

Quarndon Neighbourhood Development Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation

4 July to 15 August 2018

Table of Responses

The tabulation on the following pages of this document presents the feedback received from residents, stakeholders and statutory consultees to the 6-week public “Regulation 14” consultation from 4 July to 15 August 2018 on the pre-submission draft of the Quarndon Neighbourhood Development Plan.

The table is organised to group the responses into:

- general comments;
- comments relating to the “Catesby” development of 400 houses off Kedleston Road;
- comments on specific paragraphs in the introductory part of the Quarndon NDP document;
- comments on the Quarndon Neighbourhood Plan objectives; and
- comments on each of the policies contained within the draft Quarndon NDP.

In the case of responses received from individual residents of the parish and landowners the responses are presented anonymously. In some cases responses have been paraphrased to preserve anonymity and/or to keep this document as concise as possible.

Against each comment a “reply” is included to indicate the action taken to address the comment in the context of the overall opinion assimilated from all the responses to each part of the draft Plan as grouped above.

Glossary of acronyms used in the table on the following pages

AECOM Consultants who produced the HNA for the Parish of Quarndon	AVBC Amber Valley Borough Council
BfL Building for Life	DCC Derbyshire County Council
GI - Grade I listed	GII Grade II listed
HIA Health Impact Assessment	KE Kedleston Estate
LGS Local Green Space	HNA Housing Needs Assessment
NDP Neighbourhood Development Plan	NPPF National Planning Policy Framework
NT National Trust	PCC Parochial Church Council
PPG Planning Policy Guidance	QNP Quarndon Neighbourhood Plan
QNPSG Quarndon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	QPC Quarndon Parish Council
RSPB Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	SSSI Site of Special Scientific Interest
SUDS Sustainable Drainage Systems	

