SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING TO DISCUSS THE LOCAL PLAN

WEDNESDAY 16 MARCH 2016

REPRESENTATIONS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS
REPRESENTATION FROM BARRY NIXON

Objection to allocation of sites – Brailsford

Site references; SHLAA235 - SHLAA234
East of Throstle Nest Way / North of A52

Below are my reasons why the referenced sites should be removed from the proposed Derbyshire Dales Local Plan.

General points of rejection;
a. It is paramount importance that in meeting the development needs of the Derbyshire Dales care is taken to ensure the principles of sustainable development are met and that the communities well being is addressed.

b. Previous reviews have identified the need for employment land within Brailsford.
   Without this Brailsford will act as anything other than a dormitory village for Derby. Consequently any significant additional residential development within the settlement is likely to have an adverse impact upon the levels of sustainability.
   Development within Brailsford should therefore be carefully controlled.

c. Whilst Brailsford acts as a commuter village the current growth of the settlement in terms of patterns of sustainable development has already been unbalanced by the current school development of fifty homes.
   Any further development would place unsustainable pressure on the current facilities. As the words suggest ''settlements need time to settle''.

Specific points of rejection to the sites listed above;
a. Any development plan must consider the impact in reducing the consumption of Green Field sites.
   This development is on a Green Field site.

b. The proposed sites would result in the indiscriminate and obtrusive spread of unacceptable residential developments into open countryside.

c. The description of the setting is inaccurate. The site is on a hill and would be visually prominent over some distance from the east of the settlement.

d. The size/number of homes proposed is out of proportion (20%) to the current size of the settlement when considered together with other propose sites doubling the current size of Brailsford.

e. A seismic study of the ground structure needs to carried out due to the underground reservoir.
   Any structural movement to surrounding properties would result in a Consequential Claim for damages being made against Derbyshire Dales.

Hope these points help with your deliberations.
Regards Barry Nixon
I would like to oppose plans to build such a large number of new homes at Brailsford for the following reasons:

There are very few jobs actually in the village most people commuting to the nearest towns of Derby and Ashbourne via the A52. During the last 12 months there have been 12 fatal accidents on this road the more traffic you put on it the higher that number is going to rise. Also Derby city council are actively reducing work space parking and strongly discouraging cars being driven to work it is one of their major policies The bus service through Brailsford is only 1 per hour which is not flexible enough for people to use public transport as a viable alternative for commuting. People who buy new house need jobs to pay the mortgages on them.

Where are all of the children going to go to school? I assume the houses will be family sized the new primary school will straight away be too small and also the senior school at Ashbourne is already fully subscribed Again the public bus service Brailsford children have to travel on is standing room only so how are more children going to fair The situation is already putting children’s lives at risk by crowding on to the bus I dread to think what will happen if the bus is ever involved in a crash.

If other villages around Brailsford want to apply for new housing why are there applications being refused any lightening off the burden of your targeted villages would be helpful

Lastly it is not right to keep building on green belt these fields are farm land and should be kept that way. We are constantly told to recycle to conserve energy what is the point conserving recycling being green if you are going to put roads houses concrete over green belt land how are you conserving our countryside the animals in it and the ability to feed our growing population in the future it is narrow sited for us to rely on imported produce

There are lots of brown field sites in and around the town of Derby where jobs are without needing transport to get to them this is a far more environmentally friendly option than constantly tearing up beautiful country side Planning departments should develop the often run down unsightly brown fields sites first before turning to green belt.

Julie Coxon
Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Mr Hase

I am writing to you regarding the housing plans for Brailsford. We were prior to the recent development a village of some 200 houses which has grown and developed in recent years. Currently there are being built, or planning has already been passed for around 100 more houses, meaning the village will increased by 50%. There is a limit to the number of new homes a village can sustain, it's tipping point, which will change its nature, integrity and structure, which I feel should be maintained and i feel that the current housing plans for a 50% increase will meet this. Can you please explain what the decision making has been to decide that Brailsford can sustain further development with its current infrastructure. I am concerned that the infrastructure of the village will not be able to cope with any further development specifically; the sewerage system, the drains as the roads in the village are frequently flooded when it rains heavily with manholes being raised in the past with the volume of water, and water coming up the drains frequently and running down the roads in at least two directions into the centre of the village. The GP surgery has very little capacity for more patients without additional staffing - a problem for all GP surgeries currently with a national shortage of GP's therefore not a guaranteed solution. The new school currently under construction has places for 120 pupils this will not be enough if there is more development in the village. This will also have a knock on affect for secondary schools with the high level of development within the wider Ashbourne area. I understand there is nationally a shortage of homes, and that Derbyshire Dales has pressures to provide a set number of homes in the next few years, further complicated by the understandable restrictions within the National Park. I also understand there have been small planning requests from some villages who would welcome development on a small scale, which have been refused. Why? All communities need development to keep them viable and this is to be encouraged. However I feel any further development within the village of Brailsford will be detrimental to the current community instead of an asset, is unsustainable and as such should not be approved. Please could you keep me informed of any further developments regarding all further planning requests within the village of Brailsford.
Yours sincerely
REPRESENTATION FROM DAVID LONGSTAFF

Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Sir,

First of all I would like to register as a Consultee for the above Local Plan.

Secondly I would ask why Brailsford has been chosen for all this proposed development, the numbers involve would double the size of the village, which I suggest is not sustainable. The Parish Council suggested 50 additional to those that are already being built which the village could have dealt with but 100 plus!

What arrangement's have been made with other utility providers, such as water and sewerage. The small sewerage works at Brailsford is going to struggle to cope with what is already being built.

Then there is the question of the school, 120 places sounds great but with another 100plus houses that could increase the school population significantly, so the village are in the same problem as previously with not enough spaces.

The Health centre is yet another worry, the waiting time for appointments has increased significantly in recent times and with all this planned development the numbers of patients will increase yet again, if they can in fact be allowed to register with the Practice.

Parking for the current Health Centre is poor and that leads to roads in the area. A52 is a fast and dangerous road, yet you are putting further entrances and exits on to the road, never mind the increase in traffic that the Ashbourne Plans will have.

