

Bradwell Neighbourhood Plan	Summary of Representations	 PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	--

The following responses were received during the public consultation on Bradwell Neighbourhood Plan that ran from 2 March 2015 to 30 April 2015 and submitted for consideration by the independent examiner.

Response from	By	Summary
Derbyshire Association of Local Councils	Email 05.03.15	Do not wish to comment.
Derbyshire County Council (Flood Risk Management)	Email 30.03.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newburgh Engineering Works are unlikely to be subject to surface water flooding for critical duration 1 in 100 year return period rainfall event in its current land use. Promote Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to be incorporated within the design of a drainage strategy for any proposed development. • Policy E1 relates to local drainage requirements of new developments. Confirm that these local requirements are largely in line with current national policy for the implementation of SuDS and are supported by the FRM team. • Due to the historic mining and mineral extraction, networks of old stone soughs may exist around Bradwell. Recommend that the possibility of the presence of soughs is acknowledged. • Policy E3 relates to the mitigation of the impacts of Climate Change on the Parish. Policy could incorporate resilience to the impacts of climate change on flood risk. Such measures could include self-resilience, appropriate design of new development & promoting awareness of flood risk amongst the community and the provision of information.
Derbyshire County Council	Email 05.03.15	The approach of the Neighbourhood Plan, particularly the policies requiring new development to provide pedestrian and cycle facilities, superfast broadband, and education contributions, is welcomed.
Eleanor Dunn	Email 02.03.15	Does not wish to comment.
English Heritage	Email 06.03.15	Forwarded to regional office.

Response from	By	Summary
Environment Agency	Letter 03.03.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft plan sets out many good policies, supportive of vision and policy, particularly that flood risk is a key consideration within policy E1. • Policy E1 only addresses surface water flooding. Bradwell has areas (including part of the Newburgh site) that are subject to high flood risk from the Bradwell Brook which is classed as a 'main river'. • Policy CC5 of PDNPA Core Strategy states developments that have a harmful impact upon flood water storage will not be considered. This information should be added to the justification text for E1 or as an appendix alongside the flood map.
Highways England	Email 29.04.12	There is no strategic road network infrastructure in the vicinity of Bradwell so Highways England has no comment.
Historic England	Email 22.04.15	Does not wish to comment.
JB (local resident/landowner)	Letter 29.04.15	Objects to the exclusion of an area of garden from the 'built area'.
Natural England	Email 20.04.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes the Plan and notes amendments that have been made to Draft. • Pleased to note that comments regarding the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the National Character Areas (NCAs) have been included in Appendix 5 of the Plan. • In response to the SEA Screening report we suggested that additional wording should be added to Policy LE2 to further safeguard the character and setting of the village within the National Park. We assume that the National Park Authority is satisfied that this objective can be achieved by the policy in its current form together with policy E2 (Local Design) and the adopted Core Strategy policies.
Peak District National Park Authority (Transport Policy)	Email 15.03.03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy T3 – level of provision of parking spaces is against policy. • Policy T4 – seeks to cover Private Non Residential (PNR) and Visitor Parking within the same Policy. • Support of new parking facilities is against PDNPA policies, unless there is demonstrable need (visitor parking).

Response from	By	Summary
PB (Peak District resident)	Letter 30.04.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newburgh site should have its own specific policy rather than being split between H2 and LE2. • Policies H2 and LE2 confusing. • Requirements for affordable housing presented in unnecessarily complicated way • H3 should refer to a development boundary • H4 does not make sense • H5 largely replicates existing PDNPA policies • T3 is far too generous
SS (Bradwell resident)	Letter 16.03.15	Concerned about levels of traffic.
ST (Peak District resident)	Letter 29.04.15	Housing development should provide suitable mix, including for older people.
CW (local resident/landowner)	Letter 28.04.15	Objects to the exclusion of an area of garden from the 'built area'.
RF	Email 26.03.15	Wishes to include plot of land for future development.