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
AVBC	General	The various references in the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Amber Valley Borough Local Plan should be to the 'submitted Local Plan'. The Neighbourhood Plan should also ensure that any references to specific paragraphs in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are to the recently published new version (24 July 2018).	All NDP text will be checked/ corrected to make sure references to the AVBC Local Plan, NPPF and other references are up to date.
Derby City Council	General	This is acknowledgement that your e-mail has been received. We will respond to you as soon as possible	No further communication was received from Derby City Council
Derbyshire County Council	General	DCC considers that the Plan is well-written and structured. In particular it is supported by a range of evidence, such as the AECOM HNA, Derby Principal Area Green Belt Review, census data, and the Kedleston Hall setting study, which have helped inform and frame the policy approach in the QNDP. DCC public health department has considered how the Plan aligns with the agreed Strategic Statement - Planning and Health across Derbyshire and Derby City. The Plan does not make any reference to Health Impact Assessments (HIA). DCC suggests that the following statement should be added to the Plan: "Planning applications for major residential developments of 100 dwellings or more should ideally be accompanied by an HIA where there is likely to be a negative impact on population health as a consequence of development." DCC feels that this Plan demonstrates a commitment to support and enhance the wellbeing of local residents through local planning policy. There are many references to health and wellbeing throughout the Plan, demonstrating the potential for a joined-up partnership approach to supporting healthy communities within Quarndon. The Plan supports biodiversity for the health and wellbeing of local people, and the provision to walk and cycle in the context of managing traffic volume and improving people's health.	DCC suggestion re HIA will be incorporated into the NDP, where it will specifically apply to the proposed development of 400 houses off Kedleston Road.
Ecclesbourne School	General	This is just to confirm that your e-mail has been received & passed on.	No further communication was received from the School.
Environment Agency	General	We note that there is no flood risk policy within this document and no site allocations have been provided. We would make the following comment that any development that is proposed within the flood zones will need to meet the requirement of the submitted Amber Valley Local Plan Policy EN1 and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Guidance	NPPF and Local Plan policies to minimise flood risk must be met for any development proposal so the NDP does not duplicate these. However, NDP Policy QH3 seeks to ensure run-off risk is minimised. Conditions for the Kedleston Road 400 house plan will be checked.
Historic England	General	The area covered by the QNP encompasses Quarndon and Kedleston Conservation Areas and includes important designated heritage assets including Kedleston Hotel GII* and 9 GII listed buildings, also Kedleston Hall GI listed Park and Garden. In line with national planning 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.	The NDP already recognises the importance of the assets listed, no changes to the NDP are required in light of this comment.
Kedleston Estate	General	KE considers that the HNA for the Quarndon Neighbourhood Area for 2018 to 2033 should remain at 45 dwellings as estimated by AECOM.	Disagreed - but explanation will be strengthened in NDP.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
National Grid	General	An assessment has been carried out with respect to the National Grid's electricity and gas transportation apparatus which include high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's intermediate and High Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan Area.	Acknowledged.
National Trust	General	National Trust welcomes the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan for Quarndon Parish, and in particular the commitment to protecting the setting of Kedleston Hall, Park and Conservation Area. 8.2.1.3 Clarify to reflect there is only one SSSI: "the Kedleston Park Site of Special Scientific Interest". 8.2.3.1 NT has owned and managed Kedleston Hall and Park since 1987.	These clarifications/corrections will be incorporated in the NDP.
Severn Trent Water	General	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation. We currently have no specific comments, but please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments/advice. We acknowledge a view has been taken to not formally allocate development within Quarndon and rely on infill to deliver housing needs in the coming plan period	Acknowledged.
St. Paul's Church	General	The only comment I have received is regarding parking on Church Road, around the corner outside the Joiners. I'm sure you will be aware of the issues cars parked there causes. The recent use of traffic cones has eliminated the problem and therefore respectfully request double yellow lines be painted on the road covering the area where the cones are.	Traffic/parking is acknowledged as a significant problem but is outside scope of the NDP. QPC is working with DCC Highways to address resident's concerns.
Virgin Media	General	We currently have no network in Quarndon. But are close by in Allestree. This means any development won't affect any of our existing network, but we are close enough to be able to service any developments which request service.	Acknowledged.
Landowner	General	It is inappropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to be progressed further or finalised ahead of the AVBC Local Plan review, which will not only assess the overall housing requirements, but also at the Local Plan Inspector's direction, will now incorporate a full Green Belt review which could well be relevant to the village of Quarndon. The revised NPPF allows detailed amendments to be made to Green Belt boundaries through a Neighbourhood Plan where a need for changes has been established through strategic policies, i.e. the current Local Plan and Green Belt review. The Neighbourhood Plan identifies a need for 36 dwellings and there is a clear need for affordable and elderly housing. There is no evidence to suggest the claim that there are no suitable sites to meet this need. There is no detailed assessment of any sites to demonstrate that the village is too constrained. The Neighbourhood Plan should not rely solely on windfall sites as there is no evidence to suggest that these will meet the Parish's needs either in terms of overall numbers or in fact the size/tenure of accommodation to be provided. In this respect there is clearly a specific need within Quarndon to provide affordable housing as defined by the NPPF and also housing for the elderly. This cannot be provided on small/single plot windfall sites. It needs a suitable allocation of land within the village to meet the needs. It is clear that the latest version of the Plan does not address these obvious needs within the village and therefore should be addressed as a matter of urgency.	There is no requirement in the planning process to wait for the AVBC Local Plan to be finalised before this NDP is submitted. The NDP is for the Parish of Quarndon. During the 6-week consultation the Court of Appeal found in favour of granting permission for 400 new homes to be built in the Parish off Kedleston Road. This will be recognised in the final version of the NDP and will more than fulfil all of the Parish's needs for affordable housing and housing suitable for the elderly, without any need to release sites in Green Belt.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	General	There is no comment on pedestrian safety on village verges. On Burley Lane in particular the absence of pavements along some stretches makes safe walking impossible. Many verges have pieces of stone or timber placed to prevent traffic churning strips of grass. Sooner or later a child will be hit by a vehicle or fall.	The issue of pedestrian safety is covered (e.g. section 6.7.9 of v.09 of the NDP), but is primarily an issue for the Parish Council and discussions are already on going with DCC Highways.
Resident	General	Laudable objectives. My main concern is the continuous development that takes place in Church Road and Burley Lane where planning approval controls the start date but does not appear to specify an end date. For example, the cottage at the Burley Lane/Common junction has had scaffolding erected for weeks but no sign of work in progress. This is typical of many development sites in Quarndon. Residents are subjected to noise, dust, dirt and bad contractor parking but this doesn't seem to be addressed anywhere.	Timescales for building work are outside the scope of the NDP. Section 9.1 of the NDP provides a "Building Method" standard. In cases of concern AVBC development/environmental control should be consulted.
Resident	General	A very comprehensive document. Some policies are aspiration which may be difficult to achieve without more local cooperation; e.g. new housing to be restricted to 3 bedrooms or less, better local bus service (the village failed to support this last one). Para. 6.6.4 could be used by the Boundary Commission to justify transferring Poppyfields etc. to Derby. Do we want this to happen? Para. 7.4.5, the NT has owned Kedleston Hall since 1987, not "since the 1970s".	It is accepted that elements of the Plan are aspirational, but those aspirations are derived from the consultation process. 6.6.4 is a statement of fact. Date will be corrected in 7.4.5
