

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

### **COUNCIL – EXTRAORDINARY MEETING**

**02 SEPTEMBER 2020**

Summary of submissions received prior to deadline

#### **Clifton**

A total of 360 communications relating to this site were received prior to the deadline, with an additional 12 being received too late for consideration.

Points raised consistently by the correspondents included:

- The cost of the lease being above market value and including provision for cancellation at relatively short notice. There were many objections to the overall cost, estimated at £1m for rent alone over the term of the lease, to local taxpayers and also on the basis that other potential sites were already in public ownership
- Access and egress difficulties and the potential for accidents on a narrow lane regularly used by heavy vehicles and also as a cut through between A515 and A52. The lack of a pavement and street lighting on Watery Lane were cited as reasons for the unsuitability of this site. Concerns about parking and personal safety were also expressed by nearby residents for whom this was the only access to their property
- The site is outside the settlement framework and not mentioned in the Local Plan.
- Watery Lane is subject to frequent flooding and this had been a factor in the refusal of previous planning applications for housing on the site
- Another factor in those refusals was the contamination of the site. There would be a cost related to the remediation of this and the possibility that, if not satisfactorily completed it could be a health hazard to those resident there. Noise from the adjacent breakers yard was also mentioned as a potential problem for occupants of the site. Several objectors also mentioned the presence of Japanese Knotweed on the site.
- Lack of local amenities – Clifton does not have shops, medical facilities or a police presence. Residents of the site would need to travel at least a mile to use the facilities that are available, such as the school. Sewage, power and water services would need to be provided, again at a cost to the taxpayer.
- There was criticism of the accuracy and impartiality of the report:
  - There is more than one property nearby
  - Does not specify number of users of the site
  - Reasons given for the unsuitability of other sites also apply here but are not cited in the report
  - Undue weight given to the preferences of the traveller family
  - Lack of costing information, beyond the cost of the lease, in relation to relative construction costs for this and other proposed sites

- Some objectors believed that the proposal contravened government guidance for the selection of appropriate sites in several ways
- Lack of consultation and a perception that this report was being pushed through under cover of the reduced public participation arrangements instigated by the Council during the Covid-19 pandemic.
- Number of proposed pitches and potential to accommodate up to 40 people is disproportionate to the size of the village
- Concerns regarding crime and increased anxiety, particularly for elderly residents, based on experience of illegal pitches used by the family in the area.
- Proposed site is adjacent to the Clifton Goal for Royal Shrovetide and there were fears that this historic site would be damaged.
- Some correspondents were concerned about the impact of the development on local house prices and the saleability of properties in the area.
- This use of the site would remove one of the few potential employment sites available in Clifton
- The impact on wildlife was mentioned in relation to badgers, bats, foxes and rabbits
- Concerns for the safety of children on the site given the narrow road and lack of footway if they were to attend the village school.
- Local MP has publicly stated that she does not support the site.
- Site is only 200m from Derbyshire Dales border – a central site would be more practical
- Supported as a permanent site by Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison that supports whole heartedly the land identified at Clifton and comments,

“although this may seem an expensive option, in actual fact it is not, as the other sites may have great difficulty getting services on at a reasonable cost.

We should be putting social need high on the agenda and also best value for money. Access to support in Ashbourne and other family members, living not far from Ashbourne therefore make the Clifton site ideal.

Regarding best value for money, DGLG think it is a mistake to make a temporary site at considerable cost, we should be looking now at the long term decision and make it. It has been 12 years since we identified this family with high needs.

Health and social care needs are pressing, ideally this family should be on a site for winter and have access to facilities.”

### **Matlock Bath – Artists Corner**

A total of 8 communications relating to this site were received prior to the deadline

Points raised included:

- Pleased with removal from Temple car park but not happy with alternative nearby
- Long history of problems with illegal traveller sites in the village. Has an adverse effect on local businesses and, consequently, on the District Council's car park revenue.
- Parish Council concerned for residents who pay for parking spaces at Artist's Corner
- There is a need public consultation
- Proposed site it not big enough and has potential for fly tipping as open to river
- Artists Corner is Busy with tourists – this will affect local businesses in Matlock and Matlock bath
- Suggestion that site be at end of station car park or top tier of temple walk
- Previous experience of barking dogs and generators used by travellers. Will add to mess left by tourists.
- Loss of parking space which is at a premium locally
- Littering and contamination of site
- Facilities being provided free of charge

### **Knabhall Lane, Tansley**

A total of 77 communications relating to this site were received prior to the deadline, with an additional 3 being received too late for consideration

The points raised included:

- Site is on a narrow lane in a very rural location. Increased usage by large vehicles would lead to deterioration of the verges and possibly the need to completely reinstate the road. Access would be particularly difficult in winter when this route is regularly affected by snow and ice. The entrance to the site is concealed and there is no street lighting.
- There are currently no amenities on the site and the cost of providing these was not included in the report
- Local amenities are limited, with no food shops in Tansley. A round trip of approximately 8 miles from the site would be necessary to buy bread.
- The ownership of the land is not clear and the Parish would like to have ownership of it, by way of a Community Asset Transfer, for use as allotments.
- A planning application nearby was refused because of its "unsustainable rural location.
- The site would have an impact on the caravan site business, opposite and other near neighbours expressed concern regarding the security of their animals and the potential for the residents to spread onto neighbouring land
- The lane is popular with jogger and walkers
- Badgers have recently returned to the site, having been absent for 10 years.

- Some objectors queried how this site had been identified when there had been no previous mention of it and no public consultation.
- It was noted that the traveller family had indicated that they did not wish to go to Tansley and the report also contained a number of negatives in relation to the site. The main positive appeared to be a lack of local opposition in comparison with Watery Lane at Clifton.
- It was suggested that political considerations may come into play as Tansley is represented by a minority group.