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LATE WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
Subject: FW: SHLAA Gritstone/ Wolds road/Pine road development

-----Original Message-----
From: Pamela Anderson [ ]
Sent: 07 August 2016 16:36
To: Hase, Mike
Subject: SHLAA Gritstone/ Wolds road/Pine road development

Dear Mr Hase,

I am writing this e-mail, as I am very concerned about the possible development of the above site. I am aware that the Planning Advisory Committee of DDDC were in favour of withdrawing this site. DDDC are under pressure from the Government to produce a viable Local Plan. This has come about because of the so called "national park effect", which means that DDDC have to identify sites for 6,040 homes in order to compensate for the very small number of dwellings (400) which will be built in the Park. We know, that our national parks need protecting, however, I consider that this is no reason to build developments where there are serious issues. As follows:-

This site is subject to flooding, and the reduced number of houses 450 is not going to resolve that problem.

A lack of appropriate roads in and out of the site onto the main Chesterfield road or causing a 'rat run' through Cavendish rd is not good for road safety.

A lack of school places with the increased number of Children; plus the over stretched medical facilities having to deal with the additional number of residents.

Road issues, due to the weight of additional traffic, that will cause grid lock in Matlock and therefore, affect business.

Other issues relating to a loss of natural habitat.

In general, I consider that this development will in affect, be like building a new Town but, without the relevant facilities, that this size of development requires. I also consider that it is important that known brown field sites are developed first.

Yours sincerely,
P Anderson
Sent from my iPad
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Sharon Briddon [mailto:~]
Sent: 07 August 2016 10:21
To: Lamb, Sandra; Bunton, Dorcas; Complaints
Subject: Fw: Request for Standard Investigation

Please ignore emails sent to you previously which were sent in error from my draft and as it is from my mobile I am unable to recall them.. The correct email we intended to send is detailed below.

Sent from my Huawei Mobile

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: Request for Standard Investigation
From: sharon_in@hotmail.com
To: "sandra.lamb" ,"dorcas.bunton "
CC: "thomas.donnelly@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," tony.morley@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," vicky.massey@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," susan.hobson@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," sue.burfoot@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," sue.bull@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," steve.flitter@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," richard.fitzherbert@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," richard.bright@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," philippa.tilbrook@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," philip.chell@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," peter.slack@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," neil.horton@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," mike.ratcliffe@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," martin.burfoot@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," mark.salt@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," lewis.rose@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," joyce.pawley@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," john.tibenham@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," joanne.wild@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," jennifer.bower@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," jean.monks@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," jason.atkin@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," jacquie.stevens@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," irene.ratcliffe@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," helen.froggatt@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," graham.elliott@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," garry.purdy@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," deborah.botham@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," david.chapman@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," colin.swindell@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," chris.furness@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," tony.millward@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," ann.elliott@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," angus.jenkins@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," andrew.statham@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," andrew.shirley@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," alyson.hill@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," albert.catt@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," Cc: " ," sueandmartinofmatlock@hotmail.co.uk " ," savegriststone1@gmail.com " ," sbriddon@outlook.com " ," committee@derbyshiredales.gov.uk " ," paul.wilson " ," mike.hase " ," norman.saunders370 " ," julie
Dear Councillors,

We would like to draw your attention to the unfair treatment that the site HC2v Gritstone Road/Pinewood Road (hereafter referred to as The Wolds site) has been subject to compared to others in the draft local plan "consultancy". We find it hard to understand how this site will be subject to a vote by the full council on the 8th August when other sites that have also being rejected by the Local Plan Advisory Committee will not be voted upon. We know of no other sites that have been removed from the draft plan that have being subject of a vote to determine whether it is excluded let alone being subjected to a vote at the full council meeting. Why is this site being treated so differently? How is this fair and consistent? This seems totally unfair and shows a total inconsistency in the way that this site has been dealt with.

The Snitterton fields site appears not be going through the same process despite this site not appearing to have the same level of sustainability and viability issues as The Wolds site. This only lends to the belief by residents on The Wolds site that we are being treated differently and that we are going to be the sacrificial lambs to "save" the Local Plan. If this site gets voted into the Draft Local Plan at the aforementioned meeting, despite the Advisory Committee voting it out of the plan then what is the point in this committee? They have heard all of the evidence. Evidence that the rest of the Councillors have not heard. If The Wolds site gets voted in to Draft Local Plan the whole town of Matlock will feel they have been hung out to dry and treated with utter contempt by those that are meant to protect their interests.

We also have a complaint accepted by the Information Commissioners Office relating to the lack of transparency when communicating with the sites agents for the developers. We request that a standards committee investigate the way that the council has dealt inconsistently with this site whilst we await an investigation by the Information Commissioners Office to begin.

Also we have concerns that at the meeting on the 8th August site HC2v will be subject to a vote by Councillors whose Wards are outside of the areas affected by the Draft Local Plan. Those Councillors whose Wards lie in the Peak Park should not be allowed to vote as they are effectively voting on issues which do not affect them. It is a similar scenario to Scottish MPs voting on English issues, which has been prevented by the government. If they are allowed to vote this would be undemocratic and akin to a kangaroo court, especially as we have concerns some may use their influence to affect the vote.

Is this email adequate to request a standards investigation into how site HC2v has been unfairly treated or is there another process which we have to follow to ensure our concerns are fully met?

Can you respond to our concerns regarding the voting by Peak Park Councillors raised in this email as a matter of urgency as the meeting is tomorrow at 6:00pm.

Yours sincerely,

Stuart Briddon
Dear all,

I am writing this from a beach in Greece and so am unable to download the large agenda or check a couple of facts such as what the above mentioned site reference is for this agenda (as it has changed a few times already) and the exact number of houses required in the local plan, so I hope you will take this into account if I make any errors.

As you are all very well aware, the local plan advisory committee voted overwhelmingly in favour of removing this site from the local plan. I very much hope that the remaining Councillors who are not on the advisory committee will follow their recommendations and not be pushed into voting against that decision. Otherwise this makes a complete mockery of having a committee in the first place and is a complete waste of time for the council and the taxpayer, as well as overriding the entire principles if democracy, instead replacing with autocracy.

I would just like to remind you all if the reasons the site has been removed.

1. During consultation and throughout the various committees meetings this site has had more objections to inclusion than any other site that most councillors can recall. You have a duty to listen to the public's very real and balanced objections. These are your constituents who have genuine concern for the future if the whole town. We are not NIMBY's as rudely referred to by Mr Purdy. We are people who have spent an awful lot of our time and money researching and presenting evidence to back up every claim made. This included a landscape study funded by residents and presented to Mr Wilson again a few weeks ago as it hadn't even been read when originally sent in earlier this year. If these objections are not even considered then it is not a consultation at all, but more of a kangaroo court.

2. We have provided photographic and video evidence of badgers and pipistrelle bats on this site, along with many birds on the red and amber endangered lists, such as sparrow, starling, cuckoo, reedwing & fieldfare. We have many hedgehogs visiting the gardens, and lots of field mice and voles provide sustainable food for the local owls and buzzards. It's criminal to destroy such a huge swathe of land and in turn the wildlife that are supported by it.
3. Flood risk. It is very common knowledge that this site suffers from flooding which runs into residents' gardens and causes damage and chaos at times. We have had to build a huge soak away beneath our garden to harbour run off water which previously would reach through our rear patio doors. Many other residents have provided pictorial and video evidence of flood damage to their gardens which have been posted to a website per the link on my earlier email below. The council and developers can spend as all the money they like on flood tests, but all they actually need to do to find proof is to look at the environment agency website per link also in my previous email below, which clearly proves the point that there are numerous areas of high risk, one of which is directly behind my house on High Ridge. The fact that the builders have asked for another 10 acres of land to provide the required drainage infrastructure clearly demonstrates its unsuitability. Extending the town settlement boundary to destroy even more land to counteract nature is disgusting, and should never be allowed. Even then it can never eradicate the return of natural springs that pop up all over the site, so all this land may be desiccated for nothing.

4. Underground aqueduct. There is a Victorian underground aqueduct running straight through the middle of the site. It is over 100 years old and no one knows what its state of repair is. It carries 200 million litres of water per hour. It cannot be built upon as Severn Trent require access to it in case of emergency and if repairs are needed. If this were to rupture or burst, the consequences would be devastating for the whole town. How can anyone even consider building more houses on top of this? The consequences of groundworks alone are unknown and could disturb or damage the pipeline. This is putting the whole town at unnecessary risk of a catastrophic flood incident.

