Consultation Responses
Ashover Neighbourhood Plan
Submission Draft July 2017

Respondent 1:
Joseph Drewry from Environment Agency

Response:
The Environment Agency previously replied to the Ashover Draft Neighbourhood Plan on the 8th March 2016. At this time, specific housing allocations made up part of the Neighbourhood Plan and we had comments on the proposed housing allocation at Fallgate. As the housing allocations are no longer part of the Neighbourhood Plan, then these comments are now no longer applicable.

The Environment Agency also commented on the proposed Biodiversity policy, which is now AP 19. We are happy to see that the majority of suggestions for the rewording of the condition have now been incorporated within the policy.

Therefore, the Environment Agency has no further comments to make on this Ashover Parish Neighbourhood Plan Pre Submission.

Respondent 2:
Clive Fletcher from Historic England

Response:
Your Neighbourhood Plan falls within Ashover Village conservation area and includes a number of designated heritage assets including 1 GI listed building, 83 GII listed buildings and 1 scheduled ancient monument. It will be important that the strategy you put together for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the importance of those historic assets. This will assist in ensuring they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure it is in line with national planning policy.

The conservation officer at [NEDDC] is the best placed person to assist you in the development of your Neighbourhood Plan They can help you to consider how the strategy might address the area’s heritage assets. At this point we don’t consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area.

If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staff at Derbyshire County Council who look after the Historic Environment Record and give advice on archaeological matters. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society, local history groups, building preservation trusts, etc. in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.
Your local authority might also be able to provide you with general support in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan. National Planning Practice Guidance is clear that where it is relevant, Neighbourhood Plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide planning decisions and to put broader strategic heritage policies from the local authority’s local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. If appropriate this should include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions.

Further information and guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans has been produced by Historic England. This signposts a number of other documents which your community might find useful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at: http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-yourneighbourhood/

Respondent 3:
Adrian Chadha from Highways England

Response:
Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Ashover Neighbourhood Development Plan that covers the period 2016-2033. It is noted that the document provides a vision for the future of the Parish of Ashover and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications.

Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is the role of Highways England to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan, Highways England’s principal interest is safeguarding the operation of the M1, which routes approximately 9 miles to the east, whilst the A38 routes approximately 8 miles to the south of the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Highways England understands that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly the Neighbourhood Plan for Ashover is required to be in conformity with the emerging North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDLP) and this is recognised within the document.

It is noted that planning permission has been granted for a total of 50 new dwellings to come forward across the Neighbourhood Plan area. It is expected that limited further development will come forward with the North East Derbyshire Local Plan document not proposing any specific housing requirements for the Parish and stating that development will be limited to small infill sites to meet local needs.
Highways England considers that due to the small scale of development being proposed, and the distance of the Neighbourhood Plan from the SRN, that there will be no impacts upon the operation of Highways England’s network.

Respondent 4:
Daniel Sellers

Response:
Agree with plan objectives:

1. Ensure that development takes place in the most sustainable location. Encourage the right types of development that meet local needs.
2. Conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings.
3. Protect important community facilities and shops.
4. Promote high quality design in new development.
5. Protect the countryside and special landscape.
6. Protect open spaces that are important to the community and/or wildlife. Seek ways of addressing the problems of traffic congestion.

I feel it is important that new development maintains the setting/ character/ local distinctiveness.

I agree with the requirement to support sustainable development.

I agree with all the Neighbourhood Plan Policies. I especially agree with Policies AP11 (design) and Listed Buildings (AP12).

I feel it is important that Listed Buildings are used & maintained to stop them becoming derelict.

It is also important that new development preserves & enhances the natural and built environment.

I support the Local Green Space submissions.

Respondent 5:
Amec Foster Wheeler on behalf of National Grid

Response:
National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.

About National Grid

National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure
tiers until it is finally delivered to our customers. National Grid own four of the UK’s gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.

Specific Comments

An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes 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 that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure

Whilst there are no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution’s Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact plantprotection@nationalgrid.com

Respondent 6:
Carolyn Garnham

Response:

I am a resident of Farhill just outside of Ashover.

Overall I think it is a very good and well thought out plan/

Inevitably, I am contacting you because I have a negative comment about one part of it, for which I apologise. I appreciate all your work and sensitivity.

Tranquillity is identified as an important part of the neighbourhood character, but in fact Ashover can be a very noisy place indeed at times, and after a recent discussion with the environmental office I understand that it could potentially be a lot noisier, as new owners of the motocross site allow it full usage to exceed the hitherto experienced norm.