Resident	General	I think that the plan is a very commendable and comprehensive document. It is full of a lot of detail showing that there has been significant research. Having read through it, it would be an excellent framework for the development of Quarndon over the next period. But I fear that it is "too idealistic" in several areas - as a resident of Quarndon for almost 30 years, I have seen many "well intentioned" changes which really have been taken advantage of, I therefore consider that the wording should sometimes recognise the limitations of the village that we have and its geography, its housing density around the "centre" and say quite categorically: (1) We do not want the school to expand, due to the space that we have and the influx of traffic etc. (2) We do NOT believe that cycling should be encouraged around the core village. (3) People working from home should not be encouraged if outside resources e.g. delivery vans, meetings with visitors are part of the process of that business. (4) A convenience store is a nice idea, but not feasible with the present infrastructure. The plan should ideally make as a requirement that of the infrastructure and the necessary development of that structure is a prerequisite for some of these objectives if they are to be pursued. Finally, I would like to thank all the members who have spent a lot of time in putting the plan together. It seems unfortunate that I and I suspect many others, are feeling rather negative about the real impact that such a document will have in the future. Kedleston Voice have fought an admirable campaign to protect us from building 400 houses, and thought they had achieved their objective, only to have that ruling over-turned.	The NDP as far as possible tries to take into account the existing limitations of the village. Regarding the specific points (1 to 4) made these do not reflect the majority of the views collected during the Plan consultation process. However, the Plan policies are written to try and encourage a reduction of motor traffic in the village (working from home is part of this), which in turn would make walking and cycling safer. The NDP policy QCLE4 seeks to ensure that businesses in the Parish do not have a detrimental impact on their neighbours and other residents.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	General	Greatly concerned about the unbearable volume of traffic cutting through what was once a quiet village road and the amount of pollution caused. It is more like the A6. The noise is constant and very few drivers appear to be observing the speed limit. Surely some form of deterrent to stop the volume cutting through could be applied.	Traffic and parking is acknowledged as a significant problem but is outside scope of the NDP. However, QPC is working with DCC Highways to address resident's concerns.
Resident	General	Thank you to the QNP team for working so hard over the last two years to produce this Plan, giving so many opportunities for those of us who live or have interests in the Parish to express our wishes, and taking these wishes into account in the Plan's objectives and policies.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	So far, so very good. Quarndon is a lovely village. Keep it up.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	The objectives of the plan are robust and aligned to the needs of the local community and district.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	<p>I wish to say a big thank you to all the people who contributed to the plan and hopefully you won't feel that you have built a coconut shy for people to knock down.</p> <p>I count myself as one of the many 'quite apathetic' folks in the village who just want to keep on keeping on. I did attend the first meeting where I felt there was an optimistic view of the future of the Village and giving residents a say in the shape of that future. My overall feeling is that the Plan should possibly be renamed a 'lack of development plan'. This being because it seems highly skewed to keeping things very much as they are. Much as that would be nice, I feel it is far from practical for coping with our share of the nation's housing needs (although with the 400 houses recently passed that might now be different). Any external councillors, planners, lawyers looking at it could take a view that we are trying to create a sealed box using the green belt as some form of shield. Should that view be reached, we run the very real risk that they dismiss the plan as 'nimbyism' and thus proceed to do what they feel they need to do anyway. This would most likely end up as either or both of infill with Allestree and or Duffield. I grew up in Mickleover as it was joined onto and became part of the city and really wouldn't like to see that happen here. So what I feel is lacking in the plan is a section detailing – 'If we really must expand and develop the Village, then it should be along these lines and in this location/area'. AECOM seems to have calculated the need based on 4 different methods and taken the average. I guess to assess need that might be as good a way as any. However, in terms of real need the fact that a developer is wanting to build 400 properties at the edge of the parish should speak volumes. I do agree that we do have an aging population, many of whom will want to 'downsize' in the coming years. I am afraid I do feel that we need to allow and propose some growth to the actual village itself. Maybe a case for a new school on a green field site within the village; that land then available for housing, amongst other ideas. As I said at the beginning, I think there has been a lot of excellent work done by the group. I just wouldn't want to see it shot full of holes because we haven't really fully considered the expansion of the village outside of its box.</p>	The NDP attempts to strike a balance between development needs and the strongly held view of residents and local stakeholders that the rural quality of Quarndon should be maintained. The housing need for the Parish is estimated at 15 to 30 houses over the next 15 years. You are right that the Green Belt provides a significant constraint to development - but our consultation has shown that the Green Belt is very highly valued by both residents and some local stakeholders. The school governors have been consulted and highly value the current central position of the school, adjacent to the church and village hall.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	General	We are pleased this plan will give extra protection to Quarndon Parish. We are particularly pleased it addresses preserving the rural aspect of the village and Kedleston setting.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	You (QNPSG - all members) doing a fantastic job. Keep up the good work.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	Vitally important to preserve the separation of Quarndon from Derby and avoid further encroachment on Kedleston Hall, Park & Gardens. Green spaces within the village including those overwashed by the green belt should be given every possible protection. Overall an excellent document and I fully support all the objectives and policies.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	The plan is very encouraging and well laid out.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	Comprehensive and painstakingly compiled. Well done QNP steering group.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	We strongly object to a small group of non-elected Quarndon residents precisely prescribing under what conditions future development should take place. We do not believe all policies in the QNP represent the spirit of residents' views, and believe policies are too dogmatic and include wish lists by third parties. Para 7.4.6: this is not a result of the consultation process with residents, but results from suggestions from the Woodlands Trust, RSPB, etc.	The QNP Steering Group (QNPSG) has worked under the direct guidance of the elected Quarndon Parish Council (QPC). Several QPC members are on the QNPSG. The Neighbourhood Plan process requires that external stakeholders as well as residents are consulted.
Resident	General	Good work.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	Well produced by an excellent team.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	I have no general comments to make except to say that we both wish to express our appreciation for all the hard work done by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	I very much appreciate the hard work that has gone into drawing up the Quarndon Neighbourhood Plan and thank you for that. I hope matters proceed smoothly from now on.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	I have reviewed the plan on your internet site and am happy with it.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	I am pleased with the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which addresses many of my concerns - particularly the lack of suitable footpaths on Burley Lane and between the Kedleston Hotel and Kedleston Hall (policies QIN1, QIN2 & QIN3).	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	Comprehensive Plan, well-structured and well written. I hope the Plan contributes significantly to curb the excess of development in our village so that we may maintain our semi-rural character as a community separate from Derby sprawl.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	The Quarndon Neighbourhood Development Plan is a well-consulted, considered and compiled road map for the future of the village, its environs, inhabitants and wildlife	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	I have read the documents and am very happy with the contents.	Thank you for your support.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	General	I am in general favour of the Plan.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	We write to provide our support for the vision, objectives, proposals and policies set out in the pre-submission consultation document. We consider that the document sets out Quarndon's needs for future development, (taking into account its share of adjacent housing needs for Amber Valley and Derby City). The document seeks to fulfil those needs over the plan period whilst importantly preserving Quarndon Village's position as a settlement distinct from both Derby and Duffield. We support the need for housing that allows people from within the village to downsize and the need to address the issue of large houses being developed on undersized plots. The protection of Quarndon Parish and its rural environment, green belt, together with the historic setting for Kedleston Hall is in our view important. It is important for the document to reflect as best it can the situation in relation to the proposed development off the Kedleston Road, and provide where it can appropriate application of policies should this development proceed.	Thank you for your support. The change in circumstances, during the (Regulation 14) consultation period for this NDP regarding the Court of Appeal decision to grant permission for the 400 house development off Kedleston Road will be addressed in the final version of the NDP.
