitor the impact of development on biodiversity	Amendment made
Duffield PC	27/9/15	Email	No comments to make	
Ecclesbourne Valley Railway	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Ecclesbourne Restoration Partnership	27/9/15	Email	No objections	
Environment Agency	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Erewash Borough Council	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
Highways Agency	27/9/15	Email	No impact on strategic highways network	
Hulland Ward PC	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Kirk Ireton PC	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
National Trust	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Natural England	27/9/15	Email	No likely significant risk	
Network Rail	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Severn Trent	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Shottle PC	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
South Derbyshire Council	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Turnditch & Windley PC	27/9/15	1st class mail	Nil response	
Western Power	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
Wirksworth Town Council	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
Belper Town Council	27/9/15	1st class mail	Nil response	
Callow PC	27/9/15	Email	Nil response	
AVBC	13/10/15	Meeting with Rachel Coates	As per NPIERS Health Check	
NPIERS Health Check	16/12/15	Request from AVBC	The NPIERS Health Check report is on the Hazelwood NP web site the following is a summary of the key comments and response. Note policy titles and numbers in health check reflect pre submission draft these have been amended in submission draft to reflect consultee responses	
			Clarification required regarding SEA and Habitat screening and pre submission consultation	Procedural matters clarified with AVBC
	27/9/15		NP1: <i>Policy 1; Support occasional new build</i> Conflict with AVBC Local Plan saved policies re; development restriction to 'adjoining the built-up area'. Need to also clarify and consider	Policy re drafted to reflect all points raised here (and from other consultees) regarding green belt reference , use of word adjoining and 5 year review period

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			<p>Green Belt situation</p> <p>Ambiguous terms need clarifying to avoid legal challenge.</p> <p>Consider title for NP1 'Development Strategy', criteria based and name built-areas for clarity, as suggested.</p> <p>Delete item 4 re; Plan review. Already covered in 'Monitoring and Review'</p>	
			<p>NP2 <u>Design principle for residential development</u></p> <p>Reference to Housing Character Survey needs to be consistent; not 'Review'</p> <p>More cross relating of Village Design Statement suggested.</p> <p>Modifications to VDs recommended to ensure consistency with Plan</p>	<p>Plan Amended</p> <p>Plan Amended</p> <p>VDS Amended</p>
			<p>NP3: <u>Consider a limited number of smaller new homes</u></p>	<p>Policy re drafted to reflect points raised</p>

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			<p>Title ambiguous suggested alternative</p> <p>Criteria1 ambiguous and unnecessary; already covered by Policy 1</p> <p>Criteria 2 acceptable but needs to show more flexibility and possible appendix to show local exemption qualification.</p> <p>Suggested wording to show required flexibility re; more than single dwellings to ensure viable delivery under NPPF (para.47)</p> <p>Criteria 3 re Conversions not part of Housing Mix. To be removed and form separate policy Re; 'The conversion of redundant farm buildings', suggested criteria acceptable but more extensive preamble suggested to justify policy.</p> <p>Policy needs to cross refer to VDS</p>	VDS amended

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			which is 'silent' currently on specific advice.	
			NP4 <i>Maintaining and enhancing the Parish's biodiversity</i> minor amendments	Plan Amended
			NP5 <i>Protect the public views across the Plan area</i> Redraft to protect landscape character and 'openness' from 'intrusion'. Cross refer to VDS – adding more to this to explain nature of intrusive development. Consider suggested revised policy wording, headed 'Protection of landscape character'	Policy re drafted to reflect points raised
			NP6 <i>Support the re-use and re-development of rural buildings for employment</i> Remove from preamble any reference to Parish's relationship with this local business Consider removing any references	Policy re drafted to reflect points raised

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			to specific businesses, in case of offence through omission! Specific suggested mods to criteria a-f	
			NP7 <u>Supporting the creation or expansion of local businesses</u> Modify start with 'expansion' Delete 'outside the settlements'. Question specific reference to The Knowle and possible charge of 'special treatment'	Policy re drafted to reflect points raised
			_NP8 <u>Improving the provision of Broadband</u> Criteria 1 should link to Policies 4 and 5 Criteria 2 is unreasonable in relating to 'all new development'. Add 'where viable and practicable'	Policy re drafted to reflect points raised
			NP9 <u>Enhancing the provision of community facilities</u> This is aspirational and should be reworded as such, grouped with	Whilst it is acknowledged that funding is required to improve or extend community facilities the extent of the improvement may mean that it is possible as part of a capital

Summary of Statutory Consultation				
Who	When	How	Summary of Comments	Action
			<p>the two such policies which follow</p> <p>Note suggestions re wording and need to cross refer to other policies.</p> <p>Suggestion; to create overall 'Aspirational Policies' heading,</p>	<p>programme undertaken by the parish council. Discussions are currently underway regarding extending the village hall and it was considered to be more than aspirational so no amendment made to move it to aspiration section.</p> <p>Plan amended</p>