It seems as though there are few actual curbs effective on noisy sports within the area, and multiple such developments could spring up without any regard for the actual ACCUMULATION of time periods of noise.

For example motocross has been a 6 day a year activity, but could now increase, and be accompanied by regular shooting. Additionally, reckless motoring seems to me to be at least as important as traffic congestion. Having children here makes me sensitive o bikes and cars driven with no regard for pedestrian safety or excessive noise, and this seems a regular vent in the region of the village. There have also been drones overflying residences on a number of occasions.
There are also no curbs on the number of late night commercially run parties at the Ashover showground, in marquees (sounds like a rock festival, and you can hear every word of the music!) which have run into the small hours several times.

Overall, we have to do more to (at least) protect the existing levels of tranquillity we so enjoy here, and make sure that noisy sport activities do not actually increase.

---

**Respondent 7:**

Helen Boffy

**Response:**

I am writing to advise the NEDDC my views on the draft Ashover Neighbourhood Plan which is currently out to public consultation.

I would like it to be recorded that I fully support all aspects of the draft Ashover Neighbourhood Plan. The plan reflects my views on how future development in the Parish should be managed/controlled. I agree that there should be some development but it should be managed in a sensible way.

I trust that the independent Examiner and the District Council will be made aware of this response and that the Plan is approved to make the Ashover NP part of the development plan for the district.

I also hope that the development plan is finalised and adopted as soon as possible.

---

**Respondent 8:**

David Boffy

**Response:**

I am writing to advise the NEDDC my views on the draft Ashover Neighbourhood Plan which is currently out to public consultation.

I would like it to be recorded that I fully support all aspects of the draft Ashover Neighbourhood Plan. I believe that the plan reflects my views on how future development in the Parish should be managed/controlled. I agree that there should be some development but it should be managed in a sensible way.

I trust that the independent Examiner and the District Council will be made aware of this response and that the Plan is approved to make the Ashover NP part of the development plan for the district.

I also hope that the development plan is finalised and adopted as soon as possible.
**Respondent 9:**

Christopher Pratt

**Response:**

With reference to the submitted Ashover Neighbourhood Plan I would like to make the following comment...

The Neighbourhood Plan is good for Ashover because it has given the community an opportunity to say what happens regarding new development in the parish regarding location, types of building etc. We must endeavour to protect as much as possible for future generations and at the same time do our bit towards the districts housing needs. I feel that this has been achieved and fully support it.

---

**Respondent 10:**

Muriel Pratt

**Response:**

I would like to comment on the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan is a good guide directed by the people of Ashover. We understand we have to contribute to the districts housing numbers and we believe this has been addressed by consultation with the community and identifying suitable sites which do not detract from the identity of the village.

On the question of windfall sites I believe when assessing what happens to these it should not automatically be 4 bed dwellings but consideration should be given to people's opinion that if there is a shortfall it is for smaller houses or bungalows.

I fully endorse the contents of this plan and believe it should be put into force as soon as possible.

---

**Respondent 11:**

Jane Hardwick

**Response:**

I am in support of the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan. I support the proposed SDLs and suggest strongly that these should be taken forward to the Local Plan.

I support that any future housing should be low density and that the settlement gaps between Ashover, Kelstedge, Milltown and Fallgate are very important and must be maintained.

I agree with the statement that residents of Ashover parish have a strong sense of pride and connection with the countryside and as such urban style development must not destroy this.

Development in the countryside should be very strictly controlled.
I support the statement that windfall sites should not all go to large detached houses, just because there is more profit to be made. If bungalows for the elderly and small family homes are identified as what is required then windfall sites should take this into account. Second homes should be discouraged.

Since the Plan has been written a further application for 10 bungalows has been passed and this too should be taken into account.

Any affordable houses built should only go to people with a local connection.

I support the statements that tranquillity, countryside and dark skies are very important to Ashover and must be protected strongly.

Noisy sports must be strictly controlled.

To sum up I am in support of the Plan and hope it can swiftly move through the process now with no further holdups.


Respondent 12:

Christine Brocksopp

Response:

I want to express my wholehearted support for this plan.

It has consulted the community at all stages and has given the community ample opportunity to have input. This plan reflects the wishes of the community.


Respondent 13:

David Dale – Derbyshire County Council

Response:

The comments below are Derbyshire County Council’s Member and Officer technical comments with regard to the housing, renewable energy and dark skies aspects of the Plan.