Resident	General	Impressed by the scale and scope. Thank you for your hard work.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	May I first of all express my personal admiration and gratitude for what you and the team have done on behalf of the rest of us. I appreciate this query is too late to be of use but I thought I ought to lob it in anyway. My query relates to the 400 houses on the KR Estate. Obviously it is outside the policies in the Local Area Plan, but I suspect that can't affect the situation retrospectively. My query is whether if this is so and the Appeal to the Supreme Court fails, there is scope to argue that the development should be transferred to Derby as an alteration in the City boundary because of its overwhelming size relative to the village and its impact on the village infrastructure (e.g. . the school).	Thank you for your support. The Neighbourhood Plan is not able to propose a change to AVBC/ Derby City Council boundaries. The Neighbourhood Plan area was determined by public consultation at the start of the process in 2016 to be the Parish of Quarndon.
Resident	General	I've studied the documents on the website, and I'm generally supportive of the policies and objectives of the plan.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	I fully support the Plan for Quarndon as written	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	We are responding to the circulation of the 'Pre-submission' Quarndon Development Plan and would like to record that we are supportive of the objectives and policies in the Plan. We are aware of all the careful thought, discussion and consultations which have gone into this document and wish to thank you and all the committee who have worked so hard to make the Plan what it is	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	We are very grateful for the work you have all undertaken on our and other villagers behalf and it would be good if could you pass on our acknowledgement of the considerable work involved. I wonder if the current Parish boundaries should be redrawn to offer Derby City the new development of 400 houses which will have a closer affinity with the City and its services than Quarndon? Thank you for all the effort you and your colleagues make on behalf of Quarndon residents.	Thank you for your support. The Neighbourhood Plan is not able to propose a change to AVBC/ Derby City Council boundaries. The Neighbourhood Plan area was determined by public consultation at the start of the process in 2016 to be the Parish of Quarndon.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	General	We agree with the policies and plans contained within the neighbourhood plan	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	I (and my wife) are generally supportive to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan as we discussed at the last drop in session	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	The plan has obviously been the result of a significant effort both in canvassing independent sources and everyone in Parish for opinions and in providing frequent updates and opportunities for everyone to find out what is going on, be involved and comment further. The dedication and professionalism that has obviously been put into collecting and sharing information with everyone in the parish and using it to develop a plan that reflects this is much appreciated. I support all the objectives and policies in the neighbourhood plan and feel that they are very important to the future of the Parish.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	General	No comments - all the best with the Project	Thank you for your support.
Derbyshire County Council	Catesby	There is an important opportunity for the Plan to seek to influence how the Kedleston Road Housing development is designed and brought forward particularly to influence the type and mix of housing incorporated within the scheme. Evidence commissioned by the NP group in the AECOM HNA clearly identifies an important need in the Parish for 2 and 3 bedroomed family homes, more affordable homes and homes for the elderly.	The change in circumstances, during the (Regulation 14) consultation period for this NDP regarding the Court of Appeal decision to grant permission for the 400 house development off Kedleston Road will be addressed in the final version of the NDP.
Resident	Catesby	The QNP should recognise that the Catesby development in the south of the Parish is likely to go ahead and include applicable policies.	The change in circumstances, during the (Regulation 14) consultation period for this NDP regarding the Court of Appeal decision to grant permission for the 400 house development off Kedleston Road will be addressed in the final version of the NDP.
Resident	Catesby	Policies should be applied to the Catesby development wherever possible.	The change in circumstances, during the (Regulation 14) consultation period for this NDP regarding the Court of Appeal decision to grant permission for the 400 house development off Kedleston Road will be addressed in the final version of the NDP.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	Catesby	<p>There has been a change in circumstances during the consultation period whereby outline planning permission for a large development of 400 houses within the parish has been granted. This means that it would now be appropriate to consider adding to the plan to take the impact of this development into account. I am pleased that all of the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan (that do not contradict the outline planning permission) will also apply to this development because it is part of the Parish. These policies are all relevant and important and I fully support them. Additional policies to ameliorate the effect of a large development on the rural agricultural nature of the northern part of Kedleston Road in Quarndon parish, its effect on the setting of Kedleston Hall and its effect on the rural setting and character of Quarndon Village itself are important. (Particularly for objectives 1, 2,3,4,5 and 10). I suggest that a local example such as Osiers Close can be learnt from. Where <u>any</u> development is involved, it is important that all hedgerows and trees surveyed to help ensure they are retained on the site. In addition for a large development (of say, more than 3 houses), and in particular for the 400 houses by Kedleston Road with outline planning permission, there should be a tall hedge, ideally the existing hedge but where none exists a new hedge, bordering Kedleston Road, and within that a cycle and pedestrian way and a service road - all between the housing development and Kedleston Road. This would also have the advantage of noise and pollution reduction for the new development. In addition, feedback from the village questionnaires and the independent Housing Needs Assessment emphasises the need for bungalows in the Parish. If all the edges of the development were bungalows it would improve the rural aspect and openness of views both into the development and out of the development for both the bungalows and the taller buildings within it and also address the identified need for bungalows. Finally, would it be possible to define a maximum height to any buildings within the new development, again to protect the setting?</p>	<p>The change in circumstances, during the (Regulation 14) consultation period for this NDP regarding the Court of Appeal decision to grant permission for the 400 house development off Kedleston Road will be addressed in the final version of the NDP.</p>
AVBC	6.2.4 to 6.2.7	<p>These paragraphs should be amended to distinguish between development either side of Somme Road, which is the area covered by policy H7 in the adopted Amber Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 and development south of Memorial Road (Poppyfields Meadow), which is outside the area covered by policy H7 and as such was and is not subject to the restrictions of that policy. The reference in paragraph 6.2.7 to development north of Memorial Road may also need to be amended depending on the legal position in relation to the appeal decision.</p>	<p>Paragraphs relating to the 2006 AVBC Local Plan policy H7 will be revised as suggested. The change in circumstances, during the (Regulation 14) consultation period for this NDP regarding the Court of Appeal decision to grant permission for the 400 house development off Kedleston Road will be addressed in the final version of the NDP.</p>