5. Traffic congestion. We already know that the Highways Authority have no concern for local congestion, so who does? The buck has to stop with the District Council and our local County Councillors. Otherwise who is looking after our local roads? Many of you are not from Matlock, but am sure you will be aware that access to the proposed site has been the reason for rejection of many previous applications for the development of this site, when housing numbers were as low as 129. Despite nothing having changed other than traffic getting heavier, the planning Dept seem to be completely ignoring this fact! 500 houses equals minimum 500 cars. Going by existing surrounding families, it is more likely to average 2 cars per household. That's another 1000 cars per day using the one passable lane of Cavendish Road, the one passable lane of Wellington Street, the exceptionally busy and accident prone junction between Wellington Street and Chesterfield Road, and Chesterfield Road itself which the Highways Authority state is already at capacity. Highfields School is right next to the proposed site, and at peak hours the traffic and footfall in this area is huge, and it only takes one incident to bring the whole area to a standstill.

The mitigants proposed to relieve this congestion are utter rubbish!
> Providing more public transport. I work in Somercotes some 15 miles away. Using public transport would take 3 buses and 2.5 hours to get to work. Or I can drive in 25 mins. Which would you choose? There are very few employment opportunities in Matlock. And bearing in mind the likely cost of a new house in Matlock, would mean people will likely need to commute to work by car to earn what they need to afford their mortgage.

> Providing cycle paths. This is the most hilarious of all. How many of you have ever cycled up Bank Road and Wellington Street? It rises to 800 feet above sea level!! The majority of people struggle to walk it!

> Changing people's travel behaviour. Again a ridiculous suggestion. People don't just pop out at rush hour for no reason. Their travel behaviour is dictated by when they need to get to work, drop off and collect kids from school etc. That isn't going to change. The planners need to stop treating us like idiots and accept these suggestions are utter fantasy.

Finally, this site seems to be the number one site that Mr Hase, Mr Wilson and Mr Rose are absolutely desperate to keep in. At the last planning meeting, when it seemed apparent that the vote was not going their way, Mr Wilson tried to persuade Councillors that to vote against the site would ruin the plan. This is above and beyond his remit as a Council Officer. He should not be allowed to try and lead the Councillors nor show any favour to a particular site, but was allowed to do so by Mr Rose and the committee chair.
Mr Purdy referred to the local Plan as a "numbers game". What a disgusting comment to make - this is our lives we are talking about and the future of our town. We don't consider this a game, and anyone who does should not be representing people in the role of a local councillor.

There are around 240 sites reviewed and only 28 sites included in the local plan. A few weeks ago the plan only included 6 015 (?) houses and it was expected that the Peak Park would cover the 400 or so shortfall under permitted development. There are now over 6400 houses included and another 222 sites could be reconsidered. If this site was removed, we would be in not much worse a position as a few weeks ago. What's happened that the 400 Peak Park houses no longer count? Also we heard evidence of 3 brownfield sites that have been excluded with no real rationale, that Roger Yarwood asked to be reinstated. The shortfall would be covered by those alone.

Mr Morley said excluding this site puts a big hole in the plan. If it is a draft, and still under consultation, so how can this be? A decision on its inclusion was not yet made was it?. We have further consultation to come do we not? Or is this just paying lip service to the community?

Why are the developers William Davis already organising an exhibition for September if the final plan has not been ratified? This leads us to be very suspicious of why they are so confident their application will be successful. This seems rather unethical.

Snitterton fields site was removed without the bat of an eyelid, yet the revised sustainability report that facilitated it's removal has never been published. The two sites are broadly comparable, but we believe that the Pinewood / Gritstone site has more issues to consider for its removal from the plan as it is less accessible, prone to flooding and has the aqueduct. I have asked to see this report through a freedom of information request 2 weeks ago and have not yet even had my request acknowledged. We would like to compare the two reports to ensure that Council policies are being equally and fairly applied to both sites, but are being prevented from doing do by this evidence not having been shared.

In addition I also have an ongoing complaint upheld by the Information Commissioners Office due to having a request to view documents showing discussion between the developers and planners refused, on the basis that there is none. But subsequent planning committee agendas have referred to such documentation.

There is a complete lack of transparency around the Council's dealings with this site, and there is clear desperation to keep this site in despite all evidence against its suitability. There is deep suspicion with local residents and indeed some Councillors that the democratic process is being compromised by this sites' continued inclusion, and if that is the case, we hope the ICO investigation is not too late and uncovers any misdealings.

Please use your vote to represent the people who rely on you to provide their democratic voice, listen to them, read the objections and continue to support the decision made by YOUR Local Plan Advisory Committee. Do the right thing and vote this site OUT.

Kind regards,
Sharon & Stuart Briddon
Tel:

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: Further information for consideration at Local Planning meeting 27/07/16
From: Sharon Briddon
To: enquiries@matlock.gov.uk, committee@derbyshiredales.gov.uk
CC: thomas.donnelly@derbyshiredales.gov.uk, tony.morley@derbyshiredales.gov.uk, vicky.massey@derbyshiredales.gov.uk, susan.hobson@derbyshiredales.gov.uk, sue.burfoot@derbyshiredales.gov.uk, sue.bull@derbyshiredales.gov.uk
Hi,

Evidence regarding site to rear of Pinewood Road / Gritstone Road for consideration for Local Plan Meeting 27/07/16.

Please see attached video evidence of bat activity taken at 18 High Ridge last week, on the same evening that the bat inspector was also in attendance in the fields just behind our home and off Pinewood Road. The Inspector must have seen the activity for himself as the bats were out in force that evening. Obviously the video is quite dark as footage taken at dusk when the bats are active. We have many video examples of activity taken over a few nights but the files too large to include them all. These pipistrelle bats appear every year from Spring to Autumn and are a very welcome sight to all residents. To have their habitat destroyed would be criminal.

In addition, there have been many comments from the council, and from developers insinuating that there is no evidence of flood risk at the Pinewood / Gritstone site. Developers of the Tansley Once again I refer you to some examples of flooding that happens to residents on a very regular basis that is shown on the attached weblink:-

https://savematlocksgreenfields.wordpress.com/archaeological-and-topographical-info/

Developers for the Tansley House Gardens site stats that there are "no known issues of surface water flooding in Matlock. To prove that this is a complete fabrication of the truth, I also refer you to the Environment Agency website per link below, which is also linked through the same weblink above.

http://watermaps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiiby/wiiby.aspx?topic=ufmfsw&scale=9&ep=map&layerGroups=default&lang=_e&y=360306&x=430419#x=430502&y=360521&scale=11

This clearly shows three areas - Bentley Lane, Gritstone Road and directly behind my house on high Ridge, which are rated as high risk of flooding, indicated by dark blue patches. How can anyone dispute the findings of the Environment agency, and even submit such drivel without checking this freely available information site?
This site has more blue areas high risk flood areas than the Snitterton field site which has since been removed from the local plan following a "revised sustainability study" update. Where exactly is this revised sustainability study? it has not been provided with the agenda, nor added to the evidence base. Without seeing that evidence how can anyone objectively assess the fairness of your decision. I would like to see what attributes make that area so significantly different to that behind Pinewood / Gritstone? Snitterton's arguments were identical to ours, that it is a greenfield site, supporting wildlife, with accessibility issues, and is an area of historical importance. What is the difference and where is the consistency of policy application? Is it the fact that those with more disposable income paid for a report and the council have shied away from a potentially expensive argument? The Wolds action group also provided a professional landscape study to the council which hasn't even been read! A hard copy was again provided to Paul Wilson at the last meeting, has this now been shared with the rest of the committee for consideration?

I would like to make it clear that I agree with the exclusion of Snitterton, on the same basis as I am fighting for the exclusion of the Wolds site - it is valuable greenfield. I challenge the council and committee to demonstrate that both sites have been given the same degree of consideration, reports treated equally and to explain what makes one site so different to the other that one is in and one out.

I would also like to challenge the comment on the DCC response included in the agenda where they refer to sites of sensitivity. Gritstone / Pinewood is not included in that category list, but the ex Permanite site is!!!! How in anyone's book can the filthy contaminated ex asphalt production brownfield site be considered be an area of landscape sensitivity, where as a beautiful greenfield site, whose loss would affect so many lives and wildlife habitat is not? I have never heard so much drivel in my life.

Finally, regarding the findings of the highway authority regarding impacts to local areas. As you eluded to in the last meeting, the highways report does show they have no concern for local congestion areas. So if the don't who does? Surely it is down to the District Council? In which case the traffic issues that will impact the Chesterfield Road, Wellington Street, Cavendish Road junctions, the school and safety of children must be your responsibility. Therefore we would like to hear the District Councils views on this impact rather than trying to fob us off that it is not their responsibility. Surely someone has to take responsibility for the chaos and safety issues that will ensue?

