

**Repton Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultation March 2017**

25 replies

Policy		No	Comments	Response
H1	Agree	22	<p>Amend to include Milton Road &amp; footpath but exclude above footpath.</p> <p>Neither agree or disagree</p> <p>Please keep trying to exclude site at Burdett Way (Milton Road)</p> <p>I prefer smaller developments than some of the huge developments that have been passed lately.</p> <p>We would like to make our comment for concern that the present plans for further houses in Repton will result in many more cars using the roads in the village. It is already a challenge to cross to the other side of the street because of traffic and the reduced vision of cars approaching due to parked cars all along the High Street. Other main roads in Repton have similar conditions as there is no alternative should you need to cross the River Trent. Traffic has increased noticeable since the A42/M42 was built as a cut-through from Ashby and Swadlincote.</p> <p>We object to the proposed developments in the parish of Repton for the following reasons:</p> <p>The road infrastructure is not adequate for existing traffic - the most recent development on Milton Road has very poor access which demonstrates how little regard developers have for the well being of the village.</p> <p>Villages like Repton and Milton are few and far between - we should treasure our heritage and not allow it to be developed particularly when there are so many dormant brown-field sites in the U.K. that should be developed before destroying agricultural land. Developers make far more money by building in tranquil village areas than by developing brown-field sites so the whole system is corrupted by greed rather than need, and, of course, more expensive houses mean more revenue for the government coffers!</p>	No justification to change the policy

	Disagree	1	<p>Neither agree disagree, leaning towards disagree</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1.1 of the Repton Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan notes that the settlement boundaries set out by the document are consistent with those currently proposed in the South Derbyshire Local Plan Part 2, with <u>one important exception</u>. The policy commentary continues that <i>“it is very clear that there is a high level of opposition to the proposal to build 25 houses off Milton Road. The neighbourhood Plan therefore seeks to exclude the site at Milton Road.”</i></p> <p>The South Derbyshire Local Plan Part2 is concerned with non-strategic allocations and detailed management policies. The Local Plan Part 2 was submitted to the Secretary of State on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2017 and accordingly can be given substantial weight in decision making. Policy S4 of the adopted South Derbyshire Local Plan part 1 requires 600 dwellings to be allocated as non- strategic sites as part of the overall housing target, and therefore Policy H23 of the Part 2 Local Plan seeks to include 14 site allocations across the district to meet this need.</p> <p>Repton is identified in the Local Plan Part 1 as a Key service Village and in view of the wide range of facilities and services available is considered to be a sustainable location for growth. In accordance with the strategy set out by Local Plan Part 1 Policy 23G of Local Plan Part 2 proposes the allocation of land at Milton Road Repton, for up to 25 dwellings, a set out in emerging Policy SDT1.</p> <p>An outline planning application was submitted to South Derbyshire District Council in October 2016 by Pegasus Group on behalf of the landowner (application reference number: 9/2016/1118). The application was developed to fully accord with the site specific requirements of Policy 23G. South Derbyshire District Council’s Planning Committee on 7<sup>th</sup> February resolved to grant outline planning permission, subject to conditions and S101.</p> <p>Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is clear that a neighbourhood plan should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan and plan positively to support local development. This includes policies for housing development.</p> <p><i>“Neighbourhoods should....</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development;</i></li> <li>- <i>Plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan; and</i></li> </ul>	<p>The recent granting of outline planning permission (9/2016/1118 - LAND AT SK3126 0097, MILTON ROAD, REPTON, DERBY, DERBYSHIRE ) now means that the settlement boundary must reflect that. Permission has not been granted for houses to be built on the northern side of the field, above the footpath. Consequently policy H1 will be amended to reflect that situation, with a boundary that follows the footpath. This is consistent with the high sensitivity to building on the raised ground above the footpath, as described in the FPCR Landscape Character and Visual Amenity survey, CEF6 and policy OS2.</p>
--	----------	---	--	--