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	Objectives	I fully support all the objectives, but would like to see specific policy in the QNP relating to Objective 6.	Objective 6 will be addressed in new policies included in the NDP for larger housing developments, which give the opportunity to seek funding from the developer to support community facilities.
Resident	Objectives	9. I do not support working from home where it has an impact on neighbours. I know this is covered in the Plan (7.4.13 and 7.4.14) but if faster internet is to allow people to do so, then I would discourage it.	The NDP policies are intended to promote working from home that does not adversely impact neighbours and other residents.
Resident	Objectives	No specific mention of The Green Belt. I recall this was one of the things people highlighted in the original survey that they valued about living here. Item 12 on renewable energy. What's the view on the impact of non-domestic installations such as wind turbines and photo-voltaic cells? Also, emphasise the importance of any domestic installations being appropriate to, say, being in the Conservation Area	Objective 1 covers retaining the rural character of Quarndon as a village separate to Derby - the Green Belt is a key enabler to this and is covered in detail in the body of the NDP. Policy QRE1 covers the points made regarding renewable energy installations.
Resident	Objectives	Objective 11: Church Road is like a racetrack at weekends. Public transport needs urgent attention. Parking outside Queenies causes chaos on Church Road. Could developers on Burley Lane be asked to stop parking 3-4 big vans at the same time - this makes it impossible to see oncoming traffic an overtake.	Traffic and parking is acknowledged as a significant problem but is outside the scope of the NDP. However, Quarndon Parish Council is actively working with DCC Highways to address resident's concerns.
Resident	Objectives	10. One way to encourage and facilitate walking in the Parish would be for the County Council to provide more pavements, particularly on Burley Lane and a safe way to cross Church Road near The Joiners Arms	Provision for walking is already covered in policies QIN1 and QIN2. QPC are continuing to consult with DCC Highways on parking & road crossing at the Joiners.
Resident	Objectives	I recognise that a great deal of work has gone into preparing this plan and strongly support all 12 objectives. In connection with Objective 2, I feel there is a need to discourage excessively large properties becoming the norm for Quarndon. Already many recent developments and extensions of existing properties have led to more properties of 5 bedrooms and above being built. This could lead to Quarndon becoming a privileged enclave in which there is no space for people on more modest incomes. I also approve strongly of Objective 7 to "protect, develop and enhance community facilities..."	Thank you for your support.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	Objectives	2 starts with Encourage and I would soften to Approve only as it is more conservative	Wording has to be in line with NPPF standards which cannot be wholly prescriptive.
Resident	Objectives	I support all the objectives and policies in the plan. Well done for writing them	Thank you for your support.
AVBC	QSS1	This policy as worded is inconsistent with paragraph 145 e) of the new NPPF, which allows for limited infill development in villages wholly within or 'washed over' by the Green Belt and with the relevant policies in the adopted Amber Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 (policies EN2 and H4) and the submitted Local Plan (policies SS9 and H2). You may wish to consider whether there is any evidence to support a more specific interpretation of 'limited infill development' in this policy for Quarndon as opposed to other villages 'washed over' by the Green Belt. The policy should also distinguish between Somme Road and Poppyfield Meadows for the reasons set out in the comments in respect of paragraphs 6.2.4 to 6.2.7 above. Appropriate amendments should also be made to the wording in paragraphs 8.2.2.1 to 8.2.2.9	<p>Conflicting responses on whether or not the policy relating to limited infill in Green Belt proposed in the Pre-Submission draft of the NDP complies with the NPPF have been received. Further advice will be taken and if necessary the policy wording of the NDP revised.</p> <p>The NDP will be revised to distinguish between Poppyfields Meadow and Somme Road. Update of 8.2.2.1 to 8.2.2.9 will be made in line with the conclusions made regarding infill in Green Belt and the Court of Appeal decision to grant permission for the development off Kedleston Road.</p>
Derbyshire County Council	QSS1	It is fully supported that Green Belt is given high prominence in the QNDP in framing the overall future approach to growth in the Parish, particularly housing development. The policy approach to Green Belt set out in paras 8.2.1.3 and Policies QSS1 & QSS3 is fully supported, which seeks to ensure that any new housing development will be limited to infill of the village inset from the Green Belt, through new build, the re-use or re-development of redundant buildings or conversion of re-use of agricultural or residential buildings. This approach is fully compliant with the newly revised NPPF, adopted AVBC Local Plan, and AVBC Local Plan submission.	Conflicting responses on whether or not the policy relating to limited infill in Green Belt proposed in the Pre-Submission draft of the NDP complies with the NPPF have been received. Further advice will be taken and if necessary the policy wording of the NDP revised.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Kedleston Estate	QSS1	<p>KE considers that this policy is not compatible with the new (July 2018) NPPF, which states at para 145 that limited infilling in villages is appropriate development with the Green Belt. Furthermore no evidence has been provided to justify why the land which is designated as Green Belt is superior to land not included within the Green Belt in terms of character or biodiversity. The interpretation text to QSS1 states that limited infilling should be restricted to 1 or 2 dwellings on the built frontage, KE consider that this is unduly restrictive and is not compatible with the new NPPF (para 117) which states that planning policies should promote an effective use of land. We consider that reference to a specific number of dwellings should be removed and that the policy instead includes criteria that allows the decision maker to use discretion to assess a proposal's acceptability. We consider that QSS1 does not provide sufficient flexibility to deliver even the Plans reduced housing requirement of 15 to 30 dwellings. We consider that QPC should engage with KE and AVBC to seek limited Green belt release in Quarndon.</p>	<p>Conflicting responses on whether or not the policy relating to limited infill in Green Belt proposed in the Pre-Submission draft of the NDP complies with the NPPF have been received. Further advice will be taken and if necessary the policy wording of the NDP revised.</p> <p>The vast majority of input through the continuous consultation carried out over the two years that the NDP has been in preparation was strongly supportive of protecting all Green Belt areas in the Parish.</p>
Resident	QSS1	<p>Very strongly support except, rather than not permitting infill development in Green Belt areas of the village the Plan should define what limited infill development would be supported in these areas.</p> <p>Presumably if the Catesby development goes ahead it massively over fulfils the entire housing need?</p>	<p>Conflicting responses on whether or not the policy relating to limited infill in Green Belt proposed in the Pre-Submission draft of the NDP complies with the NPPF have been received. Further advice will be taken and if necessary the policy wording of the NDP revised.</p> <p>It should be noted that the NPPF cannot be wholly prescriptive or there would be no need for Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>The Catesby development would deliver the entire housing need for the Parish of Quarndon many times over.</p>
Resident	QSS1	<p>Housing - 1. 'New build to be in-keeping with surrounding property - with certain exceptions, the new build on Church Road/Burley Lane/Woodlands Lane is ugly and not at all in-keeping with existing buildings and 2. The size of the build is disproportionate to the overall plot size. Who agrees the planning approval if there is this in-keeping rule? To be realistic, smaller 2/3 bed houses are not going to be built by developers when small plots are selling for £300k to £400k.</p>	<p>All planning applications are required to meet the policies in the AVBC Local and will also be required to meet the policies in this NDP when it is approved.</p>

