

**Crich Parish  
Neighbourhood Development Plan  
Referendum 2018**

***Summary of Representations***

This page is intentionally blank

## Summary of Representations

The following table provides a summary of the representations received in response consultation under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 which were forward to the Independent Examiner.

Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation
Amber Valley Borough Council	<p>Concern that the proposed Settlement Development Boundary around Whatstandwell will allow for a significant amount of future development but has been identified as being suitable for only a limited amount of growth in the submission version of the Amber Valley Borough Local Plan.</p> <p>Settlement Development Boundary around Crich inconsistent with the proposed Housing Growth Site in the submission version of the Amber Valley Borough Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy NP2 is more restrictive than adopted and emerging Local Plan policies on housing growth.</p> <p>There is a lack of evidence to support policy NP5 relating to the provision of a mix of housing types.</p> <p>Concern that NP1e), NP2 2d), NP4b) and c) are insufficiently clear</p> <p>Locations of the Local Green Spaces are insufficiently clear.</p> <p>There are a number of drafting errors.</p>
Planning and Design Group on Behalf of Wheeldon Brothers Limited	<p>Settlement Development Boundary around Crich inconsistent with the proposed</p> <p>Housing Growth Site in the submission version of the Amber Valley Borough Local Plan</p> <p>NP1 should be reworded to conform with the emerging Amber Valley Borough Local Plan and is not clear.</p> <p>Limiting development proposals to 5 dwellings is not supported by national planning policy</p> <p>NP2 is not considered to be clear in several respects.</p> <p>NP3 the Green Gaps do not reflect the land form and is not in conformity with the NPPF</p> <p>NP4 Buildings for Life is guidance and should not be translated into a specific criterion and is not supported by evidence.</p> <p>NP7 contrary to both national and local plan policy</p> <p>NP11 locally important heritage assets do not have the status of Locally Designated Heritage Assets.</p>

Natural England	No specific comments
Coal Authority	No specific comments
Crich Parish Council	Outlines reasons for policies and wording used.
Derbyshire County Council	<p>Not clear if 3 large scale developments are within the Settlement Development Boundaries.</p> <p>NP1 approach incompatible with Amber Valley Brough Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>NP7 supported in principle</p> <p>No formal Habitat's Regulation Assessment.</p>
J. Woodhouse	The plan is very comprehensive and agree with the policies set out. in particular Policies NP3, NP4, NP13, NP17
Gladman Developments Limited	<p>Concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic conditions (a) and (d), considered that it does not conform with national policy and guidance and that it does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>Feel that some of the policies contained within the plan do not reflect the requirements of National Policy and Guidance and fails to provide flexibility which may lead to policies being overridden upon adoption of the AVLPL.</p> <p>NP1 – still restrictive in terms of numbers, fails to state why it is considered appropriate to limit development in this way and now lacks clarity required by the Framework.</p> <p>NP2 – Oppose to the use of settlement boundaries if they would preclude otherwise sustainable development coming forward.</p> <p>NP3 – considers this policy to be strategic in nature and therefore beyond the remit of neighbourhood plans. Evidence is not sufficient enough to warrant the designation of green gaps in the neighbourhood area. The green gap policy will be more extensive than the Special Landscape Area and will be more restrictive than the emerging Local Plan policy. Recommends this policy to be removed.</p> <p>NP4 – considers the criteria to be overly restrictive and concerns over criterion (a), also considers the policy to be unclear on how decision makers should apply aspects of it. Recommends that the policy should be reworded.</p>
K. Oliver for Crich Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Outlines reasons for policies and wording used as also set .
M. Haslam	<p>Concern about the Settlement Development Boundary around Whatstandwell has been drawn loosely and not confined to the existing built up area.</p> <p>Whatstandwell is suitable for only a limited amount of growth and any further development will have a significant impact on the Conservation Area and the World Heritage Buffer Zone which appears to have been overlooked.</p>

	<p>Unlikely that the boundary of development and statements about Whatstandwell will allow for the community objectives to be met.</p> <p>The names Whatstandwell and Crich Carr appear to have been used interchangeably and it is not always clear what boundary and settlement is being referred to.</p> <p>Reference to the settlement running along ridges does not describe my understanding of the village or meaning of ridge.</p>
Mr S. Woodward and Ms L. Richards	Concern that the Neighbourhood Plan allows for development of the Woodside area behind The Common Crich.
Mrs P. Holloway	Concern that the Neighbourhood Plan allows for development of the Woodside area behind The Common Crich.
National Grid	National Grid has identified that it has no record of electricity and gas transmission apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area
Mr N. Shaw	<p>Notes the Settlement Development Boundary being larger than in the pre-submission draft but not evident how it is justified.</p> <p>No acknowledgement of comments made as part of the public consultation on pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan, or explanation of how they have been addressed, in the 'Consultation Statement' accompanying the submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan</p>
Mr P. Dolby	<p>There seems to be a complete lack of future planning for the green field areas in the parish other than to say no building outside the settlement development boundary which may not be realistic</p> <p>The settlement boundary's that have been drawn seem to closely follow the existing buildings and gardens in Crich and Fritchley but the boundary for Whatstandwell is very loose round the settlement with quite extensive open land included within the boundary. It seems to suggest a disproportionate amount of available building land in Whatstandwell compared with the other two villages</p> <p>There is no plan for outlying areas in the parish such as Wheatcroft, Parkhead and Plaistow Green</p> <p>Education provision has not been addressed.</p>
Severn Trent Water	No specific comments.