Local Member Comments: Councillor Barry Lewis, the Local County Council Member for Wingerworth and Shirland Electoral Division has been consulted.

Officer Comments

General: To aid referencing, DCC would suggest that it would be helpful to add paragraph numbers throughout the document.

Housing: DCC has now assessed the Submission Draft against the housing comments it made on the Pre-Submission Draft and welcomes the fact that apart from the comment on Page 22 of the Affordable Housing section all its other comments have been fully taken into account, as follows:
4. The Plan, Its Purpose and What We Want To Achieve: This has been updated to reflect the comment DCC made that the Neighbourhood Plan period should be extended up to 2033, to be consistent with the Plan period of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan Consultation Draft.

7. Ashover Neighbourhood Plan Policies

7.1 Spatial Strategy: The Development Strategy has been appropriately updated to address DCC’s comments on the Pre-Submission Draft and to include the Settlement Hierarchy definitions relevant to Ashover Parish set out in the LPCD, which defines Ashover and Kelstedge as being Level 3: Settlements with Limited Sustainability and Alton, Fallgate and Littlemore as Level 4: Very Small Villages and Hamlets with Very Limited Sustainability. In both the level 3 and 4 settlements, the LPCD does not set out a housing requirement for these settlements. The requirements of the LPCD have been appropriately incorporated in revisions to Section 7.1 Spatial Strategy, Section 7.2.1: Housing Growth, and Section 7.2.3: Housing Allocations which set out the LPCD hierarchy and state that the APNP does not make any specific housing allocations.

7.2 Housing Development and Meeting Housing Need

7.2.1 Housing Growth: DCC also commented on the Housing Growth Section of the Pre-Submission Draft that the methodology for setting out a housing requirement for the APNP area was rudimentary (based on the Parish’s proportion of the 2011 census figure) and was based on an outdated District housing requirement figure set out in the North East Derbyshire Local Plan Initial Draft (2015). This has been addressed in the Submission Draft as no reference is now made to a housing requirement for the Parish, consistent with the requirements of the LPCD which does not identify a housing requirement for Level 3 and Level 4 settlements.

7.2.5 Affordable Housing: On page 22, DCC would reaffirm its previous concerns about the reference being made to development proposals for new housing comprising 10 or more dwellings to provide at least 40% on site affordable housing. It should be noted that the LPCD actually states that there is a requirement for affordable housing to be provided in developments of more than 10 dwellings, which reflects the order of the Court of Appeal decision on 13 May 2016, which gave legal effect to the policy set out in the Government’s Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014, that developer contributions (including affordable housing) should not be sought from developments of 10 units or less and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1,000 square metres. This needs to be amended in the background text on page 22 to be consistent with both national and emerging Local Plan policy requirements.

7.6 Landscape, Green Spaces and the Natural Environment

7.6.6 Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies: DCC welcomes the adoption of its suggested wording amendments to the Pre-Submission Draft supporting text and the associated policy (AP19).

7.6.8 Dark Skies: DCC also welcomes the adoption in the Submission Draft of its suggested addition of a dark skies policy (AP21).

Respondent 14:

Roger Brocksopp

Response:

I wish to express my support for the above plan.
Respondent 15:
Andrew Hardwick

Response:
I write to totally support the Ashover neighbourhood plan and hope it will soon move to completion.

As it says – Ashover residents do have a strong sense of pride and connection with the countryside and settlement gaps must be maintained and any permitted development must be strictly controlled.

The SDL’s should be taken forward to the Local Plan with all haste.

---

Respondent 16:
Alastair Petrie

Response:
I write in support of the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan.

It’s preparation:

- Has been the subject of extensive consultation and taken full account of the widespread views of the community.
- It represents an excellent balance between providing the housing needed for local growth and protecting a landscape much valued by both residents and visitors.
- The report pays due attention to protecting important heritage assets and the biodiversity of the parish.
- By all account it reflects the views of the overwhelming majority of the community.
- It appears to be fully harmonised with the aims and objectives of the emerging Local Plan for the rural west of the District.
- The Neighbourhood Planning Team have given careful consideration to the setting of settlement development limits and it is to be hoped that these are reflected and consolidated in the next release of the Emerging Local Plan.

And for all these reasons I commend its adoption.