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	QSS1	Limited infill should be defined in such a way as to maintain important gaps between clusters of housing which allow views of fields, trees and countryside and provide corridors for wildlife.	Conflicting responses on whether or not the policy relating to limited infill in Green Belt proposed in the Pre-Submission draft of the NDP complies with the NPPF have been received. Further advice will be taken on this issue and if necessary the policy wording of the NDP revised.
Resident	QSS1	Pleased to note infill only and 1/2 buildings on built frontage in Inset from Green Belt.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QSS1	Fully supported	Thank you for your support.
AVBC	QSS2	For clarity, the wording of this policy could be amended by either combining the first and third bullet points, or by revising the wording in either or both bullet points to draw a greater distinction between the two	Agreed.
Derbyshire County Council	QSS2	The inclusion of policy QSS2 is supported, which sets out the Plan's aim to ensure that any new development does not cause significant harm to the setting of Kedleston Hall Park and Conservation Area. However, the supporting text to QSS2 should make reference to the key test of "Harm" that should be applied to planning applications affecting designated heritage assets and their settings as set out in paras 193 to 196 of the revised NPPF.	Wording in the NDP will be amended as required to align with the NPPF.
Kedleston Estate	QSS2	We consider that this policy should be removed from the Plan without a robust evidence base for the setting that can be relied upon (KE discount the 2017 Kedleston setting study commissioned by the National Trust). KE consider that the EN33 policy map's inclusion within the Plan to be wholly inappropriate. The NPPF states that the setting of a heritage asset is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. It is therefore not appropriate to define the setting of a heritage asset on a map. We do not consider it appropriate to state that development within the setting of the named heritage assets should be of "very limited scale". This is not compatible with national policy or the recent Appeal Court decision. More suitable wording for example may include, "is of an appropriate scale". We consider that the second criterion of QSS2 is vague and confusing and does not accord with the PPG which states that a policy in a Neighbourhood Plan should be clear and unambiguous, for example what would constitute an "appropriate use". The final criterion of QSS2 is also considered to be incompatible with NPPF para 195 - development cannot cause "significant harm to the setting of Kedleston Hall Park or CA. It can cause significant harm to the Hall etc., but only in so far as it diminishes the portion of those asset's heritage significance which is derived from their setting.	The text will be amended to reinforce the point that the EN33 map is a previous definition of setting during the process of evolution of what is considered to be the setting. The NDP text will be clarified to make it clear that the setting evolves over time and where necessary to ensure full compatibility with the NPPF and PPG.
National Trust	QSS2	National Trust supports policy QSS2 which aims to conserve the setting of Kedleston Hall, Park and Conservation Area.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QSS2	Agree development in Kedleston Hall area for community uses.	Thank you for your support.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	QSS2	It is important that the setting of Kedleston Hall and Gardens is protected. Any development which is considered on Kedleston Road must be screened off from Kedleston Road and from the sight of Kedleston Hall by trees and hedges at least	The Kedleston Road development will be addressed by a new policy section for large housing developments.
Resident	QSS2	Supported	Thank you for your support.
AVBC	QSS3	This policy as worded is more restrictive than the new NPPF and you may wish to consider whether there is any evidence to support such an approach for Quarndon.	This will be checked against the latest NPPF and revised if necessary.
National Trust	QSS3	We generally support this policy but suggest adding two more bullet points: (1) The building itself does not detract from the landscape and is of architectural or historic merit that warrants its retention. (This will help avoid the inappropriate re-use of poor quality buildings that detract from the landscape). (2) Suitable access and services can be provided without causing significant harm to the environment or landscape. (This will help to avoid the re-use of buildings that are isolated and cannot be readily provided with access or services).	Agree - but this will be checked against the latest NPPF and revised if necessary.
Resident	QSS3	Support this policy but make sure it is compliant with the latest NPPF.	This will be checked against the latest NPPF and revised if necessary.
Resident	QSS3	I strongly support the spirit of this policy so that any development in Open Countryside/Green Belt in Quarndon Parish is limited as described in QSS3	Thank you for your support.
AVBC	QSS4	Policy QSS4 and paragraphs 8.2.5.1 to 8.2.5.2. It should be noted that the Borough Council has commissioned a Green Belt Review, which will relate to the whole of the Green Belt within Amber Valley. Pending the outcome of this Review, the Borough Council cannot confirm whether the existing Green Belt boundary within the parish Quarndon will be retained, or whether amendments will be proposed	Acknowledged.
Derbyshire County Council	QSS4	Policy QSS4 is also supported, which seeks to ensure that the village of Quarndon will remain separated from the city of derby and Duffield, as this is compliant with the recommendations and conclusions of the Derby PUA Green Belt Study.	Thank you for your support.
Kedleston Estate	QSS4	We note that there is currently a Green Belt review and we consider it likely that the Green Belt boundaries will be amended as a result.	Acknowledged.
Resident	QSS4	Very strongly support this policy.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QSS4	Quarndon must stay separated from Derby City via a Green Belt to retain the rural character (obviously an issue for the Kedleston Road development)	Thank you for your support.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	QSS4	We would like to see an extension to the green belt of "protected" land to maintain a physical gap between Derby City and Quarndon along the Southern boundary of the "village" as opposed to the "Parish" Notwithstanding the potential development along Kedleston Road we believe that a "green gap" between Derby and the Village is fundamental to maintain the character of Quarndon. I expect that this was never done before because Amber Valley possibly assumed that being part of Kedleston Park land it would automatically be protected by English Heritage and the National trust. If the development of the 400 houses proceed it is critical that however small the end of Church Road and part of Kedleston road remains free from development.	QPC are currently engaged with AVBC as a stakeholder in the current Green Belt review that has been launched as part of the AVBC Local Plan examination process.
Resident	QSS4	I strongly support his policy	Thank you for your support.
AVBC	QH1	You may wish to consider either extending this policy to cover that part of the village of Quarndon that is 'washed over' by the Green Belt, or introducing a separate policy for that part of the village, having regard to the comments in respect of policy QSS1 above	A separate policy will be considered, depending on the conclusions reached regarding whether policy QSS1 needs to be changed.
Derbyshire County Council	QH1	The overall approach to new housing development within the larger part of the Parish within the Green Belt is considered to remain wholly appropriate. Infill development within the settlement of Quarndon, which is inset from the Green Belt will be limited and compliant with national and local planning policies for the Green Belt. In the AVBC Local Plan submission, Quarndon is defined in the hierarchy as "Other Villages and Settlements" that have a limited range of services and facilities. AVBC Policy H2 indicates that in such settlements new housing development should be restricted to the built framework of such settlements and in the form of limited infilling of small gaps. Policies QSS1 and QH1 are both compliant with the Local Plan policy approach.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QH1	Support this policy.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QH1	This is far too prescriptive and is limiting and dogmatic. A more appropriate approach is for each case to be decided on its merits with plans demonstrating consideration of feedback by residents.	Policies need to be reasonably prescriptive to deliver the objectives decided through the extensive community consultation and to allow planning decisions to be made. However, the wording will be reviewed to ensure that it delivers the intent of the Plan's objectives.
Resident	QH1	If flooding is a major issue for houses built on floodplains why build there in the first place?	Agreed. National and AVBC Local Plan policies already seek to avoid building on sites with unacceptable flood risk.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
AVBC	QH2	Policy QH2 and paragraphs 8.3.2.3 to 8.3.2.4. The policy and paragraphs should distinguish between Somme Road and Poppyfield Meadows for the reasons set out in the comments in respect of paragraphs 6.2.4 to 6.2.7 above	Agreed, NDP wording will be revised as required.
Resident	QH2	Support but should this policy only apply to Somme Road?	Agreed, NDP wording will be revised as required.
Resident	QH3	Strongly support this policy in most respects, but a few elements seem over-prescriptive - can these be reworded to communicate the intent of the policy rather than prescriptive detail?	Wording will be reviewed.
Resident	QH3	We support the general objectives, but again the policy is too prescriptive, for example in stipulating what gates are permitted.	Wording will be reviewed.
Resident	QH3	Planning permission should be refused for large houses on small sites where, for example, a demolished cottage is replaced by a house so large that a high proportion of the former garden is built on	The policies in the NDP seek to address this.
Resident	QH3	8.3.4.1 "Largely harmonious whole". This is basically wrong - compared to 30 years ago, Quarndon today is a mish-mash where it would seem that any structure has been approved. Recognise that we have lost the character of the village and should strongly want to arrest further erosion. In Appendix 2: How did you manage to produce photographs that are so unrealistic of the streets of Quarndon today, i.e. no traffic, no new builds. Maybe they are for a purpose that I haven't appreciated.	The policies in the NDP seek to ensure that future development is appropriate. The photographs in Appendix 2 seek to illustrate the general character of each part of the Parish.
Resident	QH3	Even 2m around buildings doesn't seem a very great distance, compared with some existing properties (although I guess that's what is allowing infill!). But it is better than the 1m that is proposed in the planning permission at the bottom of my garden (nothing I can do about that now). So the 2m is very welcome for the future. Also pleased that: existing hedgerows and stone walls must be retained; and vehicular access to be open; some of these larger gated properties are beginning to look like Colditz. Also we would welcome innovative design and superior environmental performance.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QH3	Strongly supported	Thank you for your support.