I have no doubt your answer will be that other agencies will be dealing with many of these issues but I would have expected the Local Planning Authority to have an holistic approach and cover all the angles.

The above are without the blot on the landscape that further development will give. Brailsford is a rural village and would like to maintain that outlook, not become a small town, with no real amenities.

Last year David Cameron said that one of the villages in his constituency should not have development if they did not want it, Brailsfords popualtion does not want all this development so why are we different from people in Oxfordshire?
I also understand that other smaller villages have been refused development Why?? some development is always needed to keep villages alive.
I have taken the liberty of copying this email to Mr Rose and Angus Jenkins(local representative on the Council)

Yours  David Longstaff
Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

It is well established that the burden of persuading a court to quash a decision of a local authority is a heavy one: a court will only intervene if the decision made is ill considered and irrational. However the proposed housing plan for Brailsford appears exactly that.

The existence of the National Park adjacent to our area means that the rest of the Derbyshire Dales area must accept proportionately more houses. That seems to be one unfairness, but, within the residual area Brailsford appears to suffer another unfairness: it is not an obvious “chocolate box” village, and seems to be paying a price for this.

The villages around with more obvious attractions (Shirley, Ednaston, Osmaston, Bradley, etc) are apparently not expected to accept new housing developments: and yet these same small villages often actually need more homes and inhabitants to maintain a viable village community, perhaps to keep a school, a pub or a shop in existence. I understand, however, that applications to build new housing in smaller villages have been turned down.

Brailsford inhabitants have been prepared to accept some new development. But the scale of possible development threatens to turn a village into a charmless small town of urban style housing and inadequate infrastructure. The A52 has long had a reputation as a dangerous road, with not infrequent fatalities; the proposed developments will add to already severe pressures in and at the junction of The Green (for the medical centre); and at the junction of Luke Lane, where the new school already built will substantially add to congestion when it opens. The old part of the village sits along the main road, often with narrow pavements, vulnerable to increasing traffic, noise and pollution.

The proposed developments in Brailsford do not meet identified housing need. Our area is acknowledged to contain relatively more older people, and future population projections confirm that this will become more pronounced. It is also known to be an area of high housing costs, unaffordable to the young, the single, and the more modestly paid.

We will find much more acceptable some new proposals to meet the needs of these groups.

Please consider me as a consultee in future applications and proposals.
REPRESENTATION FROM DIANE MINSHALL

Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Sir

I am writing to express my concern at the plans I have seen for the development of Brailsford, the village I have lived in for 25 years.

I understand that three sites have been “earmarked” for development under the SHLAA process, with potential for 104 houses, as shown on your plans. In addition to this I understand that there are applications for:

- 60 houses in the field on Luke Lane to the North of the village and
- 20 houses on the site of the old cheese factory.

I further understand that there is an application for 75 houses on one of the sites earmarked for development under the SHLAA which is shown on your plans as being a site for just 32 dwellings. This increases the number of houses proposed to 227.

At present our village contains around 200 houses. The development already in progress or approved totals almost 100 dwellings, increasing the size of our community by almost 50%. These new proposals, if they go ahead will bring the number of houses to over 500. An increase of 150% in a very short space of time. Although I appreciate the problems faced by local authorities in complying with central government policies on housing development, I am extremely concerned that agreeing to so many large developments in our “peaceful, rural community”¹, will be unsustainable and will have a devastating effect on our community.

Firstly I would appreciate your comments on the capacity of the new school. It is being built with a capacity for 120 children, large enough for the number of children currently at the school and the children expected to arrive from the sites currently in development, although even these numbers are considerably larger than when I asked this question to planning officers in the past when only the 50 homes on the Miller Homes “Dales View” estate were being discussed. I understand that the new school is of modular design and can be extended to accommodate additional children.

However, when plans for the new school were put to us, in an attempt to persuade the village that it would be an asset, we were told that there would be outdoor facilities including two sports pitches which would be available for use by the village as well as the children attending the school. To accommodate all the children from the 227 houses listed above (as a starting point) additional classrooms will need to be built, which will remove at least a large part of the outdoor facilities.

It would seem that, with its modular design, the school, far from being the promised asset for our community, is in fact becoming a reason to promote further massive development with the associated erosion of our community. An increase of this size will exacerbate the
parking difficulties likely to arise from when the new school opens which are already of extreme to residents in the north western corner of the village.

There is, of course, also the question of secondary education when Queen Elizabtet's Grammar School is already under extreme pressure and faces enormous growth in numbers due to the large developments in Ashbourne.

These proposed developments, particularly the development of the old cheese factory and the field to the north of the village, will create an enormous increase in traffic at the junction of Luke Lane and the A52. The nearby junction with The Green (which will also become busier as new residents use the medical centre) serves to make the situation even more dangerous. This junction is already very dangerous with limited visibility, large volumes of traffic including HGVs and fast traffic on the A52, a situation which will soon be exacerbated by the increase which will result from the opening of the new school. Can you explain how traffic difficulties in the village, and in particular on the A52 and at this junction will be mitigated to avoid compromising safety?

It would appear that the proposed developments will be large scale “estate style” developments, similar in style to those currently being constructed near Mackworth and at Radbourne Gate on the outskirts of the city, which I do not consider are suitable for a village situation where the character, landscape and integrity of the current community should be maintained so that the rural nature of the district as a whole is retained. I am particularly concerned about the development of the field to the north of the village which would significantly extend the boundaries of the village. I see this as dangerous precedent to set.

I am sure that many residents would accept, or even welcome, some development in our village. I know of several people who live in houses too large for them now that their families have grown up and left but there are very few smaller properties in the village. There is very little truly affordable housing for young families, very little social housing and very little housing for elderly or disabled residents. Can you tell me what consideration is given to the nature of developments so that they fit the needs of communities rather than simply allowing the large scale urban developments which provide the highest profits for the developers but do nothing to enhance communities.