---

Respondent 17:
Elspeth Cunningham and Robert Green

Response:
We wish to register our support for the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan.
Respondent 18:
Barbara Archer
Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 19:
John Weselby
Response:
I support Ashover neighbourhood development plan as proposed and object to the current applications for planning permission.

Respondent 20:
John and Jill Watson
Response:
As a resident of Ashover I fully support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 21:
Paul Blatherwick
Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 22:
Jane Steel
Response:
I support the above plan as presented for consultation.
Respondent 23:
Michael Steel
Response:
I am writing to express my support for the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 24:
Martin Archer
Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 25:
John Marsden
Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 26:
Joanne Bissell
Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 27:
John Bradley
Response:
I am writing to express my support for the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 28:
Ian Wildbur
Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 29:
Ian Middleton
Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation and believe that the plan satisfies both the housing requirement without over developing a beautiful village and parish.

Respondent 30:
Janet Bradley
Response:
I fully support the Ashover Local Plan presented for consultation.
It is an extremely thorough, well written document.

Respondent 31:
James Sutherland
Response:
I am writing to support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 32:
Mark and Amanda Shaw
Response:

We would like to show our support for the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan presented for consultation and thank all those who have worked on the project.

Respondent 33:
Stephen Greenwood
Response:
I wish to register my support for the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as currently drafted.
Please do not accept amendments that give any prospect of success for applicants wishing to undertake development on any land surrounding the village.

Respondent 34:
Sally Skinner
Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 35:
Melanie Proctor-Smith
Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation, it has taken into account the views of the widespread community and represents a good balance between providing the housing needed for local growth and protecting a much valued landscape.

Respondent 36:
Anne Eastwood
Response:
I fully support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for Consultation.
Respondent 37:
Peter Maskrey

Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation

Respondent 38:
Roger and Jacky Waterhouse

Response:
We support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as submitted. We think it represents a balanced view of the future development of the parish.

Respondent 39:
Thelma Childs

Response:
I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation

Respondent 40:
Neil Tiley (Pegasus Group) on behalf of Marsh Green Estates LTD

Response:
See full response

Conclusions:
As identified through this response, the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan has not been prepared in accordance with the Regulations and does not meet the Basic Conditions. As a result, it cannot be recommended to proceed to referendum. A significant amount of remedial work is required to produce a Neighbourhood Plan which is capable of being made, including the designation of the appropriate area.

The number of issues with the Neighbourhood Plan is so extensive that it is very difficult to summarise. However, I draw attention to some of the key issues below:

- The designation of the neighbourhood area was not undertaken in accordance with the regulations;
• The designation neighbourhood area does not align with the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan;
• Participation in the Neighbourhood Plan will have been prejudiced by the uncertainty regarding the designated area;
• The Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in advance of the Draft Local Plan (consulted upon from February to April 2017) and so cannot have been informed by the Draft Local Plan;
• The policies of the Neighbourhood Plan have fundamentally changed since the pre-submission draft and these changes have not been subject to and consultation;
• The current consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan has not been publicised in accordance with the Regulations;
• The incorrect publicity may have prejudiced responses to this consultation;
• The necessary evidence to support the proposed policies has not been produced and in accordance with the Examiner’s Report to the Weedon Neighbourhood Plan, the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan cannot therefore proceed to referendum;
• It is unclear what purpose the Neighbourhood Plan proposed Limits to Development fulfil. If these are meant to be included in the made Neighbourhood Plan then this would require:
  ➢ An SEA in accordance with the High Court Judgement of Stonegate Homes Ltd and Littleworth Properties Ltd and Henfield Parish Council;
  ➢ That boundaries were defined using a clear methodology that was equitable to all landholdings; and
  ➢ That all reasonable alternatives were assessed.
• However, none of the above have been undertaken and so the Neighbourhood Plan would not meet the Basic Conditions if these boundaries were proposed to be made;
• If the boundaries are not proposed to be made, they should not be included in the Neighbourhood Plan;
• The Neighbourhood Plan identifies Objectives which provide for sustainable development. However, the majority of policies undermine these objectives (and sustainable development) being achieved;
• The majority of policies are unclear providing uncertainty for a decision-taker, and/or are actively contrary to national policy (and the presumption in favour of sustainable development). As a result, the Basic Conditions are not met;
• The Neighbourhood Plan as drafted will not be effective, as it does not allocate sites and there is a five-year land supply shortfall across the District. The result will be that all of the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be immediately out-of-date and afforded reduced weight. This could be addressed through the allocation of site, such that the Neighbourhood Plan would benefit from the protection afforded by the Written Ministerial statement.