Regards,
Sharon Briddon

Archaeological and topographical info | Save our Matlock ...

savematlockgreenfields.wordpress.com

Here you'll find info about the archaeological and topographical issues with the proposed sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225. ISSUES WITH ARCHAEOLOGY OF SITE
-----Original Message-----
From: Elizabeth Chamberlain [mailto:]
Sent: 03 August 2016 14:01
To: Morley, Tony; Massey, Vicky; Hobson, Susan; Burfoot, Sue; Bull, Sue; Flitter, Steve; Fitzherbert, Richard; Bright, Richard; Tilbrook, Philippa; Chell, Phil; Slack, Peter; Horton, Neil; Ratcliffe, Mike; Burfoot, Martin; Salt, Mark; Rose, Lewis; Pawley, Joyce; Tibenham, John; Wild, Joanne; Bower, Jennifer; Monks, Jean; Atkin, Jason; Stevens, Jacquie; Ratcliffe, Irene; Froggatt, Helen; Elliott, Graham; Purdy, Garry; Botham, Deborah; Chapman, David; Swindell, Colin; Furness, Chris; Millward, Tony; Elliott, Ann; Jenkins, Angus; Statham, Andrew; Shirley, Andrew; Hill, Alyson; Catt, Albert; Donnelly, Tom; Hase, Mike; Bunton, Dorcas; Wilson, Paul
Subject: Meeting 8th August 2016 - Planning proposal Site SHAAA224 & SHLAA225

Dear Councillors,

I refer to the Council meeting held last Wednesday 27th July in the Council Chamber at County Hall and specifically with regard to Sites SHAA224 and SHAA225.

I was pleased to note that the Advisory Committee voted against including this land in the recommendations for inclusion for residential development.

In case you have mislaid my letter of objection dated 24th July sent to you by email I have included a copy within this email and would ask that you vote as the Advisory Committee has suggested, to exclude this site for all the many reasons put forward previously by myself and others.

Kind regards

Elizabeth Chamberlain

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Elizabeth Chamberlain and I live at 8 Gritstone Road, Matlock.

I suspect you will all know who I am by now and what my objections are to this particular element of the proposed plan for affordable social housing within the Derbyshire Dales.

For those Councillors who have not added my email address to their junk folder I feel obliged to once again reiterate those objections. I will try not to simply repeat all that I have said in previous emails and letters but you will forgive me if most of my points have been raised before as to date I do not feel there have been any satisfactory answers given.

The transport infrastructure is wholly unsuitable to support the additional traffic on the roads surrounding this proposed development. Ultimately this will not only lead to terrible traffic queues and inevitable accidents but also endanger the lives of families and residents both new and old. It will also affect the hundreds of pupils attending Highfields School. This is something you can stop!

Elizabeth Chamberlain
The loss of this greenfield site and the wildlife that will disappear with it will never return. The plans merely mention that as there are no protected species of plant or animal involved there does not need to be any consideration given to them, a point I simply cannot accept. This is something you can stop!

The complex issues of drainage, natural springs and heavy clay soil still haven’t been addressed, the developers simply stating they will put in place measures to take care of this. How? The current drainage system is at capacity and who will be picking up the bill when the inevitable happens and flood damage occurs to both new and old properties because of this development? This is something you can stop!

The Government national framework talks about consultation and engagement with local communities and residents to try to build in consensus throughout this process, it’s not too late to listen to all those residents who, like me feel this particular proposal is foolhardy and dangerous. This is something you can stop!

Finally I would just like to thank you for your time in reading this as well as not adding me to your junk mail and hope that with a clear conscience you will make the right decision at the next meetings on the 8th August 2016.

Kind regards

Elizabeth Chamberlain
Mr Gareth Clarke & Mrs Rose Clarke

Derbyshire Dales District Council
Town Hall
Bank Road
Matlock, DE4 3NN

6th August 2016

Re: Derbyshire Dales Draft Local Plan

Dear Councillor

I wish to object to the proposal to include sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225 (Policy HC2(v) and DS4 Housing Land Allocations Site allocation at Land off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road, Matlock) in the Draft local plan for the Derbyshire Dales for the following reasons:

- **Traffic Congestion**

  The increase in the number of vehicle movements on the existing highways to access these sites will no doubt be well in excess of 1000 a day on a work day on top of existing vehicles. Although Gritstone Road is currently a moderately quiet street, it is still challenging to get onto Chesterfield Road during rush hour with heavy traffic coming into Matlock and the school traffic to Highfields and then there are the queues down in town from all the roads into Matlock and the traffic lights and roundabouts. So hence extreme congestion, noise and air pollution (exhaust fumes) from moving and queuing vehicles. With the sites being approx a mile from the amenities of the town centre and at the top of the steep hill the majority of people would choose to use their car to access local amenities. The whole of the town and the approach roads will be even more congested if there is such a large estate built. Most of you will have experience the frustration of queuing to get in/through town – I have been sitting in queues from beyond Sainsbury’s roundabout on Bakewell Road frequently and at the bottom of Steep Turnpike in the last few weeks even though there is no school traffic. Matlock’s Highways are SIMPLY already at SATURATION point and any increase (100+% on Chesterfield road as the traffic report has indicated, not even thinking about construction traffic) will gridlock the towns roads.

- **Road safety**

  The implications of the significant increase in traffic on the roads at the Wolds area of town and Matlock generally are hardly worth thinking about. Access to the Gritstone Road site will impact on children coming and going from Highfields upper school and residents. And the risk of a collision with another vehicle or pedestrian or cyclist is automatically increased with an increase in traffic using the highways. Many drivers already abuse the 30mph limit on Chesterfield Road. I myself have reported on several occasions’ joy riders and motorcyclists using the road as a speed track.

- **Flood risk**
The houses on Gritstone Road already suffer from flooding and poor ground and surface water drainage and the natural gradient of the fields proposed for building on due to the low porosity geological structure of the bedrock and overlying clays. Our house has had rising damp from one of the underground springs that run under the house. We have a bog for a garden for at least 4 winter months, despite having installed land drains around the edge. Our garage has repeatedly flooded as run off from the field floods through the stonework. Other houses have had the same issues and water from the underground springs has forced through the tarmac pavements and roads on Gritstone road in several places during the 10 years we have lived here. Where would a developer put drains and soakaways for 500 houses when they would be bound on the downhill edge by the existing housing?

- **Expanding the boundary of Matlock**

  Sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225 are both beyond the current settlement framework boundary for development thus if developed would set a precedent for future development on other greenfield sites rather than existing un-developed brownfield sites as well as allowing developers to cherry pick.

- **Accessibility compromised**

  The site as a whole is elevated and exposed, being one of the highest points around the town boundary. This area is above the snow line during winter and exposed to a different climate, usually 2 degrees colder than the centre of town can be notoriously icy and snowy and difficult to access in harsh winter weather. With County Council cutbacks to public transport and Highways maintenance such as gritting routes the site would be very inaccessible. The DDDC Local Plan, Nov 2015 clearly states: “A 43% increase in people aged 60 or more, but the biggest change will come in the 75+ age group, where an 88% increase is forecast”. With potential new residents likely to be of this age group the site is hardly suitable for the elderly or infirm, particularly if they have to rely on public transport. The recent womens Tour of Britain cycle race classed Bank Road hill climb as gruelling. Surely we are not expecting the elderly to be walking or cycling up and down here or the average younger person? Is the council going to suddenly find money to out on extra buses? The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 says: “In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.” P9 NPPF which these sites clearly do not!

- **Loss of wildlife habitat**

  Loss of such habitat is contrary to the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework which states that the planning system should:
  “Contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
  – recognizing the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
  – minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.” P26/27
Many of which are on the RSPB’s “Birds of Conservation Concern – Amber List for Species in Decline”. The site is a wintering ground for fieldfare and redwing – both of which are on the RSPB’s “Birds of Conservation Concern – Red List for Species in Severe Decline”. The nation is already drastically reducing the biodiversity of the English countryside by development and intensive farming methods so every bit of open countryside with any sort of ecological value such as this that is lost is one step further to an unsustainable future with loss of habitat and thus important species that contribute to the food chain.

- **Noise & Light pollution**

With the proposed size of development these sites are inevitably going to be construction sites for several years (just look at how long the smaller Moorledge site was) which will cause noise and light pollution and disturbance from construction traffic. With the elevated position of the site there would be no way of screening this from the rest of town. And the impact once a large housing estate is complete would be totally contradicting the Planning framework: “Planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation”. P29 NPPF. Just look at the impact of the lights from Matlock Golf Club Driving range at night as you approach from Slack Hill.

There are a number of other issues for concern such as subsidence, impact on existing infrastructure such as schools, availability of employment as well as those outlined here that really do not make the Gritstone Rd and Pinewood Rd sites suitable for development. I urge the Council to re-consider this for the Local Plan and come up with a more sustainable solution. **The flood risk assessments and traffic issues reports are still in progress so inclusion of the site and the scale of proposed development should not even be considered until the findings of these assessments are presented to the council and all other potential sites that may not have already been considered have been included.**

Thank you

Yours sincerely

Rose and Gareth Clarke.
I would like to object to the building of houses on the GREEN FIELD site of Gritstone road/ Pinewood road.

There are many reasons why this plan should not go ahead.