I would be really interested hear the logic behind recent decisions (I know of several) where smaller villages who actively want to add to their villages are refused. Many smaller villages want to grow their communities by attracting new residents on small developments to ensure the future of their existing facilities and to keep the villages alive. Derbyshire Dales has an ageing population and this can make smaller villages stagnate if new blood is not introduced. Small scale developments would also be most likely to encourage small local developers and builders to become involved, helping the local economy and retaining skills in our area. And yet several applications have been refused recently, which seems to indicate that this is a deliberate policy by our council. Such development in smaller villages would relieve some of the pressure on villages such as Brailsford to take such a large proportion of the development planned for this southern part of Derbyshire Dales.
I would like you to register that I wish to be considered as a formal respondent to any future consultation and that I am notified when the consultation is underway.

Yours sincerely

Diane Minshall

1. Miller Homes sales publicity for Dales View.
REPRESENTATION FROM EMMA THACKER

Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Mr Hase

Thank you for your time during our telephone conversation last week. My family have lived in Brailsford since the 1960’s. I went to Brailsford School and QEGS. I have fond associations with the village and its community and care about it. I have experience in master planning communities.

I would like to object for any further planning applications for housing estates to be passed with immediate effect. The process to date I believe is flawed from a supply and demand standpoint.

We do not need any additional housing for Brailsford other than that agreed to through consultation with the parishioners over the past 3 years of process. Brailsford should not have to pay the price for housing need elsewhere in the Dales. We are the Gateway to the Peak, not an arterial route to a centre of employment. There are brownfield sites available in the plan period to 2032 which may subsequently become available e.g. quarries which can provide additional housing if required. Why the gold rush?

I would like to be a consultee and be kept informed by e mail of all future planning applications. I would like to have permission to speak and raise a question at the forthcoming meeting in respect of housing needs and allocation for Brailsford.

As regards Highway Infrastructure, I understand the highway issue, although very important, is not supported by the Highway Authority who are of the opinion that S106 contributions can be used to improve the all-important junction of Luke Lane and the A 52. I disagree. If they are in future found to have failed in their duty to provide adequate infrastructure, I hold the Highways Authority accountable in law for not having correctly assessed the true cause and effect and will be negligent in not undertaking due diligence in assessing the expansion of where the traffic is coming from. i.e. overspill from M1 j 29 to 23A; and a38/A50 which is forcing major hauliers and couriers who have advances logistics and utilise Luke Lane as a cut through.

The Peak Park has some 3 million visitors per year. The Derby - Ashbourne route is highly seasonal. What traffic surveys have been undertaken to assess the bottlenecks on Friday afternoons, Bank Holidays, Monday mornings from 7-10am?

I contest that this is insufficient and no highway study has been transparent to the community. What I understand is that the scope of the highway authority has not gone deep or wide enough over the plan period.

I would like to have a copy of all the DCC reports in respects of the impact of existing and proposed development.

I have further concerns, not least the environmental impact and effect on tourism which I will no doubt address later during the consultation period.

Thank you, Emma L Thacker MRICS MBA (Chicago Booth)
Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Mr Hase

Draft Local Plan – Proposals for Housing Development

I am a resident of the village of Brailsford living in Saracens Court and I am writing to express my alarm and concern about the scope and nature of proposals relating to Brailsford, which have been published to date.

In addition to the 50 homes approved for Miller Housing, over the last year some additional 25 homes have been approved within the village with a further 20 in the pipeline, including an application by Miller Homes for a further 20 houses on the Old Cheese Factory site adjacent to Luke Lane. I believe that this land has previously been designated as Employment Land and new local jobs are needed in the village. These approvals already represent a c50% growth in the size of our village.

Published documents suggest that the Council is proposing an allocation of c100 more homes, and from approaches made by developers this could rise to around 200 plus. This will have a very significant impact on the character of our community, much more than doubling the size of the village in a very short space of time. Also of concern is that the proposed developments are for large standard estates more suited to an urban environment, and despite reservations raised to the Council by landscape experts, appear to take no account of the preservation of the local environment or landscape character. Neither do they recognise the traffic implications – volumes and related road safety issues. Traffic remains a major concern for residents.

While I accept that some further development may be necessary in the village as the Council plans to meet its housing allocation targets, this should be at a much smaller scale and consistent with maintaining the character and integrity of our village environment. Ahead of the formal consultation on the Council’s proposals, I would like to understand the rationale for the Authority’s current decisions and to make sure that your Local Plan Advisory Committee has taken full account of the expectations of residents which are currently being formulated in our Neighbourhood Plan. I should therefore like answers to the following:

1. What is the logic of the settlement hierarchy as set out in the DDDC core strategy which risks placing major developments in Brailsford, Doveridge and Hulland Ward, and the decision taken that there would be no new development in the smaller villages such as Wyaston, Shirley and Longford? (Despite a meeting held in Hulland Ward in the Autumn suggesting that some representatives of the smaller villages are seeking small scale development to keep their villages vibrant an application for a small development in Clifton was recently refused.)

2. The rationale for the density of allocation to Brailsford when c50 new homes only were proposed under the previous Local Plan - an additional 2000 to be found would therefore suggest an allocation of c30 only was needed. How is Brailsford now thought to
have sufficient amenity for an additional 200 homes? Who has decided this and what are the criteria for the decision?

3. In relation to 2 above, what account has been taken of new approvals since the last draft Local Plan? e.g. Cheese Factory, Main Road, equating to around an additional 50 with all infills the Cheese Factory - 20 homes and land at main Road - 15 homes, plus around 10 infills and 10 proposed retirement bungalows on The Green; thus double the expected requirement and equating to an already 50% increase in the size of the village.

4. The village integrity and structure needs to be maintained. The landscape does not lend itself to further major urban (estate development). What constitutes a 'tipping' point for the larger villages? i.e. the effective balance of new estate development (suitable for a town) and economic, social and environmental (sustainable development) which maintains the nature of a village.

5. How have the findings of the Landscape Sensitivity report 2015 by Wardell Armstrong been accommodated in relation to the expansion of the village? and particularly the site to the East of Throstlenest Way (SHLAA 235). The landscape assessment shows Amber for the Council’s preferred sites.