			<p>- <i>Identify opportunities to use Neighbourhood Development Orders to enable developments that are consistent with their neighbourhood plan to proceed.</i></p> <p>Paragraph 184 of the Framework is explicit that Neighbourhood Plans and Local Plans should be in conformity:</p> <p><i>“Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.”</i></p> <p>The draft Neighbourhood Plan is therefore not in accordance with the strategic policies of the adopted local Plan Part 1 and South Derbyshire District Local Plan Part 2, which is at an advanced stage, having now been submitted for examination. This conformity is a requirement of Paragraph 184 of the framework which confirms that Neighbourhood Plans should reflect the policies of Local Plans and should plan positively to support them.</p> <p>The adopted Part 1 and submitted Part 2 Local Plans make it clear that Repton is a sustainable location for growth, and the submitted Part 2 Plan includes an allocation for 25 dwellings at Milton road, Repton at Policy 23G. The emerging Local Plan is considered to be fully compliant with the requirements of the NPPF. It is clear that the current draft of the Neighbourhood Plan undermines the strategic policies of the adopted Part 1 Local Plan and the draft allocation of the site within the submitted Part 2 Local Plan. To ensure conformity, the Repton neighbourhood Plan should reflect Policy 23G (the allocation of 25 dwellings at Milton Road), and should plan positively to support it.</p>	
H2	Agree	19	Must be acted upon if violation occurs	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree	2	The Limits to Development for Repton and Milton should conform with the submitted South Derbyshire Local Plan Part 2, for the reasons set out under Policy H1 above. The Settlement Confines should therefore be amended to accord with the Settlement Boundary within the submitted Local Plan Part2, which includes the allocation for 25 dwellings at Milton Road, Repton within the built limits of the settlement on the Policies Map.	See comments against Policy H1. No justification to change Policy H2
H3	Agree	20	Even if it is a ‘village’ arrangement as in Swadlincote. Definitely. Repton has very little for the elderly, we do not have almshouses like other villages. I believe it is important to have a good mix of ages within a village to make a community. It is good for young children to visit the homes etc.	No justification to change the policy

			Really important as the population gets older	
	Disagree	1	Provision should be made to accept refugees	No justification to change the policy
H4	Agree	21	But who has right to make allocation But not much land to do this Not affordable/social.	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
H5	Agree	22	Reflect character of the part of the village they are situated in The houses on the front of Clayfields look awful. Just because they are social housing doesn't mean they can't look appealing. This policy is not apparent in the Clayfields development	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
H6	Agree	22	Or car ports Absolutely	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
OS1	Agree	22	Don't like use of 'very'. It is essential that open spaces are protected in both villages	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
OS2	Agree	23	Extend policy with specific reference to Landscape Assessment Report Keep away from hill tops	Report will be referred to in policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
OS3	Agree	21	But all trees need husbanding as they grow too tall and take the light out of the area. Replanting has great merit so as to have a variety of age of trees that allow the very tall to be cut and the next generation of young and fit trees to develop. If correctly planted in first instance and maintained	No justification to change the policy

	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
AS1	Agree	20	But it is unrealistic in practice Uncertain what this might imply Could part of the Dales be used? Or that site? This is essential & not avoided by any technicalities Developers can be expected to provide leisure and recreational facilities and parks since they provide very little in the way of gardens to houses they build, but health care facilities are beyond their remit	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
AS2	Agree	22	However am impressed by the Willington practice so perhaps a surgery held in Repton might suffice??	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
AS3	Agree	22	Not limited to Village Halls Yes!!! What about help with the Village Hall?	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
AS4	Agree	22	But not necessarily the only such meeting place eg URC School Room better for some purposes and important to church. This is a very important Village asset. Perhaps the Parish Council could do more to help move this project forward?	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
CLE1	Agree	20	Provided the sports & play facilities provided near to new development. But only if put in well considered places. Mitre field poor place The Mitre park is awful at the moment. A step has been removed off the big slide, so it cannot be used. A rocking horse was removed and not replaced, litter is a problem. The	No justification to change the policy

			play tarmac would be better if it was one large square rather than between play equipment.	
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
CLE2	Agree	19	Proposals for redevelopment or change of use of business premises should only be permitted if those proposals benefit the residents by the provision of social facilities and services for the residents	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
CLE3	Agree	20	Not sure you have worded this correctly	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
CL4	Agree	18	However I think we should push for better internet links and possibly a fibre link to enable people to work from home or start up a small business, as it is very difficult without a fast internet.	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree	1	Apart from businesses which serve agriculture and shops which serve the residents, the development of businesses should <u>not</u> be permitted	No justification to change the policy
T1	Agree	21	Additional housing requires additional parking which seems not to have been achieved with the new development of Clayfields Road or the Repton to Milton Road	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
T2	Agree	13	Would love Repton to have a village car park but can't see where it might be!!	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy
T3	Agree	20	Parking facilities should be made by 'The Cross' for those who wish to use public transport to travel to Burton & Derby, and would use bicycles etc. to get to the bus stops Milton has <u>no</u> public transport	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy

T4	Agree	22	Plus retain existing footpaths Provided does not usurp footpath The separation of pedestrians and cyclists and motor traffic should be considered as the traffic increases with additional housing	No justification to change the policy
	Disagree			No justification to change the policy