1. The land has natural springs and the area is known to flood.
2. The heavy increase of traffic not only on the already struggling estate roads but also the surrounding roads (Wellington street and Chesterfield road)
3. The lack of amenities. There are no shops, Dr's up here and a very limited bus service so everyone will have to drive.
4. Increase of pollution to the area and noise pollution which will disturb the wildlife.
5. Lack of school places for children.
6. Doctors surgeries in Matlock are already struggling to cope with demand and so is Darley Dale (it usually takes 2 weeks to see a Doctor) My daughter was ill I ended up having to go to Whitworth hospital and waited 2hrs as everyone else where doing the same due to lack of Dr's appointments.
7. Lack of Dentists( im still registered at Bakewell due to lack of space in Matlock).
8. The effect on the hillsides beauty you will scar the land.
9. The location, its to far from town to walk (I challenge you to walk up bank road, rockside steps or Wellington street with bags of shopping or children in tow as you cant class Smedley street as a shopping area it’s impossible to buy daily goods from there.
10. JOB's there are hardly any full time jobs available in Matlock so where are all these people going to work?? With the decline of the high street and big chains like BHS closing, the tights factory in Belper closing, the decline of the Banks in Matlock, locals are struggling to find work to pay the bills already.

Please consider other options:
Halldale quarry is a bigger area with a lot less homes planned to be built. Change the rules and enforce that site be built on 1st to see how those homes in a lot better location sell.

Building a new village with amenities like people have mentioned in the meetings, other areas have done so and its worked well.

Yours faithfully
Mrs Sarah Cooper
Pinewood road resident
To Whom it may concern

I would once more like to take this opportunity to raise my concerns about all aspects of basic and infrastructure issues which will be in my opinion unsurpassable;

1. People already struggle for Dentist and doctors appointments
2. Access onto Chesterfield Road at peak periods can take anything up to 15-20mins and will only get worse with an estimated 100% TRAFFIC INCREASE ONTO CHESTERFIELD ROAD AND 39% INCREASE OR MORE INTO CROWN CENTRE,

These factors I can see personally meaning a complete "Grid-Lock Situation" without taking into account the tourism aspects.

I look forward to the forthcoming meeting at which I hope ! common sense will prevail

Regards

Mrs D Dawes
I am writing to ask the councillors to REMOVE GRITSTONE ROAD/PINEWOOD ROAD from the local plan PERMANTELY.

At the last meeting it was 7 councillors vote to take of our site, and 4 councillors to vote to keep it in the local plan, i would like to take this opportunity to thank those 7 councillors from ALL THE RESIDENTS OF MATLOCK. Apparently its a numbers game, NOT TO US, the residents of matlock, its OUR HOMES AND LIVES, obviously the 100% increase in traffic onto an already very busy chesterfield rd and 39% increase or more into crown square doesn't seem to worry you, loss of tourism to a gridlocked town centre. We all thought DDDC was here to support local residents not the builders William Davies. There are Cawdor quarry Hall dale Quarry which would take all the houses allocated to Gritstone, why should it be easy for Davies homes to build on our 59 acre GREENFIELD SITE. Talking of a numbers game, would the residents of Gritstone/Pinewood road get compensated for loss of value to our homes and privacy which will be none existent. On the 12th March 2016 you were sent an email from janet Roberts who took legal advice about how bad the flooding and drainage are in gritstone fields now, so when the fields are disturbed with heavy machinery and the natural springs which are all over the fields, this will of course cause MORE serious damage to the houses that are on the border line of the fields (including ours). Some of these homes have already had to be underpinned and also built on rafts, Halifax building society have refused some homes for insurance because of flooding, drainage etc. So if this site is added to the plan and building goes ahead, and our homes suffer even more then there will be a few claims going in, as advised the lawyer.

PLEASE SUPPORT MATLOCK RESIDENTS MOVE 430 HOUSES ONTO CAWDOR/HALLDALE QUARRY AND TAKE GRITSTONE/PINEWOOD ROAD OF THE LOCAL PLAN PERMANTELY.

See you on monday 8th august at 6 pm.

julie dawes
Dear Mr Hase and Mr Wilson,

We write in regard to the Local Plan, and the proposed development of the site off Gritstone Road and Pinewood Road, following the last meeting on 27 July 2016.

Our principle concern is one of the safety at points of access to this site, particularly with regard to the effect on local traffic of an increased volume of cars.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to which the planning officers direct the council to guide their decision making clearly states in the core planning principles, section 17 on page 6 that planning

- should actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling.

With regard to this proposed development and its effect on the teenagers who walk and cycle to the upper site of Highfields School, we can find NO detailed analysis of the implications to pedestrians in ANY of the papers presented of how access to the proposed new houses via Gritstone Road will affect students going to school, merely broad statements to make improvements to walking facilities.

Worryingly, the traffic assessment presented has concentrated on what the potential traffic effects will be on the busiest local junctions which have experienced high accident rates, which also happen to be nowhere near the proposed development. There has been no assessment of the actual junctions at the point of access to the proposed developments, and pedestrian volume has been totally omitted from the analysis.

The junction of Gritstone Road with Chesterfield Road has a huge pedestrian load as children walk up Chesterfield Road to use the crossing on the brow of the hill to enter the school grounds. In addition, parents drop their children off on the short connecting spur of Gritstone Road leading to this junction, and wait to pick them up at the end of school. To add to this mix the new traffic load will make an already busy junction a real risk to the safety of our teenagers.

In the evidence that has been presented, the section of road leading to Highfields school is already marked as red on trafficmaster, page 22, Transport Evidence Base, so the load of traffic from new houses will just add to this volume.
Despite all this, the Highways assessment is that no traffic modification can be made.

We think this is wrong and indeed it goes AGAINST statements made on page 10 of the NPPF in section 35 that developments should

- give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities;
- create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians

Any consideration given to accessing the site via Cavendish Road very soon becomes redundant when it is realised that this road is, for all intents and purposes, single track with passing places due to existing parking. It is also relatively busy with the council car park already-it shows up as brown on the traffic-master analysis, page 22 Transport Evidence.

The road beyond the junction with Wolds Rise becomes impassable when it snows, as evidenced by the large numbers of cars abandoned near this junction belonging to residents who live further up the road who cannot get up the inclines in bad weather. Adding the abandoned cars of 400 new homes would be reckless.

From the point of view that access with no highway modification via Gritstone Road would contravene the guidance of the NPPF, and that access would just be unsafe via Cavendish Road, we would ask this site is removed from the local plan.

Additionally, there is also the issue of this being country land, and to develop it would also contradict the NPPF guidance to

- take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it

We think that rather than spending any more time considering the development of this site because it is expedient to do so, effort should now be directed to finding alternative locations by those how have that responsibility.

Yours faithfully

Neil & Helen Fray
Subject: Derbyshire Dales Local Plan - proposed allocation of land off Gritstone Road, Matlock
Attachments: Draft Illustrative Masterplan.pdf

From: Louise Harrison [mailto:]
Sent: 05 August 2016 09:44
Cc: Hase, Mike; Wilson, Paul
Subject: Derbyshire Dales Local Plan - proposed allocation of land off Gritstone Road, Matlock

Dear Councillor

We are writing to you on behalf of William Davis in connection with the Special Council meeting on 8 August which will consider the emerging Local Plan following the recommendation of the Local Plan Advisory Committee that the Gritstone Road, Matlock allocation is withdrawn.

You will, of course, be aware that the officer’s report to the Full Council continues to recommend the allocation of the Gritstone Road site. We fully endorse this recommendation and, as an experienced developer in the East Midlands, believe that the Gritstone Road site can deliver 430 much needed new homes to support the housing requirements of the Local Plan.

The Gritstone Road site can also provide substantial areas of new public open space, including a Countryside Park which would be available to existing and new residents of Matlock. This is a significant benefit as the site currently has no rights of way across it. This is shown on the attached illustrative masterplan which also shows that certain parts of the site on its northern boundary previously intended for housing are now proposed for open space. The proposed Countryside Park, in this location, will also ensure that existing overland flows of surface water, which currently cause flooding problems in the area, can be appropriately dealt with as part of a positive drainage system for the site.

We are aware that there are concerns amongst local residents about the site’s proposed allocation in the Local Plan. However, we are confident that we can address the technical issues that have been raised and deliver a sensitively designed, sustainable development which will play a key role in helping Derbyshire Dales to deliver the new housing that it needs. Without the site’s inclusion in the Local Plan there would inevitably be a delay in the housing supply for Matlock and Derbyshire Dales as a whole, with no clear alternative sites that could come forward, and a significant risk that the Plan will be found unsound.

We thank you for your time in reading this email and hope that you are able to support the Gritstone Road site’s inclusion in the Local Plan.

Kind regards

Louise Harrison – sent on behalf of William Davis Limited
Dear All,

As a resident of Gritstone Road, Matlock, I am writing to strongly object to the housing development proposed for sites SHLAA224 and SHLA 225 particularly.

There are several reasons why I strongly object which you have been provided with previously from me which I have again listed below.

After several meetings regarding the local draft plan you will be well aware of the strong objects from the residents of Matlock to over 400 houses on Greenfields. The 100% increase in traffic in Matlock with no plans to develop the highway infrastructure is lunacy.