Respondent 41:

Kathryn Eastwood

Response:

Please be advised that I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.
Respondent 42:
Nick Chapman

Response:
Please be advised that I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 43:
Felicity Bingham on behalf of Natural England

Response:
See full response

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.

We support the following policies: AP14: Landscape Character, AP15L Local Green Spaces, AP16: Biodiversity, AP17: Important Trees and Hedgerows and AP19: renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies.

Additionally we refer to the annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.

Respondent 44:
John Fleming on behalf of Gladman Developments

Response:
See full response

Conclusions:

Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. Whilst we support many of the policies aims and objectives in principle, we feel that the Plan would benefit from additional modifications to the Plan to ensure that it allows for flexibility going forward and ensures the Plan is capable of reacting positively to changes which may occur over the plan period.
Respondent 45:

David and Sheila Allen

Response:

We support wholeheartedly the Ashover Neighbourhood Local Plan and would like to see it implemented without any further delay.

---

Respondent 46:

Warwick and Susan Gorman

Response:

We fully support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

---

Respondent 47:

Charlotte Stainton on behalf of Philip Barlrop

Response:

We are concerned that the settlement boundary for Fallgate shown on previous versions of the Neighbourhood Plan has now been removed. Fallgate has been recognised as a sustainable settlement by the Council granting 18 dwellings in this settlement over the last few years. The lack of a settlement limit and the policies as currently drafted effectively means that no new development (other than countryside developments) will be appropriate in this hamlet and this will result in the decline of this part of the parish.

We request that the settlement limit for Fallgate be reinstated to reflect that there are a significant number of existing dwellings in this locality and that development within the settlement of Fallgate should be seen as appropriate (as demonstrated by recent permissions).

We also request that the site which is the subject of planning permission 15/01302/OL be allocated as a housing site. The Council concluded that this development is sustainable when permission was granted and therefore it is logical that this site be acknowledged as an appropriate way to allow Fallgate to grow in a small way.

If no settlement boundary is introduced, the policies should be amended to allow the development of sites that fall between existing dwellings. As the Neighbourhood Plan is currently drafted, developments such as 17/00539/OL for 2 houses at Woodview would not be allowed. This cannot be what the Neighbourhood Plan team intended because Ashover Parish Council strongly supported that development and the Chairman of Ashover Parish Council even spoke in support of the application at the NEDDC Planning Committee. This indicates that the Neighbourhood Plan as currently drafted does not reflect the intentions of local people and the Parish Council, in terms of permitting appropriate infill development.
The planning policies for Fallgate need to be amended to reflect the numerous permissions (for all 18 dwellings) that have been granted for this settlement and also to ensure that appropriate infill developments will be permitted in the future (whether within or outside settlement boundaries).

**Respondent 48:**

Melanie Lindsley from Coal Authority

**Response:**

The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing.

As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined coalfield. The eastern part of the Plan area including Northedge, Alton, Fallgate and Littlemoor lie on the surface coal resource. The defined Development High Risk Area also covers part of the eastern side of the Plan area.

According to the Coal Authority Development High Risk Area Plans, there are recorded risks from past coal mining activity in the form of approximately 43 mine entries and there have been 6 reported hazards in the Plan area. In addition there are recorded shallow coal workings, thick coal outcrops, past surface coal mining and unrecorded probable underground coal workings at shallow depth.

If the Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for future development in these areas then consideration as to the development will need to respond to these risks to surface stability in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the North-East Derbyshire Development Plan. In addition any allocations on the surface coal resource will need to consider the impacts of mineral sterilisation in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Derbyshire Minerals Plan.

As the Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate any sites for development at this time the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make.

**Respondent 49:**

Sharon Hubbard

**Response:**

I support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.
Respondent 50:
Paul Eastwood

Response:
I would like to make clear my support for all aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan for Ashover as is currently proposed.

Respondent 51:
Wendie and Jim Heading

Response:
This is to confirm that we support the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan as presented for consultation.

Respondent 52:
Richard Pigott (Planning and Design Practice Ltd) on behalf of Simon Carr

Response:
See full response

Conclusion:
The policies contained within the Neighbourhood Plan are reliant on a Draft Local Plan which remains in its early stages and is pursuing a strategy of Green Belt release which is highly questionable. Whilst there is a recognition that the parish’s housing market is unbalanced there are sustainable solutions to deal with this issue in the medium to long term.