AVBC	QH4	You may wish to consider whether it would more appropriate to apply this policy to the village of Quarndon, rather than any development of strategic sites that may take place on the edge of Derby within the parish, the provision of which would be to either meet housing need within Amber Valley as a whole, or unmet need arising within Derby City	Agreed - This policy will be clarified to make it applicable within the village of Quarndon only.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Derbyshire County Council	QH4	Policy QH4 seeks to encourage the development of smaller 2 and 3 bed houses which are likely to be more affordable compared to larger 4/5 bedroom houses. However, this does not appear to be a robust approach for the development of affordable housing because a 2/3 bedroom house in Quarndon could cost in excess of £200k compared to a similar house costing considerably less in another part of Amber Valley. Setting a maximum unit size will not therefore guarantee that those units will be affordable. DCC suggests therefore that there needs to be a specific policy in the Plan for affordable houses if it is to be effective in tackling the acute affordability problem in the Parish.	With the recent Court of Appeal decision to grant approval for the proposed 400 house development off Kedleston Road within the Parish of Quarndon, this gives the opportunity for 30% of these new homes to be delivered as affordable housing in line with AVBC's policies.
Resident	QH4	Does this policy make sense if the Catesby proposal (the outline permission for which includes 2, 3, 4 & 5 bed homes and affordable housing) is going ahead?	This policy will be clarified to make it applicable within the village of Quarndon only. The policy cannot apply to the proposed Catesby 400 house proposal as this already has outline planning permission.
Resident	QH4	8.3.6.2 could be strengthened by adding something along the lines of: a well-planned retirement housing scheme in a suitable location is desirable. The Ashton on Trent Richmond village is an example of such a scheme. (Note there are significant downsides to such schemes such as costs and leasehold arrangements - so wouldn't suit everyone! There is obviously no suitable location in the village, but could be included if the Kedleston Road 400 goes ahead).	It will considered whether policy supporting a retirement housing scheme can be added to the NDP to apply for part of the 400 house site off Kedleston Road.
Resident	QH4	We strongly object to this. It is too prescriptive. Each case should be decided on its individual merits.	Acknowledged, the text of this policy will be reviewed in light of all the comments received.
Resident	QH4	I was pleased to note the clause in the plan suggesting new developments should be limited to 3 bedroom properties.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QH4	Downsizing and provision for the elderly is welcome.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QH4	We are supportive of affordable housing as we see that as fundamental to maintaining a cross section of ages to help maintain village life – school , village groups etc.	Thank you for your support.
Derbyshire County Council	QH5	DCC encourages the Planning Group to include a reference to Building for Life (BfL-12) in section 8.3.4 Design and Built Character. The Plan could also be strengthened by making reference to encouraging dementia friendly communities.	BfL-12 will be reviewed and reference included in the NDF as appropriate.
Resident	QH5	Support but could provision of a Care Home be included on the Catesby site?	Agreed - policy wording will be clarified to support this.
Resident	QH5	QH5 & QH6: Agree that parking, speeding and public transport issues need to be addressed.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QH5	8.3.6 Provision for the elderly: - correct and hope that this point is maintained in the Final Plan.	Thank you for your support.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
AVBC	QH6	Paragraphs 8.3.7.1 to 8.3.7.4. It may be helpful to refer to the maximum parking standards of Derbyshire County Council within one of these paragraphs.	It needs to be determined whether it is appropriate to quote parking standards in the NDP and if so what these are.
Derbyshire County Council	QH6	This policy is welcomed. However, DCC suggests similar wording should be added to QCLE2 e.g. "New community facility proposals should include provision of ultra-low emission vehicle and e-bike charging points, available for both the public and staff."	Agree - NDP text will be amended as appropriate.
Resident	QH6	8.3.7.2 "On-street" parking. Would like to have seen a more positive position being adopted that would address reducing it rather than implying that "don't want to allow it to get worse".	QPC is currently working with DCC Highways to alleviate current parking problems. The policies in the NDP can only address future parking issues, but several of the policies are aimed at reducing reliance on private car use.
Resident	QH6	Supported. Ideally all new developments should provide a number of off road parking spaces equal to least the number of bedrooms to the property to reduce the hazards of roadside parking. Is it possible to say this specifically?	It needs to be determined whether it is appropriate to quote parking standards in the NDP and if so what these are.
Resident	QH6	Speeding - Quarndon speed vigilantes report that of over 1000 checks less than 8% were 'speeding' - whilst speeding needs to be addressed this figure doesn't show any major problem especially as the speed checks were carried out at the bottom of Church Road and Burley Lane either going into or out of either a 40mph zone or derestricted. A more dangerous situation is the parking around the school and the Joiners Arms. Both would benefit from double yellow lines and/or parking restrictions at certain times. Footpaths - the Council can't fill a pothole so where is the money coming from to extend footpaths along Burley Lane/Common; and where is the space to put them?	QPC are in consultation with Derbyshire County Council Highways department on all traffic issues in the Parish.
Resident	QH6	It is essential that we stop traffic through the village as a short cut to other areas of Derby, we have to make sure that drivers drive carefully through the village as school children and pedestrians must be protected. Any construction traffic to the Kedleston Road development site must be prohibited. We must find ways to create parking near the village school to allow the bus service a "free" run.	QPC are in consultation with Derbyshire County Council Highways department on all traffic issues in the Parish.
Resident	QH6	Strongly support this policy - essential that measures are taken to encourage people out of their cars and to ensure parking problems are not made even worse.	Thank you for your support.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Quarndon PCC	QCLE1	Despite there having been no burials in it for many years, the Old Churchyard is legally still an open church yard/burial ground. Even if it were officially closed for burials it would still be consecrated land subject to the legal effects that flow from that, including being subject to the ecclesiastical faculty jurisdiction. The Old Churchyard is also within the Conservation Area and contains the ruined remains of the old church tower, which is a listed building. The PCC can accordingly see little benefit in the proposed designation as local green space and is concerned that such designation might be taken to imply a level of public access and recreational use which is not appropriate to a consecrated churchyard.	Designation of the Old Church Yard as a Local Green Space will be removed from the final version of the NDP and the PCC clearly believe it has sufficient protection without this designation.
Natural England	QCLE1	We support Policy QCLE1 Green Space though we would like to see more detail on how the neighbourhood plan will encourage protection and enhancement of biodiversity. Green Infrastructure: We recognise that the neighbourhood plan area is within a Green Infrastructure (GI) zone. We would therefore suggest that, either within the above policies or as a separate policy, the issue of GI is covered and the opportunity to make GI links within new developments at the earliest stages of the planning process is emphasised more strongly.	It is currently QPC policy not to seek to designate LGS without the advance agreement of the land owners. It will be considered whether any additions or amendments to the NDP are appropriate to further recognise Green Infrastructure.
Resident	QCLE1	I support the designation of Local Green Spaces to meet the plan objectives and am very pleased to see the two areas that are listed. It would have been good for the Parish to be able to designate more local green spaces. In particular, the small piece of land to the north of the Kedleston Road meets the criteria in the revised 2018 NPPF para 99 and 100 for Local Green Space designation – it is important to the whole Parish and immediately adjacent to both the residents of the village and any future Kedleston Road development in the Parish. It is significant to the rural agricultural feel of the landscape which is also beautiful, tranquil and rich in wildlife. The footpaths bordering this local green space are widely used and appreciated by locals and visitors for their local rural and agricultural setting to enable walking, cycling, horse riding and just relaxing in the setting (particularly by the stream). However, I do understand that landowners are reluctant to give permission for their land to be designated as a Local Green Space where it may possibly reduce future hope value of the land to them.	It is currently QPC policy not to seek to designate LGS without the advance agreement of the land owners.
Resident	QCLE1	It would be good to see more areas designated as LGS in Quarndon, but I recognise that landowners are unlikely to agree to anything that might reduce the value of their land by restricting the hope of future building.	It is currently QPC policy not to seek to designate LGS without the advance agreement of the land owners.
Resident	QCLE1	The initial proposal to designate part of our land as LGS was inappropriate.	It is currently QPC policy not to seek to designate LGS without the advance agreement of the land owners.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	QCLE1	Dialogue with landowners should be conducted to investigate the creation of further LGSs. I am willing to nominate the footpath on my land as an LGS to protect it for future generations.	It is currently QPC policy not to seek to designate LGS without the advance agreement of the land owners. Your offer is very welcome and will be referred to QPC to be progressed.
Resident	QCLE2	Support this policy - if the Catesby development goes ahead can any funds from that be channelled into Quarndon's facilities?	This will be reviewed.
Resident	QCLE3	Support this policy, particularly a shop within Quarndon village.	Thank you for your support.
AVBC	QCLE4	Policy QCLE4 and paragraph 8.4.5.1. It may be helpful to include more details regarding the national standards for sustainable construction in either the policy or the paragraphs.	This will be investigated and additional wording included as appropriate.
Derbyshire County Council	QCLE4	DCC suggests that in the final line of the policy "sustainable drainage management systems" should be replaced by the more recognisable term "sustainable drainage systems (SUDS)".	Agreed.
Resident	QCLE4	8.4.1.2 Don't want to be too negative, for while this is commendable, it's also fraught with being the cause of many frustrations and anger amongst the immediate neighbours of these local employers.	It is important for the NDP to support local employment and sustainability through increased working from home (reducing motor traffic). The policy specifically seeks to avoid detrimental impact on neighbours etc.