I am pleading that you rethink the new development and vote against it and have this site removed from the plan.

1. The NPPF states that the planning committee should...
   ● preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.

   There are already serious issues with drainage and flooding with the houses that boarder the sites, buy, building new houses this will only enhance that problem for existing residents and create more issues for new dwellers.

2.
   ● protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils.

   The new sites would certainly NOT support the above point. The proposed plots will destroy the habitats of many animals, including badgers and bats. The birds will also be at risk of decline some of which are already in decline, such as the field fare and redwing which are listed as cause for concern on the RSPB's website.
I again refer to the NPPF "In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment. Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework”

The plans do not promote the minimising of pollution, how can an increase of 500 house in a residential area not cause a negative impact on the environment? There will be an excessive amount of carbon emissions from house holds, such as the carbon gasses from heating, car fumes and not to mention noise pollution.

3. The developments will have a huge impact on the number of vehicles that frequent chesterfield Road and the surrounding residential areas such as Gritstone Road. There will be at least 1000 more cars in and around the area!!! The access to Gritstone Road by Sandy Lane and Wolds Road is already restricted at around peak times due to the school traffic, people park on the roads when collecting school children, and at work peak times, it is almost impossible to pull out onto Chesterfeild Road due to the number of commuters from chesterfield to Matlock and vice versa. The view is restricted from the access roads and with more traffic this will result in queues in to Matlock and onto the main Road, resulting in more aggravation and potential for car accidents.

An extract below from the NPPF should be given careful consideration...

Public safety from major accidents

172. Planning policies should be based on up-to-date information on the location of major hazards and on the mitigation of the consequences of major accidents.

Has the council factored into the decision making that there is a large secondary school just yards away from the proposed sites? The increase in vehicles would no doubt increase the danger of accidents involving the school children and increase the congestion around the residential roads. There is a bus depot not far from the site and the increased volume of traffic on the road would have a detrimental impact on the business due to the congestion.

I have listed my main arguments to object the plans, there are many, many more which I am sure will be taken into consideration when decision making. I ask that careful consideration of the points raised is taken and it is realised that it will have a major impact on so many lives of the residents of the local area, commuters, school children, tourists, animals and wildlife.

Thank you

Katie Haywood
Dear Members of the Council

At tonight's meeting I was very pleased to see that this site was voted to be removed from the plan.

After sitting through all of the subsequent council meetings and listening to the same points being raised over and over again, I thank those members of the council who voted to remove this site from the plan. At last, common sense is beginning to prevail!

I now urge the rest of the council members when this goes back to vote on the 8th August that you listen to what has been said in the recent meetings and the evidence that has been put forward is taken on board. Please do take the time to take our concerns seriously.

I have sent emails and letters to you all. I have also sent in a video of water flooding into our house. We back onto the fields off Moorfield and have seen the amount of water that flows through this field, as on more than one occasion now that said water has joined us inside our house causing devastation to our home, large insurance claims, 6 months of industrial fans, not to mention my son being admitted to hospital with a chest infection due to the spores from all the filthy water! It caused great upset to my family.

If these houses were allowed to be built this would put us all up here at risk of more flooding. NOT acceptable at all, and definitely not something we would ever want to go through again, this risk is SERIOUS and has to be taken into account, it CANNOT be brushed over!! I will do everything I can to ensure this risk is taken into account on the vote!

This site is a beautiful green field site full of wildlife and nature at its best. This is exactly what Derbyshire is all about Green fields, rolling countryside and open space. This is what brings people into Matlock, this is what puts our beautiful town on the map! I appeal to you, please do not destroy it!

We can not place a further 430 houses on this site as this would give us so much more traffic on areas that can not cope now with existing traffic. Working on an average of 2 cars per house we would have an extra 860 cars in this one area.
My children both go to Highfields school where now children struggle to cross the roads safely, with extra cars on the road this is going to become a deadly journey to school where one of these young students is going to be seriously injured. I would not want this on my conscience just for the sake of meeting the Government numbers.

So to sum up please continue to do what was done tonight and keep this decision to remove HC2V from the plan. It really is the only sensible outcome!

Kind regards

Paul Hibbitt

Get Outlook for iOS
I wish to convey my utmost disgust at the thought of anybody wanting to destroy this beautiful town, you should be thoroughly ashamed of yourselves for trying to push this ludicrous plan through! You obviously have no respect for local residents - human or animal/bird. How dare you think you can dictate to the hundreds of local residents who are totally against this monstrosity! Do you actually live up here at the top of Matlock? Very doubtful, otherwise you wouldn't have even given it a second thought and withdrawn the plan from the off. I wouldn't like to be in your shoes tomorrow night at the meeting, hopefully there'll be a massive turn out to show you that we care about this beautiful countryside and its wildlife! Something which you obviously don't. Shame on you, I so hope you are anialated tomorrow night, hopefully the rest of the councillors will stand up to you and dismiss your ridiculous plans!!!!!!
Dear Councillors,

I am pleased that the amendment was passed on 27th July to remove the Gritstone Road/Pinewood Road, Matlock (Policy HC2(u) DS4) from the Local Plan and I hope that this decision will be upheld by the full Council meeting.

I have objected to this site as it is completely unsuitable for development for the following reasons:

1. It regularly floods and the development will exacerbate this problem. At the last meeting a revision to the site was outlined to set aside almost 40% of the land "to enable necessary drainage infrastructure and open space". This is not a suitable use of precious green fields and confirms the problems with the site.

2. The "Your Local Plan" (Your_Local_Plan_publication_November_2015.pdf) confirms that Derbyshire Dales has an aging demographic and has an expected increase in the over 60 age group of more than 9,800 people and a reduction in the population of younger people. Therefore, any development must be with this demographic in mind. The Gritstone Road/Pinewood Road site elevated and is accessed by a very steep hill (considered "challenging" by professional cyclists) and narrow roads. It is completely unsuitable and unsustainable for any age group let alone the elderly.

3. Given the anticipated reduction in working age people and the increase in the non-working population, why is it necessary to set aside so much land for "employment opportunities" on the brown field sites? Surely it would be better to increase the housing allocations in these areas?

4. This site is "green field". Destruction of our natural environment should be a last resort but it seems that developers are already queuing up to develop the site. Surely the local plan should be about protecting the environment until all available brown field sites, such as redundant quarries, have been developed. I fear that the opposite will be true.

5. The Transport Evidence Base states that "the planning applications for each site should be designed to show good connection to the existing centre by walking / cycling routes" - this is clearly not the case for the Gritstone Road/Pinewood Road site. The Transport Evidence Base also confirms that the Matlock junctions are already at capacity and the developments will make the situation much worse. The additional summer traffic will lead to gridlock (as has already happened when the Chesterfield Road/Wellington Street junction is restricted by road works). It also suggests to re-examine the potential to re-open the railway line through to Buxton as a potential mitigation - will the developers and Council commit to funding this?
Building on green field sites is viewed as a last resort by both the NPPF and Derbyshire Dales planning policies and yet the developments seem to be in preference to brown field sites - and there are a lot of these in Matlock (the redundant quarries). The Gritstone Road/Pinewood Road green field sites near Matlock are not sustainable as they are a distance from the town centre and do not offer access for pedestrians or cyclists. The increase in population is due to an aging demographic: it is not sustainable to expect elderly residents to move to homes above the snow line when the quarries offer a level access to the town’s facilities. The new developments will encourage the use of unsustainable travel modes resulting in increased congestion and pollution in the town centre.

It seems to me that the Local Plan is being rushed through before all the facts have been fully explored – such as a new village to the south of the region, consideration of the “Peak Park Effect” and implications of Brexit on local populations. There is an excellent opportunity now to develop the brown field sites (including the clean-up of any contaminated land) for the benefit of the town, the Derbyshire Dales and for future generations rather than setting a precedent for development of green field sites that will almost certainly be built-on first. How can the Local Plan safeguard green field sites and ensure that brown field sites are developed first?

I ask that the Councillors listen to local opinion and ratify the amendment to remove the Gritstone Road/Pinewood Road from the Local Plan.

Regards,

James Johnson
To Whom it May Concern

I would once more like to take this opportunity to raise my concerns about all aspects of basic and infrastructure issues which will be in my opinion unsurpassable;

1, People already struggle for Dentist and doctors appointments
2, Access onto Chesterfield Road at peak periods can take anything up to 15-20mins and will only get worse with an estimated 100%TRAFFIC INCREASE ONTO CHESTERFIELD ROAD AND 39% INCREASE OR MORE INTO CROWN CENTRE,

These factors I can see personally meaning a complete "Grid-Lock Situation" without taking into account the tourism aspects.