6. Why does SHLAA 235 (land to East of Throstlenest Way) remain an Option when it was apparently ruled out as unsuitable by the Council (including a clear statement by the Council Leader in the last consultation)?

7. What consideration is being given to additional demand for infrastructure including healthcare, sewage treatment and the management of flood risk? This latter issue is of particular concern to me following instances of localised flooding of existing properties from runs offs over this winter.

8. What criteria have been used to determine that there are no traffic and road safety implications resulting from the proposed new developments, especially the Luke Lane junction and the Main Road access adjacent to the pedestrian crossing?

9. What are the expectations for education. The new Brailsford School built for 120 was apparently based on 50 additional homes. Where will secondary education be provided?

10. Planning law suggests that all development should be sustainable. How will jobs be provided in Brailsford as the employment land allocation is likely to be removed?

11. What consideration is being given to additional demand for utilities including sewage treatment and the management of flood risk?

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence and confirm that it will be brought to the attention of the Local Plan Advisory Group.

I should also like you to register that I wish to be considered as a formal respondent to any future consultation and that we are notified when the consultation is underway.

Yours Faithfully Ian Ebblewhite
Dear Mr Hase,

Re: Proposed Housing Development for Brailsford

We completely recognise the need for additional housing across the whole of the country, and fully accept that local communities should be prepared to accommodate incremental growth as a contribution to government targets. However, we are strongly of the opinion that such growth should be gradual and equitable across all communities. The recent announcement of the revised plans for further development totalling up to 200 new dwellings in Brailsford appears ludicrous, raises a number of questions as to the rationale behind the proposals, and shows a total disregard for the retention of so many of the social amenities which characterise a village like Brailsford. We are sure the council is aware that the proposed volume of houses would effectively increase the population of the village by around 50%. It is inconceivable that, under such extreme pressure, the structure and distinctive character of the community could be preserved.

Looking at the recent history of planning for this area it is difficult to recognise any logical development of thought or process in arriving at the present situation. As examples we would cite the following:

Under the previous Local Plan Brailsford was allocated a total of 50 new dwellings. Thus, when the Plan was upped by a further 2,000, a pro rata figure of 30 would have appeared more appropriate for the village, not the 150 or so now tabled?

At the time of the last Consultation a statement was issued by the Council Leader stating that the land to the east of Throstle Nest Way (SHLAA236) was ruled out as being unsuitable for development - yet this has now miraculously become a suitable and viable option! What has changed?

The development of 50 houses in Luke Lane included the building of a new school, with sufficient capacity for the additional children expected by that development. That facility will be outdated within months should the current proposals go ahead. What provision is being planned to mitigate this?

With such an apparent lack of continuity in the planning process it is difficult to perceive any coherent thought by the Planning Department; it appears that numbers are just being dreamed up on an ad hoc basis. Who has decided that Brailsford has sufficient amenities for an additional 200 houses, and what is the rationale behind this? As someone was heard to say: "This seems more like dumping than planning!"
From our own perspective there are a number of specific issues of concern which the plans raise. But, for brevity, we will restrict our comments to just three:

1. There is NO doubt that the existing traffic infrastructure is totally inadequate for handling the additional volumes which the proposed development would bring. Even now at busy times the A52 pavements are so narrow and noisy that it’s unpleasant to walk to the Pub or Institute, and impossible to hold a conversation should you meet an acquaintance. In particular, access to the A52 would become more of a nightmare than it already is, and it promises to be almost impossible with all the extra traffic from new estates planned for Ashbourne and Radbourne.

2. It is essential that further development takes into account the need for smaller properties for younger families, and specialist housing for the older residents. This requirement rated high on the concerns of residents in the recent formulation of our Neighbourhood Plan. If we MUST have more extra housing then PLEASE would you allow the village to work with you and the planners to ensure new development takes detailed account of our Neighbourhood Plan.

3. We are told that any form of development within National Parks is totally out of the question, and therefore greater allocation falls on areas outside the Parks. However, there are many smaller communities and villages which, for the sake of sustainability and vibrancy, would welcome restricted development. Why has more attention not been given to such proposals?

In summary we would iterate our earlier comments: we are not opposed to some controlled gradual development as a means of easing the country’s housing crisis; we ARE opposed to the pure volume of houses proposed for this village. Bearing in mind the quoted planning policy of “Protecting the character and local distinctiveness of the villages and hamlets”, a population explosion of this magnitude could not possibly be absorbed, and would inevitably have a detrimental affect on the community as a whole.

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence and confirmation that it will be brought to the attention of the Local Plan Advisory Group.

Also, we should like you to register that we wish to be considered as formal respondents to any future consultation, and request that we are notified when the consultation is underway.

Yours sincerely,

John & Sue Cowdery
REPRESENTATION FROM JUDITH PUGSLEY

Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Mr Hase

I live in Brailsford and am worried about recent housing proposals for this village that I have lived in for over 20 years.

Miller Housing are building 50 homes; in the last year some 25 additional homes have been approved, with a further 20 in the pipeline. Miller Homes have applied to build a further 20 houses on the Old Cheese Factory site in Luke Lane. These approvals already represent a 50% growth in the size of Brailsford.

We now learn from published documents that the Council proposes an allocation of another 100 homes. From approaches made by developers this could even rise to 200 plus. This would double the size of Brailsford in a very short time. The proposals are generally for large standard estates that are not in keeping with a rural village. The traffic implications are deeply worrying: the A52 is already a very busy road, with all too frequent accidents, and fatalities; the junction at Luke Lane would be under severe pressure. There is a lot of housing along the main road, with little to screen it from increasing noise and pollution.

Most people in the village accept that there has to be some extra housing here. But if the above proposals are accepted we would pass a tipping point whereby Brailsford was no longer a pleasant rural village, but a small town of rather characterless estates, with insufficient infrastructure. Moreover, the housing need that exists here is clearly for more housing for the elderly and for affordable smaller homes. Our local population is an ageing one. Brailsford needs much more provision for old and young, but not the 4 and 5 bedroomed homes beloved of developers, that are beyond the reach of those on average salaries.