Resident	QCLE4	Support this policy to the extent that it enables people to work from home or in small businesses that would not adversely impact the rural nature of the Parish.	Thank you for your support.
Derbyshire County Council	QRE1	DCC feels that limiting panels to 4kW is unnecessary particularly as "conservation area friendly" panels are now available. DCC suggests that it would be more appropriate to say that ground-mounted solar arrays and visually intrusive roof-mounted systems will be resisted.	Agreed - no reason to limit to 4kW. Wording will be reviewed.
National Trust	QRE1	This policy which supports renewable energy subject to certain constraints is generally supported by the National Trust.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QRE1	Would it be possible to set an acceptable maximum height for an agricultural wind turbine rather than say "avoid unacceptable visual intrusion" (Para. 6.4.2)?	Statutory guidance on this will be sought.
Resident	QRE1	Strongly support this policy, but why should domestic be defined as typically less than 4kW. Surely it would help the environment to allow larger systems, so long as they comply with the other elements of the policy?	Agreed - no reason to limit to 4kW. Wording will be reviewed.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
AVBC	QEN1	Paragraph 8.6.1.3. This paragraph will need to be amended to refer to the Screening Determination in relation to the need for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).	Agreed – paragraph will be amended as advised.
Derbyshire County Council	QEN1	DCC has no specific comments on the landscape elements of the Plan. Never-the-less the reference to the preservation of existing mature trees, ancient woodland and hedgerows is welcomed, and reflects the new NPPF.	Thank you for your support.
Environment Agency	QEN1	We welcome the requirement of Policy QEN1 to ensure new development preserves or enhances, and does not harm or degrade amongst other things biodiversity as part of the policy. If your neighbourhood plan believed it would be beneficial to have a separate biodiversity policy we would suggest the following wording: <i>“Development proposals that conserve or enhance biodiversity, and incorporate biodiversity in and around them should be permitted. Development proposals should promote preservation, restoration and recreation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations where applicable. Development proposals that cannot avoid (through locating an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigate, or, as a last resort, compensate for the loss of a locally or nationally identified site of biodiversity value should be refused.”</i>	Wording will be considered for inclusion.
National Trust	QEN1	National Trust supports policy QEN1 which aims to conserve natural features.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QEN1	We object to the illustration of a wildlife corridor crossing our land, between Allestree Park Woods and Burley Wood, since in practical terms it is not a wildlife corridor, as there is no link to green space on the north side of the road, in contrast to the illustrated wildlife corridor further east.	The illustration of this minor wildlife corridor will be removed from the NDP.
Resident	QEN1	Strongly support.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QEN1	We strongly object to this. It is not appropriate in all cases to prescriptively protect and retain existing features as part of a development. Rather a proposed development should be encouraged to include new planting if required with reference to how wildlife could be supported.	This policy is consistent with national policy (NPPF) and that in AVBC's Local Plan.
Resident	QEN1	Any development in the green belt or countryside surrounding the village should preserve the hedgerows, trees, etc.	Agreed - policies in the NDP already seek to achieve this.
Kedleston Estate	QEN2	The policy is poorly worded and refers to historic heritage, the word historic should be removed. The policy uses the phrase "shall be conserved and enhanced" this exceeds the requirements of legislation, where the 1990 act only requires that a Conservation Area's character or appearance is "preserved or enhanced".	Agreed - wording will be amended as suggested.
National Trust	QEN2	National Trust supports policy QEN2 which aims to conserve heritage assets.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QEN2	Support.	Thank you for your support.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
AVBC	QEN3	Policy QEN3 and paragraphs 8.6.4.1 to 8.6.4.3. You may wish to consider whether there is any evidence in relation to landscape character that would support the protection of views into, out of and within the parish.	A substantial revision of the policy and paragraphs covering "valued views" will be undertaken.
National Trust	QEN3	National Trust supports policy QEN3 which aims to protect certain important views identified by the Parish.	Acknowledged.
Resident	QEN3	Generally support, but how is the value of these views justified. I'd like to see more explanation in the rationale.	A substantial revision of the policy and paragraphs covering "valued views" will be undertaken.
Resident	QEN3	Protection for views should retain the overall pattern of small fields and wooded valleys that go back to pre-1720. Developments should be designed to melt into the surroundings by careful grouping of houses and choice of materials that do not make them stand out for miles.	A substantial revision of the policy and paragraphs covering "valued views" will be undertaken.
AVBC	QEN4	Policy QEN4. It is not clear where the definition of dark at night being more than 50m from an existing street light comes from.	Source of wording to be checked and wording will be revised if necessary.
Derbyshire County Council	QEN4	The policy approach is welcomed.	Thank you for your support.
National Trust	QEN4	National Trust supports policy QEN4 which aims to ensure that light pollution is limited and dark skies are protected.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QEN4	Generally support, but this policy needs to be balanced against the needs for roads/pavements to be lit.	Agreed – wording will be reviewed and revised if necessary.
Derbyshire County Council	QIN1	QIN1, 2 & 3: The Plan makes specific reference to walking and cycling and the consultation showed strong support for improving walking and cycling in the Parish.	Acknowledged.
Resident	QIN1	8.7.5 Installation of G5 mobile phone mast should be encouraged. Technology still immature but will soon spread. The high frequency will require masts at close proximity to provide cover. G5 will reduce the need for fibre broadband.	Too early in the development of the technology to support this in the NDP - the solution to providing better internet speed in the future may be something different.
Resident	QIN1	I am pleased with the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which addresses many of my concerns - particularly the lack of suitable footpaths on Burley Lane and between the Kedleston Hotel and Kedleston Hall (policies QIN1, QIN2 & QIN3).	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QIN1	Create new Footpaths in the village for walkers not to need walking along a busy road (in particular the lower part of Burley Lane)	Already supported by the NDP.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	QIN1	Strongly support this policy - safer footways are needed, but not as conventional pavements that would urbanise the Parish.	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QIN1	Support suggestion of roadside pathways where appropriate - would also help to reduce traffic speeds in these areas.	Thank you for your support.
Kedleston Estate	QIN2	We object to proposed footpaths 1 and 2. We raise no objection to proposed footpath 4.	Acknowledged.
National Trust	QIN2	While National Trust has no objection to Policy QIN3 in principle, we request clarification to ensure that there is no confusion between the proposed path across Estate land (QIN2 and Appendix 6 Footpath 1) and a proposed roadside multi-user path (QIN3 and Appendix 6 Path 4). First bullet of QIN2 needs reference to "to the Kedleston Hotel" removed as this is covered by Policy QIN3.	Agreed - there is a typo in Policy QIN2, which will be corrected.
Resident	QIN2	I am pleased with the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which addresses many of my concerns - particularly the lack of suitable footpaths on Burley Lane and between the Kedleston Hotel and Kedleston Hall (policies QIN1, QIN2 & QIN3).	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QIN2	Strongly support these proposed footpaths, but will the landowners agree?	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QIN2	Support the three suggestions for permissive footpaths. Excellent, especially Burley Lane to Bunkers Hill.	Thank you for your support.
National Trust	QIN3	National Trust is concerned to ensure that any pathway to be provided on this key approach route to Kedleston maintains the rural character of the lane. We therefore request that similar policy wording is included to that found in QIN1, i.e. "Material and construction used for the route shall be appropriate to the setting of Kedleston Hall, Park and Conservation Area. To maintain the rural character of the road, conventional kerbed pavements will not be acceptable on these routes and the attractiveness of the existing grass verges and hedgerows is to be maintained."	Agreed - policy wording will be changed as suggested.
Resident	QIN3	I am pleased with the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which addresses many of my concerns - particularly the lack of suitable footpaths on Burley Lane and between the Kedleston Hotel and Kedleston Hall (policies QIN1, QIN2 & QIN3).	Thank you for your support.
Resident	QIN3	Strongly support this proposed path/cycleway to Kedleston, which would enable many visitors to leave their cars at home and safely reach Kedleston by walking or cycling.	Thank you for your support.
Virgin Media	QIN4	Within the scope of servicing any new development we would be able to install the infrastructure required to also supply super-fast broadband as well as Virgin Media television services to the existing local residents which could be of huge benefit to them. If this becomes feasible we would welcome the chance to gauge the interest of the local residents. Any developments which take place would be of interest to us in servicing and we invite any developers to submit their sites via the following web portal: www.virginmedia.com/developer	Acknowledged.

From	NP Section	Summary of Response	Reply to Response
Resident	QIN4	Support	Thank you for your support.
Resident	Non-planning	9.2 Street lighting. The sentence should be extended to say "while ensuring the main purpose of providing safety for all road and pavement users."	Agreed - wording will be changed as suggested.
Resident	Non-planning	Any traffic obstacles should not be dangerous and planned properly (parking outside The Joiners Arms)	QPC are working on all traffic issues in the Parish.
National Trust	Appendices	<p>Appendix 3, page 61, Relief Map appears to be an extract from a map included in the National Trust's Kedleston Hall Setting Study. Before any such map (or photograph is included in the Plan, appropriate permissions will need to be sought, sources acknowledged and copyright statements obtained where appropriate. Please contact the National Trust if this document contains information from National Trust sources.</p> <p>Appendix 3, page 63, Wildlife, bullet point two - should state: "the nationally important Kedleston Hall and Park (SSSI and Grade 1 registered historic park and gardens."</p>	<p>Agreed - it will be ensured that all necessary permissions are obtained for all photos/figures, etc.</p> <p>Wording of referenced bullet point will be updated.</p>

End.