I look forward to the forthcoming meeting at which I hope ! common sense will prevail

Regards

Mr K Dawes
SPECIAL MEETING to consider the recommendations of the Local Plan Advisory Committee in relation to the preparation of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan on Monday 8 August 2016 at 6.00pm in the Council Chamber, COUNTY HALL, Matlock

Objection to site HC2(u) Land off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road, Matlock being included

DDDC Local Plan – PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT DERBYSHIRE DALES LOCAL PLAN

Derbyshire Dales District Council Local Plan – Pre-Submission Draft Plan
Policy HC2: Housing Land Allocations
Site Reference HC2(u) Land off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road, Matlock

I acknowledge all the hard work and time that the Local Plan advisory Committee have spent over the last months in attending site viewings and meetings, looking at various consultee advise and listening to the many representations and objections from the local residents who elect the councillors to represent them.

I applaud the members of the Local Plan advisory committee that having inspected the site and carefully considered all the evidence came to the correct decision that Site Reference HC2(u) Land off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road, Matlock is not sustainable and that development of this greenfield site would be totally detrimental and harmful to Matlock.

Accordingly at a meeting on 27 July the Local Plan advisory committee voted in favour of recommending that Site Reference HC2(u) Land off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road, Matlock be excluded from the Pre-Submission Draft Plan.

Seeing as the Local Plan advisory committee was selected with the specific purpose of advising the full Council and are fully acquainted of all the facts, including site inspections, I trust that the Council will indeed take notice of and agree to the recommendation.

Should the Council not vote to exclude Site Reference HC2(u) Land off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road, Matlock it will make a total mockery of the entire process of having an advisory committee and indeed the very heart of democracy.

Having regard to all the circumstances I therefore urge and request all Councillors to make the correct decision, support your advisory committee and vote to exclude Site Reference HC2(u) Land off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road, Matlock from the Pre-Submission Draft Plan.

From: Kevin J Knight
Statement in support of approving the revised and full Local Plan

My name is Roger Larke. I am a chartered engineer and I live in Doveridge.

I usually find myself in disagreement with resolutions tabled at Planning Committee meetings, but not tonight.

Let’s remind ourselves that the first Local Plan was withdrawn because it was likely to fail and that the preparation of the second Local Plan has been in progress since October 2014.

Now at the 11th hour the Local Plan Advisory Committee has voted to remove 500 dwellings in Matlock!

Clearly submitting the Local Plan with a shortfall of 500 dwellings is unthinkable since the plan is highly likely to fail leading to government intervention, loss of control and financial penalties.

So if we all agree that a sound plan should be submitted where are 500 dwellings going to come from?

Well clearly hard-to-find development land must surely be sought, but I fear that it would also be tempting to re-appraise existing sites previously rejected as being unsuitable. But how can they suddenly become suitable?
Doveridge, for example, already has outline planning consent for 224 dwellings where there are currently 600, an increase of 37%, and there are developers who continue to knock on our door! We have spent over a year getting our Neighbourhood Plan to the point of Regulation 14 and we have done that in convergence with the new Local Plan.

Either way, all this is going to take a large amount of time that we do not have.

I therefore suggest, Councillors, that you should approve the full Local Plan or you will face more public embarrassment!
Dear Councillors

I write regarding the full council meeting on August 8 regarding the Derbyshire Dales District Dales Local Plan.

In particular I write to urge you to support the Local Plan moving forward with the exclusion of the Gritstone Rd / Pinewood Rd site as voted for at the Local Area Committee meeting on July 27th.

I have sat in many many meetings of the Local Plan Committee over the past few months and I have seen all of the local plan committee members listen to the wide range of valid objections over the site and subsequently several have changed their minds about this site’s inclusion.

Given that they have sat through all of the objections and debates on all the proposed sites I feel that they are well placed to have a balanced, objective insight into the local plan, its proposed sites and the constrictions and issues with each one.

If they, having heard all the facts, have now voted, 7 to 4 to remove the site then I implore you to follow in their footsteps and approve the deletion of the Gritstone Rd / Pinewood Rd site from off the Local Plan.

To give you an overview, once again, of the myriad of issues relating to the Gritstone / Pinewood Rd site:

- **Loss of green field site, established trees and hedgerows as well as loss of wildlife habitat**
  Below is a list of wildlife spotted at the Gritstone Rd site. Please send us more for both sites and we’ll add them in.
- Pipistrelle bats – hunting ground and roosts in local trees
- Badgers
- Foxes
  Many birds including, particularly of note:
• Reed Bunting, Bull Finch, Meadow Pipit, Dunnock, Housemartin, Kestrel, Swift, Black headed gull, Snipe and Mallard have been spotted in the site – all of which are on the British Trust for Ornithology “birds of conservation concerns ed 4” “Birds of Conservation Concern – Amber List for Species in Decline”

• Fieldfare, Merlin, Woodwarbler, Cuckoo, Starling, Song thrush, Missle thrush, House Sparrow, Linnet, Yellowhammer and Redwing have been spotted in the site – all of which are on the British Trust for Ornithology “birds of conservation concerns ed 4” “Birds of Conservation Concern – Red List for Species in Severe Decline”

• Siskin, Redpoll, Brambling, Blue Tit, Coal Tit, Great Tit, Long Tailed Tit and most common UK finches all year on the site and in surrounding gardens

• Raven, Buzzard, Kestrel, Sparrow Hawk, Hobby, Tawny owl and other hunderines (swift, swallow, house and sand martin)

• Many UK bee species.

Loss of such habitat is contrary to the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework which states that the planning system should:

“Contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
– recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
– minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.” P26/27 NPPF

• Road safety – The proposals would result in potentially hundreds if not thousands of extra traffic movements each day on small, already congested, residential roads. This increases the danger for residents, especially children and the elderly. We have all seen the report that predicts total chaos on Matlock’s roads if all developments go ahead. A 100% increase on Bank Road, 106% on Chesterfield Rd - all this on top of junctions that are already at capacity and a town that already grinds to a halt at peak times and holiday season.

• School pupil safety – Pupils from Highfields school walk along Chesterfield Road, many of them are dropped off on Wolds Road and also get the school bus from stops close to the proposed accesses to the new development site. The increased traffic will severely impact on their safety especially when you consider the cumulative effect of traffic from other proposed developments at Asker Lane and Moorcroft that will all exit onto Chesterfield Road.

• Accessibility to proposed site – There is no direct access to the development site. Does this mean they will allow existing properties to be knocked down to facilitate access or persuade people to sell swathes of garden?

• Access from new site onto existing road network. We all know how hard it is to get onto Chesterfield Road and Wellington Street during peak rush hour. Hundreds, if not 1000’s of extra traffic movements will create a backlog of traffic that stretches back along all roads. There is already a serious question mark over
developers being able to achieve the required visibility at the Wolds Rd / Chesterfield Rd junction. Again this would require existing homeowners to sell land in front of their homes to allow developers to create the necessary “visibility splays”

- **Site on the fringe of town in elevated location** – The dales population is forecast to be an ageing one, therefore putting housing at one of the highest points above the town centre is not sensible or feasible for that target audience. DCCC ‘Your Local Plan, Nov 2015’ clearly states: “A 43% increase in people aged 60 or more, but the biggest change will come in the 75+ age group, where an 88% increase is forecast”

Residents of any age without cars will be effectively stuck as public transport is not frequent and Gritstone road in particular is virtually inaccessible during bad weather as the site is above the snow line. Not to mention that the severe gradient of the hill from the town centre to the new development is simply insurmountable for older people. This year Bank Road was a stage in the Aviva Women’s Cycle Tour and was described as "brutal" by pro athletes! – not exactly an easy, 20 minute walk to amenities is it?!

- **Sustainable Transport usage** – The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 says: “In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.”

In that case the sites behind Gritstone Road and Pinewood Road are certainly not the right sites – their elevated situation, and tendency to become snow bound, means that car ownership is absolutely necessary in winter. That means that any development here is effectively encouraging increased use of the least sustainable method of transport.

- **Drainage / Flooding** – Gritstone Road, Bentley Close, Amberdene and other areas close to the proposed sites already have problems with run-off water from the proposed site which is consistently boggy and water logged, even in summer.

The SHLAA 225 site is covered in natural springs and there is a long history of homes in the vicinity being flooded, on some occasions garages and gardens have been filled with sewage.

The Environment Agency’s own website clearly shows that the site is a high risk of flooding from standing water in at least three places.

Several existing houses are already built on rafts due to the wet nature of the site and other properties have suffered subsidence and are underpinned due to sodden clay.

Building on the site will cause even more problems with flooding for existing properties and could even impact on home insurance in the future.
Developers may claim to be able to “mitigate” drainage, but you only need to look at the drainage that was required at the Morledge development at Darley Dale (approx 200 new homes).

These are huge drains that run under the A6 and expel water into a field at the other side. This is for a development half the size of the one proposed here. Where on earth are they proposing these drains to be installed and where will all the run off water go?!

- **Distance and gradient from amenities** – The site’s assessment rather disingenuously claim a “10-20 minutes walk, approx. 1200m to local shopping centre on Smedley street” again this conveniently ignores the hill gradient (that formed part of this year’s Aviva Women’s Cycle Tour).

