ASHOVER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT DROP-IN EVENT

Thursday, 3 December 2015

CONSULTATION RESULTS

1. Background

a) Project Brief

Ashover Parish Council commissioned *Your*locale to assist the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group in the delivery of a drop-in event on the Neighbourhood Plan for Ashover on Thursday 3 December 2015. It was originally planned that this would take place

between 16:00 pm and 20:00 pm but due to its popularity and to maximise involvement this was extended to 21.00 pm on the day.

The aim of this event was to help inform the community on the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan and to gain some initial feedback from residents and other stakeholders on the draft policies and proposals.

b) Publicity

The drop-in event was promoted in a variety of ways:

- Leaflets and flyers were produced and circulated through the Village
- Steering Group members promoted the event
- Posters were placed across Ashover in the lead-up to the event and on the day
- Through the internet and social media such as Face Book

2. Format of Event

a) Process on the day

Sign in	Steering Group members welcomed attendees on arrival and asked them to complete a contact sheet which recorded details of where the individual lives and the age range/gender of attendees.
Introduction	Several display boards were made available to view. The format of the event was explained to people who attended.
Background	The first display introduced Neighbourhood Planning, described the process that is being followed by Ashover Parish Council and progress to date.
Consultation on key issues	A series of display boards were spread across the room, each of which focussed on a different topic related to the Neighbourhood Plan, including draft policies and proposals, including: ▪ Housing; ▪ Settlement Boundaries; ▪ Natural Environment; ▪ Design; ▪ Businesses and employment; and ▪ Transport. There was also a Power Point presentation which displayed, via a continued loop, all the draft policies. Having read the displays, attendees were asked to comment on each topic using the post it notes supplied. A number of written comments were also received after the event, which have been incorporated into the results.

b) List of attendees

The event was extremely well attended with over a hundred and forty people attending.

Name	Address
1	Anne Eastwood
2	Eon Asher and Another
3	See above
4	Mark Dennis
5	Andrew & Yvonne Curtiss
6	See above
7	Andrew & Jane Hardwick
8	See above
9	Paul Willmot
10	L Stephenson & another
11	See above
12	L Walker
13	P Brailsford
14	Lesley Atkinson
15	Darren Atkinson
16	Lynne Evans
17	P Wieteska
18	Sadie Hardwick
19	Melanie Hardwick
20	J H Brown
21	J. Dyson
22	Bryan Walker
23	Johnathan Imber
24	Helen Timmins
25	Melanie Proctor – Smith
26	Dr K A Hinckley
27	Peter Ramshaw

28	Tony Sinnott
29	Joanne Evans
30	Tighe
31	E&H Judkins
32	See above
33	Tim Evans
34	Stephen k Haslam
35	Michael Palmer
36	Chris Proctor Smith
37	Phil and Ronny Rylance
38	See above
39	P Webster
40	Don and Kath Spencer
41	See above
42	C Brecksopp
43	P.J. Malsden
44	J Nuttall
45	J Manison
46	K. Wright
47	John Wardle Bein
48	Mary Wardle Bein
49	Nick Rodick
50	Sarah Evans
51	Lucy Evans
52	Alice Evans
53	Richard Felton
54	Ben Rodgers
55	See above
56	Phillip Barltrop
57	Richard Glover
58	Dave Nightingale
59	Judi Nightingale

60	Amy Corker
61	Chris & Muriel Pratt
62	See above
63	Lucy Hunter-Bott
64	A I Wilmott
65	Rod Bowers
66	Terry Page
67	Cath Harris
68	Rebecca Vardy
69	Pauline Vardy
70	Judi Baxter
71	Anna Ford
72	David J Windle
73	?
74	Jackie Windle
75	Alex Prior-Byrne
76	Ross Martin
77	Paul Bedwell
78	Mark Shaw
79	Amanda Shaw
80	Bernard Everett
81	Janet Hutchinson
82	Alison Tyson
83	Jon Tyson
84	Lawrence Taylor
85	Ellen Hardwick
86	E Willmot
87	Mr and Mrs Kay
88	Elizabeth Pass & Another
89	See above
90	Brian & Karen Haywood
91	See above

92	Chris Scott
93	Lyndsey Power
94	Mr & Mrs Eltringham
95	See above
96	Richard Jordon
97	R Fidler
98	A Crowther
99	M Philbin
100	Steve Gilthorpe
101	Peter Ludlam
102	Peter Cassidy
103	Joanne Bissell
104	See above
105	Joan & Graham Ward
106	See above
107	Susan Ludlam
108	Mr & Mrs Howe
109	See above
110	Glenys Hayward
111	P Spindler
112	Jacky & Roger Waterhouse
113	See above
114	Ian Hayward
115	Richard Whitlock
116	Claire Harrison and another
117	See above
118	Sally Wray and another
119	See above
120	Jane Steer & another
121	See above
122	Damian Dundale
123	John Hammond

124	Nigel Smith
125	RA & TH Vine
126	See above
127	Mr & Mrs Hill
128	See above
129	Vicky & Peter Nolan
130	See above
131	D Hollingsworth
132	Martha Hayward
133	Mr & Mrs Libby
134	See above
135	Chris Miller
136	Jan & Joan Bradley
137	See above
138	James Sutherland
139	J Walker Itage
140	Douglas Laird
141	P Andrews
142	Alastair Petre

3. Results

Housing	
Total responses	35

- I really, really, really don't want any more development behind Grove House – it's developed enough.
- Small development of up to 5 as shown here. Not huge housing estates blighting the landscape area.
- All developments should require totally off- road parking- already too much on-road parking.
- St Ermyns access is ludicrous.
- Vernon Lane very narrow. Difficult to get on Matlock Road am & pm.
- Density of any new housing should be indicative of the rest of the village.
- Vernon Lane is single track and could not support any increase in traffic could not be tolerated.
- Area 12 & 8 seem to have good access for small units.