Brailsford and other larger villages in the area appear to be being penalised disproportionately because the National Park is excluded from development plans. But is also seems to be at risk because smaller villages are being excluded from development. Why should this be? Smaller villages often want at least a few more homes, to maintain the shop, school and the life of the village. Is it that developers do not want to be bothered with small scale developments through a wider area, even though this would be much more acceptable to most of us?

Our medical centre certainly cannot cope with many more people; already the parking in The Green is a major problem, creating dangers at the junction with The Green, where traffic is reduced to one carriageway.

I would wish to know what are the criteria by which it has been decided that Brailsford might be able to absorb a further 200 homes. Who is making the decisions? For those of us labouring to create a Neighbourhood Plan, there is a disheartening sense that consultation is little more than a sham, and that goal posts keep moving.

I would be grateful if my letter could be brought to the attention of the Local Plan Advisory Group. I wish please to be considered a formal respondent to any future consultation, and to be notified when the consultation is underway.

Yours sincerely

Judith Pugsley
Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

As a resident of the village of Brailsford I am writing to express my concern about the proposals relating to Brailsford which have been published to date.

In addition to the 50 homes approved for Miller Housing, over the last year some additional 25 homes have been approved within the village with a further 20 in the pipeline, including an application by Miller Homes for a further 20 houses on the Old Cheese Factory site adjacent to Luke Lane. This land has previously been designated as Employment Land: new local jobs are needed in the village. These approvals already represent a c50% growth in the size of our village.

Published documents suggest that the Council is proposing an allocation of c100 more homes, and from approaches made by developers this could rise to around 200 plus – more than doubling the size of the village in a very short space of time. Also of concern is that the proposed developments are for large standard estates more suited to an urban environment, and despite reservations raised to the Council by landscape experts, appear to take no account of the preservation of the local environment or landscape character. Neither do they recognise the traffic implications – volumes and related road safety issues. This is a major concern for residents.

While I accept that some further development may be necessary in the village as the Council plans to meet its housing allocation targets, this should be at a much smaller scale and consistent with maintaining the integrity of the village environment. Ahead of the formal consultation on the Council’s proposals, I would like to understand the rationale for the Authority’s current decisions and to make sure that your Local Plan Advisory Committee has taken full account of the expectations of residents which are currently being formulated in our Neighbourhood Plan. I should therefore like answers to the following:

What criteria have been used to determine that there are no traffic and road safety implications resulting from the proposed new developments, especially the Luke Lane junction and the Main Road access adjacent to the pedestrian crossing?

What consideration is being given to additional demand for utilities including sewage treatment and the management of flood risk?

Why does SHLAA 236 (land to East of Throstlenest Way) remain an Option when it was ruled out as unsuitable by the Council (including a clear statement by the Council Leader in the last consultation)?

How have the findings of the Landscape Sensitivity report 2015 by Wardell Armstrong been accommodated in relation to the expansion of the village and particularly the site to the East of Throstlenest Way (SHLAA 236). The landscape assessment shows Amber for the Council’s preferred sites?

Which statutory bodies will be consulted about the DDDC proposal and what weighting is given to their input?

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence and confirmation that it will be brought to the attention of the Local Plan Advisory Group.

I should also like you to register that I wish to be considered as a formal respondent to any future consultation and that I’m notified when the consultation is underway.

Regards, Mark Somerfield
REPRESENTATION FROM MARTIN PINK

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 235.

I would like to register my strong objection to the volume of proposed housing development that your council is proposing.

I believe that the quantity talked about will swamp the village and is certainly not sustainable development.

1. In earlier council plans when only 50 houses were proposed under, it was said that an additional 2000 homes had to be found in the DDDC area, which equates to 30 more houses. This does not correlate with the 200+ being currently talked about.

2. Already I believe that applications are currently in for some 55 more houses which will take the number of new houses to a 50% increase in the size of the village.

3. Has the DDDC bothered to think about such things as the size of the new school, which presumably is now far too small for the proposed increase in the village size. Has any provision been for pupils being dropped off by car, as I do not see any places provided at the moment.

4. I believe that the infrastructure of the village is not suitable to cope with the increase in size and would like to know if the sewerage treatment system is large enough. There have been several cases recently reported of developers just putting their heads in the sand and having sewerage overflow into villages. The council has a duty of care to prevent environmental disasters.

5. The proposed SHLAA235 is a big problem. There is already problems with flooding of existing properties from the run off from this area, which developing will only make worse. The field also has areas set aside for wild life, which the farmer/land owner already gets paid for no doubt. Development will destroy the habitat for a lot of bird and animals, which I find unacceptable.

6. Has road safety even been considered?

7. Who will be consulted about the DDDC proposal, and will any waiting at all be given to current residents?

I look forward to hearing back from you in due course.

Best regards

Martin Pink
REPRESENTATION FROM MARTIN PINK

Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Mr Hase

Draft Local Plan – Proposals for Housing Development

I send this by letter as my emails to you appear not to have got through.

I am a resident of the village of Brailsford living in Saracens Court and I am writing to express my alarm and concern about the scope and nature of proposals relating to Brailsford which have been published to date.

In addition to the 50 homes approved for Miller Housing, over the last year some additional 25 homes have been approved within the village with a further 20 in the pipeline, including an application by Miller Homes for a further 20 houses on the Old Cheese Factory site adjacent to Luke Lane. I believe that this land has previously been designated as Employment Land and new local jobs are needed in the village. These approvals already represent a c50% growth in the size of our village.

Published documents suggest that the Council is proposing an allocation of c100 more homes, and from approaches made by developers this could rise to around 200 plus. This will have a very significant impact on the character of our community, much more than doubling the size of the village in a very short space of time. Also of concern is that the proposed developments are for large standard estates more suited to an urban environment, and despite reservations raised to the Council by landscape experts, appear to take no account of the preservation of the local environment or landscape character. Neither do they recognise the traffic implications – volumes and related road safety issues. Traffic remains a major concern for residents.