- **Pollution impacts on health** – 100s of extra traffic movements will produce more exhaust fumes and pollution, especially as they sit stationary while attempting to access the main road. This will have a negative impact on the health of existing householders as this traffic will queue past existing homes on all surrounding roads. This will particularly impact on the very young, elderly and anyone with compromised health.

- **Expanding the boundary of Matlock** – The Gritstone Road / Pinewood Rd proposal is an extension to the very edge of the current Settlement Framework Boundary. This will set a precedent for future expansion and development into further green field sites.

- **Jobs for new house holders** – There are no large scale employment opportunities in Matlock. The main employer – the county council – is contracting not expanding. This development will house people commuting to nearby towns and cities, effectively creating a dormitory town of residents with little engagement or affiliation to Matlock itself.

- **Schools / medical facilities for new house holds** – An influx of additional school age pupils will cause overcrowding issues with existing schools and there are no sites available to build a new school. Existing GPs already struggle to cope, I have personally sat and waited for a “sit and wait” appointment for two and a half hours at the Imperial Road surgery.

- **Disruption during build and Disruption / damage to existing house foundations from heavy plant machinery.** Given that there is already a history of subsidence with properties on Gritstone Road any development directly behind existing homes may acerbate this issue.

We should be looking to ensure that all brownfield sites are developed before any greenfield. We know that given a chance, developers will cherry pick the greenfield sites above all others.
Again the NPPF states that the planning system should “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value” p6 NPPF

Thank you for your time and I hope that you will support the removal of this site from off the draft local plan for the many valid reasons listed above.

Yours sincerely

Colleen Marples
Information for Planning meeting 2016-08-04

Dear Councillor,

Reference to the Council meeting of July 27th, specifically the development of Pinewood/Gritstone Road site.

I was pleased to note that the Advisory Committee had voted against the inclusion of this land in the recommendations for residential development.

I have continually written my objections to this development with many reasons, but specifically the flooding issues from the natural springs across all that area and the road traffic problems that will undoubtedly be profound with the development of a complete new housing estate and its subsequent vehicular increase.

As a councillor you have a duty to serve your public and leave a positive legacy for future generations which hopefully you can be proud of. I worked for the DCC for over 20 years and always felt it was my duty to leave a positive legacy for those I was responsible for and I hope I did.

I hope you will see that you MUST leave a positive legacy by keeping the land above Pinewood/Gritstone Road as it is, a GREENFIELD landscape for future generations.

Regards
Wendy Marples
MATLOCK TOWN COUNCIL

RESPONSE TO THE LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

This Council feels that overall there has been too much emphasis on the search for housing sites which has been reactive and not proactive. Housing provision needs to be related to employment to minimise journeys to work. The new village idea should be actively pursued.

More owners should have been approached for sites rather than waiting for bids. It appears that some sites have been rejected which should perhaps have been included thus reducing the pressure to build on Greenfield sites. Greenfield sites appear to have been selected just to ‘make up the numbers’; the emphasis should be on developing Brownfield sites before Greenfield ones.

Matlock is taking more than its fair share of housing numbers and is developed already almost up to its capacity. The difficult topography of Matlock has not been taken into account compared with the southern dales which in our opinion are better suited to housing development. More houses should and could be built in Cawdor Quarry and perhaps Harveydale Quarry.

The Gritstone Road/Pinewood Road site (HC2v) should be deleted from the draft local plan for the following reasons:

1. **Road safety** – The proposals would result in potentially 100s of extra traffic movements each day on a small, essentially cul de sac residential road. This increases the danger for residents, especially children and the elderly.

2. **Access and visibility** – It is already difficult to exit Gritstone Road out onto Chesterfield road in the morning. 100s of extra vehicle movements will make the situation even worse.

   Previous planning applications for this site have failed due to the inability to provide safe visibility at the Wolds Road / Chesterfield Road junction.

   Even though the speed limit on Chesterfield Road has been reduced in the intervening years, the volume of traffic is now far higher.

   School children also use Chesterfield Road to get to Highfields School meaning that there are lots of young people using the pavement at peak times. This adds to the lack of visibility for drivers and increases the risk to pedestrians. Parents also use Wolds Road to drop off children.

   Cavendish Road is a one way street because of all the parked cars. Travelling along it is virtually impossible. It cannot take the extra traffic generated by the proposed quantity of houses.

3. **Site on the fringe of town in elevated location** - We suggest that this is certainly not the right site, as its elevated situation, and tendency to become snow bound, means that car ownership is absolutely necessary in winter; any development here is effectively encouraging increased use of the least sustainable method of transport.
Steepness of both Chesterfield Road and Bank Road preclude visiting the town centre on foot adding to the number of car journeys.

4. **Drainage / Flooding** – Gritstone Road and Bentley Close already have problems with run-off water from the proposed site which is consistently boggy and water logged, even in summer.

The site is covered in natural springs and there is a long history of homes in the vicinity being flooded, occasionally garages and gardens have been filled with sewage.

Several existing houses are already built on rafts due to the wet nature of the site. Building on the site will cause even more problems with flooding for existing properties.

Despite this DDDC maintain that the site is at “no risk from flooding” and has ranked the site accordingly on the draft Local Plan site assessment.

Photographic and video evidence proves that the site is at high risk of flooding from standing water. A fact that is backed up by the Environment Agency’s own online maps. See evidence - [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e8L5f_gW7VE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e8L5f_gW7VE)

It is claimed that developers can “mitigate” any drainage issues but there seems to be no evidence of how that would actually be achieved.

5. **Light pollution** – affecting current households.

Any development could significantly extend light pollution on the north edge of Matlock, “Planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation”. **P29 NPPF**

6. **Noise pollution** – affecting current households – Development would cause significant visual and noise related disruption to existing resident for many years. The NPPF states that the planning system should enhance the local environment by “preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability” **P26 NPPF**

   and

   “Planning policies and decisions should aim to avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development” **P29 NPPF**

7. **Expanding the boundary of Matlock** – This site is an extension to the very edge of the current Settlement Framework Boundary. This will set a precedent for future expansion and development into further green field sites.

8. **Loss of privacy for current residents (overlooked both ways)** The development will be very close to existing properties. There would be no way to avoid loss of privacy, loss of light and loss of visual amenity for all concerned.

9. **Employment opportunities** – There are no large scale employment opportunities in Matlock. The main employer – the County Council – is contracting not expanding. People will seek employment outside the town, leading to increased commuting by car.

10. **Local infrastructure** – Pressure on local schools, doctors surgeries and other health services.

11. **Loss of green field site, established trees and hedgerows as well as loss of wildlife habitat**

    Below is a list of wildlife spotted at the Gritstone Rd end of the site.
- Pipistrelle bats – hunting ground and roosts in local trees
- Badgers
- Many UK bee species.
- Hedgehogs
- Foxes
- Many birds

Loss of such habitat is contrary to the NPPF which states that the planning system should: “Contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils; recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.” P26/27 NPPF

12. **Use Brownfield Sites before Greenfield Sites** - As mentioned above, we should be looking to ensure that all brownfield sites are developed before any Greenfield. Again the NPPF states that the planning system should “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value” p6 NPPF

13. **Previous Applications for this Site have been Refused** as it is:-
   - In an exposed position
   - Visually damaging intrusion
   - Poorly related to the settlement pattern
   - Inconvenient access to facilities
   Nothing has changed.

14. **Garden Grabbing** – In principle there should be no building in residential gardens, however each application should be considered on merit.

15. **Objectives of Draft Local Plan** – Protecting Derbyshire Dales Character:
   - **SO1**: To protect and enhance the Green Infrastructure Network.
   - **SO2**: To maintain, enhance and conserve the areas distinct landscape characteristics, biodiversity, and cultural and historic environment.
   - **SO3**: To ensure that design of new development is of high quality, promotes local distinctiveness and integrates effectively with its setting.
   - **SO4**: To protect and enhance the character, appearance and setting of the District’s towns and villages.
   - **SO11**: To promote the efficient use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings whilst minimising the use of greenfield land.
   - **SO13**: To increase the opportunities for travel using sustainable forms of transport by securing improvements to public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure.

The inclusion of this site is against all these Objectives of the Plan. It should not be included.
Kitchen, Danielle

From: Committee
Sent: 02 August 2016 09:27
To: Planning Policy at Derbyshire Dales
Subject: FW: iam emailing to urge you to take gritstone / pinewood rd of the local plan. we live on smedley st this will have a big impact on us with the

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: jacqueline_pearson@sky.com [mailto:jacqueline_pearson@sky.com]
Sent: 01 August 2016 20:45
To: Committee
Subject: iam emailing to urge you to take gritstone / pinewood rd of the local plan. we live on smedley st this will have a big impact on us with the massive influx of extra traffic106% increase why don't you put all the 430 homes on cowdor quarry,let William davis have the problems not the people of matlock who you all represent.we urge you take this site of the local plan once and for all
Dear Sirs/Madam

Just a quick email/reminder in relation to the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan whereby Gritstone Road/Pinewood Road, Matlock was deleted from the Plan at the Planning Committee last month, and whereby formal deletion will be voted on at the Council Meeting on Monday 8 August.