- Objection to building on this site cannot be justified simply because the locals “like the green field” whilst understandable this is not justified. New housing is needed for the village to grow & invite new blood to this area.
- Concern over developments larger than 5 which impact on narrow country roads & lanes.
- Infrastructure for this site G unsustainable – roads too narrow for 24 houses.
- Fallgate. (9) This land is contaminated – and a flood place is also object of a 106 agreement to return.
- 2 - This area was supposedly reclaimed as a green field site after quarrying ceased.
- Vernon Lane - The infrastructure for this site is unsustainable – single track roads.
- Nettle site is over development.
- Housing on the site between Moor Road / Narrowleys Lane should be allowed to happen. The village cannot be allowed to stagnate. New blood is vital for the future & should not be stopped due to selfishness by existing residents whose houses were built on green fields as well.
- This proves that despite what Mr Atkinson has said he intends to develop all the land he owns.
- 2 - returning this land to former Ag use – following illegal limestone removal.
- Large family homes would encourage people to the area and would keep the school full of local children from all over. Would also benefit local business.
- Get rid of the council flats on Malthouse Lane & build some nice homes in keeping with the village (12) 2 bed homes.
- 14 & 8 what about access to this site.
- Fallgate. Really concerned about the additional proper housing – we like living in a hamlet, not a housing estate. Look at Milltown Court. It’s more than enough.
- Absolutely essential that housing is affordable otherwise the village will die a slow death and become a “dormitory” village.
- I’m not happy about more development behind Grove House – it is already developed enough.
- St Ermyns- Building here is outside the existing development limit which should be maintained as per the new draft development limits.
- St Ermyns - This will completely change the character of the village. It is outside the natural boundary of the village and destroy an area of natural beauty.
- St Ermyns - Huge development here would alter the character of the village significantly & out too much pressure on the roads.
- St Ermyns - This sort of development will totally alter the character of the village & and have a major impact on the infrastructure of the area - totally unacceptable!
- Access to & from the road. (Velting Street) is already difficult. It is used by the inhabitants as an overflow as well as existing residents.
- Fallgate. 9 houses are way too many for this site – it should be allowed at all.
- Flood in Railway Station.
- 5 new houses off Moor Road would only add to the already problematic parking and driving conditions at school times.
- I agree with up to 5 new houses as the maximum per development area. Any new development should be low impact housing – using green technology & harvesting rain water etc.
- I like the PCs proposals for small scale development.
- Please affordable housing for couples with children keep the village alive.
- If they have cats they will come and kill our rabbits. It is meant to be peaceful.

Settlement Development Limits

Total responses	3
Comments	

- We don't agree that the settlement development should be extended along Malthouse Lane. It is a natural boundary where it is, before the telephone exchange.
- In full agreement of draft settlement development limits.
- The boundaries look very good. It gives a firm nucleus to the village & retains important historical sites e.g. rope field.

Built and Natural Environment	
Total responses	4
Comments	

- Should read special landscape area rather than Special Landscape Area.
- Please reconsider having a "local list" of architecturally interesting properties around them e.g. Marsh Green Hall.
- What is "Local Green Space"? Private Land.
- Light and noise pollution

Community Facilities	
Total responses	1
Comments	

- Small local shops would be ideal.

Businesses and Employment	
Total responses	2
Comments	

- What about conversion from Agricultural to Industrial use- would this be acceptable?
- Need to consider proposals at Stoneage to build Lodges on the back of the Hotel

Transport and Access	
Total Responses	• 5
Comments	

- Narrow Leys Lane at school drop off and collection time is ridiculous! So dangerous!
- I also agree!
- Safe traffic management would make sense especially on single track roads. Could speed limits be imposed?
- Pedestrians are more important than vehicles especially children.
- Development proposals must include road widening in some places. I agree!
- Traffic will be an issue. The roads are already very busy.

General	
Total Responses	• 3
Comments	

- Best to have a plan than no plan at all.
- Very disappointed with Parish Plan - in my view it should deal with all Parish Issues this seems to major on planning and forgets issues that concern people
- I do agree with all the (above) sentiments

Summary of findings

Many comments were made reflecting a wide range of opinions. However, people who attended the consultation event demonstrated a consistency in a number of key areas:

Housing – The vast majority of comments made were in relation to this topic. There was a number of comments made in relation to specific sites suggested by developers/landowners for housing development. A few people expressed support that the Plan should focus on supporting on small scale development e.g. less than five dwellings per site.

Environment – One respondent considered that the Plan should consider introducing 'Locally Listed Buildings'.

Community Facilities – The main comment was that the Plan should support the provision of additional shops.

Business and Employment – It was considered that the Plan ought to have a policy position in relation to the conversion of agricultural buildings for employment use, and the proposals to build Lodges on the back of the Hotel at Stoneedge

Transport and access – There were concerns raised in respect of highway and pedestrian safety especially along narrow roads and outside the Primary School. Also the negative impact that future development would have on the road infrastructure.

General – there was one comment in support of the Plan. A couple of respondents considered that the Plan was too narrowly focused on planning and Ashover village issues.