While I accept that some further development may be necessary in the village as the Council plans to meet its housing allocation targets, this should be at a much smaller scale and consistent with maintaining the character and integrity of our village environment. Ahead of the formal consultation on the Council’s proposals, I would like to understand the rationale for the Authority’s current decisions and to make sure that your Local Plan Advisory Committee has taken full account of the expectations of residents which are currently being formulated in our Neighbourhood Plan. I should therefore like answers to the following:

1. What is the logic of the settlement hierarchy as set out in the DDDC core strategy which risks placing major developments in Brailsford, Doveridge and Hulland Ward, and the decision taken that there would be no new development in the smaller villages such as Wyaston, Shirley and Longford? (Despite a meeting held in Hulland Ward in the Autumn suggesting that some representatives of the smaller villages are seeking small scale development to keep their villages vibrant an application for a small development in Clifton was recently refused.)
2. The rationale for the density of allocation to Brailsford when c50 new homes only were proposed under the previous Local Plan - an additional 2000 to be found would therefore suggest an allocation of c30 only was needed. How is Brailsford now thought to have sufficient amenity for an additional 200 homes? Who has decided this and what are the criteria for the decision?

3. In relation to 2 above, what account has been taken of new approvals since the last draft Local Plan? e.g. Cheese Factory, Main Road, equating to around an additional 50 with all infills the Cheese Factory - 20 homes and land at main Road - 15 homes, plus around 10 infills and 10 proposed retirement bungalows on The Green; thus double the expected requirement and equating to an already 50% increase in the size of the village.

4. The village integrity and structure needs to be maintained. The landscape does not lend itself to further major urban (estate development). What constitutes a 'tipping' point for the larger villages? i.e. the effective balance of new estate development (suitable for a town) and economic, social and environmental (sustainable development) which maintains the nature of a village.

5. How have the findings of the Landscape Sensitivity report 2015 by Wardell Armstrong been accommodated in relation to the expansion of the village? and particularly the site to the East of Throstlenest Way (SHLAA 235). The landscape assessment shows Amber for the Council’s preferred sites.

6. Why does SHLAA 235 (land to East of Throstlenest Way) remain an Option when it was apparently ruled out as unsuitable by the Council (including a clear statement by the Council Leader in the last consultation)?

7. What consideration is being given to additional demand for infrastructure including healthcare, sewage treatment and the management of flood risk? This latter issue is of particular concern to me following instances of localised flooding of existing properties from runs offs over this winter.

8. What criteria have been used to determine that there are no traffic and road safety implications resulting from the proposed new developments, especially the Luke Lane junction and the Main Road access adjacent to the pedestrian crossing?

9. What are the expectations for education. The new Brailsford School built for 120 was apparently based on 50 additional homes. Where will secondary education be provided?

10. Planning law suggests that all development should be sustainable. How will jobs be provided in Brailsford as the employment land allocation is likely to be removed?

11. What consideration is being given to additional demand for utilities including sewage treatment and the management of flood risk?

Yours Faithfully

Martin Pink
Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Mike,

Please register me as a Consultee for the above and email me with any planning applications which precede the Local Plan adoption and any other relevant issues as it is further developed.

As you know we had a Parish meeting last night and there was a total rejection of the vast number of houses proposed for Brailsford.

I have been involved with highways and housing development for 45 years, and one is able to recognise when a major mistake is being made. Brailsford is totally unsuited to being expanded by 150% ie from 200 houses up to 500+. The Village will be completely destroyed and become a straggling connerbation.

More importantly the A52 is absolutely unsuited to this expansion. It is highly dangerous and if you take the stretch between Kirk Langley and Osmaston running through Brailsford, serious accidents have resulted in the following. In 2008 3 people were killed, the police will give deaths and injuries in 2009,10,11,12, and 13 then between 2014 and Jan 2016 there have been 3 people killed and at least 20 serious injuries. Not only the personal loss to families but the cost to the police, fire and ambulance service as well as the NHS is enormous.

By bringing at least 100 extra cars with the 70 houses now being built and potentially a further 250 cars with any additional housing, the risk of more accidents is increasing. All exacerbated by the rumoured 1,000 houses at Ashbourne. The increase will be well over 1,500 cars excluding public transport on the A52, so the cost of deaths and injuries especially will be enormous.

Our infrastructure cannot stand it and more deaths will be inevitable. Responsibility will clearly rest on the shoulders of Derbyshire Dales DC.

If common sense does not prevail we will ultimately have to take this matter legal to bring some sense to Derbyshire Dales. This would take into account the ridiculous idea of concentrating houses in one area when the High Peak National Park not only needs more housing but communities can be reborn from a sensible allocation of people who want to live there.

Also locally no allocation that I know of has been made in Osmaston, Shirley or Rodsley where land is available and if a further 50 houses in the locality were acceptable rather than 200 then these should be spread out.

Yours hopefully
Michael Cannon
Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Mr Hase

As a resident of the village of Brailsford I am writing to express my concern about the proposals relating to Brailsford which have been published to date.

In addition to the 50 homes approved for Miller Housing, over the last year some additional 25 homes have been approved within the village with a further 20 in the pipeline, including an application by Miller Homes for a further 20 houses on the Old Cheese Factory site adjacent to Luke Lane. This land has previously been designated as Employment Land: new local jobs are needed in the village. These approvals already represent a 50% growth in the size of our village.

Published documents suggest that the Council is proposing an allocation of 100 more homes, and from approaches made by developers this could rise to around 200 plus – more than doubling the size of the village in a very short space of time. Also of concern is that the proposed developments are for large standard estates more suited to an urban environment, and despite reservations raised to the Council by landscape experts, appear to take no account of the preservation of the local environment or landscape character. Neither do they recognise the traffic implications – volumes and related road safety issues. This is a major concern for residents.

While I accept that some further development may be necessary in the village as the Council plans to meet its housing allocation targets, this should be at a much smaller scale and consistent with maintaining the integrity of the village environment. Ahead of the formal consultation on the Council’s proposals, I would like to understand the rationale for the Authority’s current decisions and to make sure that your Local Plan Advisory Committee has taken full account of the expectations of residents which are currently being formulated in our Neighbourhood Plan. I should therefore like answers to the following:

1. The rationale for the density of allocation to Brailsford when 50 new homes only were proposed under the previous Local Plan - an additional 2000 to be found would therefore suggest an allocation of 30 only was needed.