We would like to remind, and reiterate our objection (as below), you of all the objections which have been made against this site and hope that formal agreement from the Council to delete this site from the Plan on Monday evening is made in view of these objections and issues which have been previously/currently raised in relation to the site.

Regards

Sue, David and Callum Rose

From: Sue Rose
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2016 8:58 AM
To: localplan@derbyshiredales.gov.uk
Subject: Derbyshire Dales District Council - Local Plan - Objection to HC2(v) Gritstone Rd / Pinewood Road, Matlock

Please find below our objection to the above site which features within the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan:

Dear Sirs / Madams

We wish to lodge out objection via you in connection with site HC2(v) Gritstone Rd / Pinewood Rd being allocated as development sites within the local plan and make you aware of the following information/objection.

Traffic and road safety - in particular at rush hour (morning and afternoon) on a main road which also feeds into a busy local school and school children crossing the entrance currently on to Gritstone Road (Wolds Road), you currently struggle to get off the road as it is. The access onto Chesterfield Road would be much harder if this development goes through. Traffic counts have recently taken place by the Wolds Action Group at various junctions.

There is currently no access to this site - will there be a compulsory purchase order on certain properties to gain access - clarification is needed for residents.

Children currently play out quite safely at the moment on Gritstone Road and Bentley Close as traffic isn’t too much of a problem at the minute with residents and their visitors etc, but with a development of the size of the proposal this will no doubt change children playing out freely and riding their bikes and having fun.
Due to the elevated position of this area, residents will need a car/cars (most households have more than 1 car nowadays), and will not use sustainable transport, which won't be good for the environment. The area is also bad enough in bad weather and most residents are cut off in snow.

Flooding may be an issue as with all the wet weather we have had recently water has been running of this area of woods, and gushing down towards Wellington Street and would be a potential flood plane - we would imagine this would need further investigations at this time.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e8L5f_gW7VE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e8L5f_gW7VE)

Please click on the above link re evidence of flooding off Gritstone Fields onto Amberdene, Matlock/Wellington Street where the proposed development HC2 (v) Gritstone Road/Pinewood Road will affect. Film footage taken on bank holiday Monday, 28 March 2016 at approximately 9.30am by ourselves.

Loss of wildlife habitat - we have foxes, badgers and hedgehogs roaming around and have had all of these in and around our garden and this development would end all of these for these lovely creatures. Last night when we walked up Sandy Lane and we could hear cuckoos.

Also in relation to Cavendish Park - traffic is dreadful in and around this area as one way in and one way out and at weekends when Cavendish Fields is being used for football related activities, traffic comes to a standstill (particularly on a Saturday morning) and residents are already in uproar about this.

Regards
The Rose Family - Sue, David and Callum,
After reading the article on the Matlock Mercury website I was so pleased to hear/read the vote of 7 against 4 for the objection of the planning. Councillor Rose has done his job so efficiently, that is of course why we all voted to put him into seat for our council, RIGHT??!! Well no sorry very WRONG. Councillor Rose is all about numbers, the little numbers game rises its ugly head yet again, and it isn’t in our favour as expected, our councillor doing what’s best for our beautiful countryside, NO he thinks it needs to be made into a concrete jungle, but obviously not on his doorstep, could our Councillor Rose be receiving a few back handers I hear everyone say? Well enough about my moan of him doing a great favour for us all, but does he really think we would vote again for his lack of empathy towards his numbers game? Not only would we have an excessively large increase in traffic on such small roads, which can barely cope with the volume now, let alone with another 500+ homes they wish to build, but the traffic on Bank Road and Chesterfield Road there would be an increase of 100% and 39% or more at Crown Square, again another mistake of closing the bridge, more build up of traffic!! I am also led to believe that certain houses on Gritstone Road and Bentley Close can’t get insurance with the Halifax because of the flooding that exists now, let alone when more properties are built. We would see a decline of the wildlife that we all see in the fields at the back of Gritstone Road, such as the badgers, hedgehogs, bats and even the red kites!! So surley the numbers game should come in here, we don’t want to see these numbers decline or is this ok, for our children growing up in areas surrounded by no wildlife, busy small congested roads, flooded constantly by our wonderful british weather? Why not build on Cawdor quarry, where this wouldn’t interfere with anyone’s view, or cause any congestion, especially with the road that caters with all Matlock traffic now, a perfect area, it could even be named as a new village!! Please support the people of Matlock who are against the building of any houses on this site (Gritstone / Pinewood Road), NOT William Davies homes.

Its about time we the residence were listened to, nobody wants all of this destroyed to make way for more and more houses when there are other sites which are just as suitable if not more to cater for all of Councillor’s Rose’s numbers!!! Please listen to our valid reasons why this, Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road site is not the most suitable and relocate all of these plans to another site, not bothering anyones views or taking any wildlife and roads built for more traffic!!!

Many thanks Joanne Shaw.
From: Chris Thompson  
Sent: 02 August 2016 18:08
To: Hase, Mike
Subject: PINEWOOD ROAD /GRITSTONE ROAD. HC2 (U) DS4

A Health and Safety Disaster Just Waiting To Happen:-
POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

500 HOUSES/1000 COUPLES/ 1000 CHILDREN / 500 to 700 CARS.
Add the above to the 300 cars that already use these exits.
All the above with exits from Gritstone Road / Wolds Road to the Chesterfield Road.
This increase in traffic coming out onto an already busy road.
1000 vehicles per hour at peak.
The school children coming to Highfield School all pass the above exit roads.
To make the decision to carry out this housing policy would be a decision to put children's lives at risk!
You are responsible for keeping the people of Matlock safe.
You are also responsible for keeping Matlock flood free.
If this development is allowed no "mitigation" will stop natural springs appearing. Already our houses and gardens flood and the builders will only exacerbate an already risky situation and they will not care!

PLEASE DON'T ALLOW THIS TO GO AHEAD

Alan & Chris Thompson  02.08.2016
Objection to the proposed development of the Gritstone Road/ Pinewood Road Site

On Wednesday, 27th July, a significant number of Councillors voted in favour of withdrawing this site from the Local Plan.

This outcome reflects the view - generally held by local residents - that the site is totally unsuitable for development for a whole host of reasons, ranging from traffic and highway infrastructure problems to sensitive landscape issues and its exposed, relatively inaccessible location. The site is within convenient commuting distance of Chesterfield, but the distance of much of the site from principal-route bus stops would severely limit the use of public transport. Furthermore, the exceedingly hilly nature of the local topography actually discourages walking and cycling. As a consequence of these factors, development here would positively encourage the use of the private car on a large scale. Such development must surely be considered as ‘unsustainable’.

Another aspect of the proposed Gritstone/Pinewood development is the adverse impact it would have on the sensitive local landscape. According to the Matlock Bridge Conservation Area Character Appraisal (page 32), ‘it was the blight of large scale quarrying and its associated traffic that prevented Matlock from being included in the Peak District National Park’. Since the Matlock quarries (Cawdor, Hall Dale & Harvey Dale) are now closed, it could be argued with some justification that the town should be within the Peak Park. The Local Plan Revised Policies Document doesn’t quite go that far, but it does say that development should protect what it calls the ‘outstanding universal value of the Derwent Heritage site and its buffer zone’. The scenery of this zone is stunning, from the Derwent Valley Heritage Site at Cromford, through Byron’s ‘Little Switzerland’, the Matlock Dale Gorge and the town centre (overlooked by the impressive hills of Ribert and Masson), to the delightful archeological gem of Lumsdale. This is the setting within which John Smedley has left his historic hydro legacy; a legacy which would be ruined not only by the large intrusive development itself, but also by the unprecedented increase in traffic that such development would cause. .....Yet another reason why the Gritstone/Pinewood site should be deleted from the Local Plan.

One site in Matlock which we suggest is appropriate for larger-scale residential development is Hall Dale Quarry. Unlike the Gritstone/Pinewood site, Hall Dale is sheltered, hidden, and well served by new roads and junctions which provide direct access to the A6 and the new Matlock-to-Bakewell cycle route. It is also much more convenient for the bus and railway stations. Although this site is larger than Gritstone/Pinewood, ‘only’ 220 dwellings have been allocated. Our suggestion is that its ‘mixed-use’ status is reclassified as ‘residential’ and the number of dwellings increased*. There are numerous quarries in the limestone area around Matlock and Wirksworth, many of which are either currently derelict or will be so in the future. These could be used as locations for commercial and industrial sites.

*When we made a similar suggestion many months ago, the response was that the ‘new’ town-centre relief road network was not designed to accommodate the increased volume of traffic generated by hundreds of houses – or words to that effect. In the light of what has happened since with regard to the proposed number of houses on the Gritstone/Pinewood site (where the highway approach network is exceedingly poor), this response seems unsatisfactory, to say the least.