2. In relation to 1 above, what account has been taken of new approvals since the last draft Local Plan, e.g. Cheese Factory, Main Road, equating to around an additional 50 with all infills the cheese factory - 20 homes and land at main Road - 15 homes, plus around 10 infills and 10 proposed retirement bungalows on The Green; thus double the expected requirement and equating to a 50% increase in the size of the village.

3. The village integrity and structure should be maintained. The landscape does not lend itself to further major urban (estate development). What constitutes a ‘tipping’ point for the larger villages, i.e. the effective balance of new estate development (suitable for a town) and economic, social and environmental (sustainable development) which maintains the nature of a village.

4. Why does SHLAA 236 (land to East of Throstlenest Way) remain an Option when it was ruled out as unsuitable by the Council (including a clear statement by the Council Leader in the last consultation?"

5. How is Brailsford thought to have sufficient amenity for an additional 200 homes. Who has decided this and what are the criteria for the decision?

6. Which statutory bodies will be consulted about the DDDC proposal and what weighting is given to their input?
7. What criteria have been used to determine that there are no traffic and road safety implications resulting from the proposed new developments, especially the Luke Lane junction and the Main Road access adjacent to the pedestrian crossing.

8. What are the expectations for education. The new Brailsford School built for 120 was apparently based on 50 additional homes. Where will secondary education be provided?

9. Planning law suggests that all development should be sustainable. How will jobs be provided in Brailsford as the employment land allocation is likely to be removed.

10. What consideration is being given to additional demand for utilities including sewage treatment and the management of flood risk?

11. A survey undertaken by the Parish Council as part of the development of the Neighbourhood Plan indicated that there was a demand for specialist accommodation for older residents (allowing them to downsize while staying within the village). What account has been taken of this requirement as current approved applications are for standard market housing?

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence and confirmation that it will be brought to the attention of the Local Plan Advisory Group.

I should also like you to register that I wish to be considered as a formal respondent to any future consultation and that we are notified when the consultation is underway.

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Mr R Hall
Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Mr. Hase,

Following last night's meeting, I have decided to write to you again, as I have on many occasions before, regarding the continued rampant and unwanted plans for the development of Brailsford - I say 'development of' rather than 'in' as the disproportionate amount of development proposed will develop the village, and its character, into something else entirely. Make no mistake, this is not a series of developments around the village, it is wholesale transformation.

I sincerely wish you, or indeed anyone from your department, had been at the meeting (I believe the invitation was made). My estimate is of around 300 people, with standing room only in the village hall - out of 200 households in the village, that is a clear representation of how strongly opposed the entire village is. I was under the impression that the local authority exists to service and represent its residents - why then, did your department not attend the meeting? More importantly, why does the authority continually and consistently ignore the opinions of those it is supposed to represent?

I understand that this is the start of a consultation process - please confirm that you will send me all correspondence connected with this matter.

I could write at length on a whole range of reasons why there should be no more development in our village - the surgery, which even now does not have enough doctors for the existing practice, the persistent flooding, strain on the sewage system, the destruction of Brailsford's character as a village, the additional traffic and junctions on an already extremely dangerous stretch of road (could you please confirm how many serious injuries or deaths you would require to officially recognise this?) the brand new school, which has space for only 40 more pupils (how many would 200 more homes generate?) Furthermore, a potential 200 extra homes, doubling the size of the village, is surely disproportionate. Since this is the size of an existing village, and new shops, school and medical facilities will be needed, why not create a new settlement, which will not upset anyone? The proposals are mainly in open countryside - so why not build in countryside elsewhere? Despite the authority's uninformed assertion that Brailsford will cope, it is blatantly obvious that the infrastructure to support the doubling of the village is simply is NOT there!

All these arguments have been made before... all have been duly ignored. The point I particularly want to make is a straightforward one, based on last night's meeting... quite simply, the residents as a whole don't want any more development! This is our home, our community - so why are our views being steadfastly ignored!? Why are we not being given a say in how much development is imposed upon us?

The process which preceded the Luke Lane development was a clear indication of how consultation works. When presented with development option A or B, villagers opposed both and now... have had both, plus the potential of several others imposed. Forgive me for having little faith in any forthcoming consultation process, as I fear it will be the same sham as previously.

One more new point - I note from your own Landscape Sensitivity Survey:
'6.3.43 The small field adjacent to Luke Lane is of low sensitivity, and the adjacent fields to the north and west are of medium sensitivity. The small fields to the south of the settlement are of low sensitivity. **All remaining land** surrounding the settlement is of high sensitivity.'

The land adj Throttle Nest and Alley Walk is to the East '... all remaining land...'; and clearly deemed of high sensitivity. This being the case, surely this makes the land unsuitable for development. If this point is ignored, then what was the point of commissioning a survey which denotes such land as of 'high sensitivity... to the character of the village'? Moreover, if land officially designated as high sensitivity IS now developed, surely that is concrete proof of the authority's complete disregard for the character of the village.

I look forward to your response.

P. Sharpe
Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

On March 2\textsuperscript{nd}, a community meeting was held, regarding the continued rampant and unwanted plans for the development of Brailsford - I say 'development of' rather than 'in' as the disproportionate amount of development proposed will develop the village, and its character, into something else entirely. Make no mistake, this is not a series of developments around the village, it is wholesale transformation.

My estimate, based on the rows of seating, is of around 300 people, with standing room only in the village hall - out of 200 households in the village, that is a clear representation of how strongly opposed the entire village is. I was under the impression that the local authority exists to service and represent its residents - why then, does the authority continually and consistently ignore the opinions of those it is supposed to represent?

I could write at length on a whole range of reasons why there should be no more development in our village - the surgery, which even now does not have enough doctors for the existing practice, the persistent flooding, strain on the sewage system, the destruction of Brailsford's character as a village, the additional traffic and junctions on an already extremely dangerous stretch of road, the brand new school, which has space for only 40 more pupils (how many would 200 more homes generate?) Furthermore, a potential 200 extra homes, doubling the size of the village, is surely disproportionate. Since this is the size of an existing village, and brand new shops, school and medical facilities will be needed, why not simply create a new settlement, which will not upset anyone? The proposals are mainly in open countryside - so why not build in countryside elsewhere? Despite the authority's uninformed assertion that Brailsford will cope, it is blatantly obvious that the infrastructure to support the doubling of the village is simply is NOT there!

On a personal note, the land North of Main Road is sharply elevated behind my home. Any development there will be level with our upper floor, having serious implications for our privacy and quality of life. Due to the design of the building, we are unable to screen our glassed areas. When applying for permission, we had to adhere stringently to the Planning department's stipulations to protect the privacy of neighbouring properties – why now is our privacy not being considered?

All these arguments have been made before... all have been duly ignored. The point I particularly want to make is a straightforward one, based on our community meeting... quite simply, the residents as a whole don't want any more development! This is our home, our community - so why are our views being steadfastly ignored!? Why are we not being given a say in how much development is imposed upon us?

The process which preceded the Luke Lane development was a clear indication of how consultation works. When presented with development option A (Luke Lane) or B (Land North Of Main Road/Throstle Nest Way), villagers opposed both and now... have had both, plus the potential of several others imposed. Forgive me for having little faith in any forthcoming consultation process, as I fear it will be the same sham as previously.

One more new point - I note from your own Landscape Sensitivity Survey:
'6.3.43 The small field adjacent to Luke Lane is of low sensitivity, and the adjacent fields to the north and west are of medium sensitivity. The small fields to the south of the settlement are of low sensitivity. All remaining land surrounding the settlement is of high sensitivity.'

The land adj Throttle Nest and Alley Walk is to the East '... all remaining land...', and clearly deemed of high sensitivity. This being the case, surely this makes the land unsuitable for development. If this point is ignored, then what was the point of commissioning a survey which denotes such land as of 'high sensitivity... to the character of the village'? Moreover, if land officially designated as high sensitivity IS now developed, surely that is concrete proof of the authority's complete disregard for the character of the village.

This land was refused for development last year as SHLAA234, as it was 'unsustainable' 'in the countryside' and 'unrelated to existing developments'. Why now, despite having no change in use or location, has this same area of land been approved as SHLAA235?

I emailed these questions to Mike Hase two weeks ago, as well as asking for confirmation that I would be a respondent in the ongoing process. As yet I have received no response – another indication that residents’ concerns are not being taken into account.

Regards
Paul Sharpe
REPRESENTATION FROM STEVE & GILLY WILMOT

Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Dear Mr Hase

*Draft Local Plan – Proposals for Housing Development*

As residents of the Parish of Brailsford we are writing to express our concern about the proposals relating to Brailsford, which have been published to date.

In addition to the 50 homes approved for Miller Housing, over the last year some additional 25 homes have been approved within the village with a further 20 in the pipeline, including an application by Miller Homes for a further 20 houses on the Old Cheese Factory site adjacent to Luke Lane. This land has previously been designated as Employment Land: new local jobs are needed in the village. These approvals already represent a c50% growth in the size of our village.

Published documents suggest that the Council is proposing an allocation of c100 more homes, and from approaches made by developers this could rise to around 200 plus – more than doubling the size of the village in a very short space of time. Also of concern is that the proposed developments are for large standard estates more suited to an urban environment, and despite reservations raised to the Council by landscape experts, appear to take no account of the preservation of the local environment or landscape character. Neither do they recognise the traffic implications – volumes and related road safety issues. This is a major concern for residents.

While we accept that some further development is desirable in the village as the Council plans to meet its housing allocation targets, this should be at a smaller scale and consistent with maintaining the integrity of the village environment. Ahead of the formal consultation on the Council’s proposals, we would like to understand the rationale for the Authority’s current decisions and to make sure that your Local Plan Advisory Committee has taken full account of the expectations of residents which are currently being formulated in our Neighbourhood Plan. We should therefore like answers to the following Points:

1. Recent Derbyshire Dales plans and planning decisions indicate that Brailsford, along with Hulland Ward and Doveridge, is intended to absorb a substantial proportion of the village-based development required over the next 20 years. We have failed to find a rationale for this allocation in the relevant Derbyshire Dales Documentation, as follows:

   a. The ‘Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Update 2013’ identifies land in Brailsford that ‘passes the filter’ (appendix 4). (Two maps of Brailsford are included in this document, and the land in question differs on the two maps, so one of these must presumably be superseded, or erroneous). The aforementioned filter evidently refers to a set of criteria presented in appendices 1 and 2 of the same document, which in turn enables the use of the ‘Site Assessment Sheet’ presented in appendix 1. However, there is no record of actual site assessment, so there is no information as to what, in substance, the choice of the Brailsford sites for development was based upon. Given the impact of these plans on the village, residents have a right to know the rationale for these choices in detail.

   In addition, the aforementioned allocation does not accord with two more recent Derbyshire Dales documents that purport to provide guidance on the location of new development

   b. The recent Derbyshire Dales district plan document ‘Settlement Hierarchy’ (October 2015) indicates that Brailsford scores relatively low on two of the three scores used, and there seems no justification on that basis for Brailsford absorbing such a high proportion of the total planned development in the district. The same document identifies other settlements with scores within a point or two of Brailsford where no development is planned at all.
c. The recent Derbyshire Dales document ‘Landscape Sensitivity Study (August 2015) identifies only a very limited amount of land in Brailsford that is of ‘low sensitivity’, (which might by that criterion be suitable for building). But recent projected building plans now extend onto land of medium sensitivity in the village. Meanwhile other villages with areas of low sensitivity land have no planned development at all.

The Consultants who authored the latter document seem to have understood that the landscape does not lend itself to further major urban estate development, and they mention a ‘tipping point’ which presently projected development would cross. At that tipping point the urban-style estate development overwhelms the economic, social and environmental sustainability of the village. This would convert the village into a detached suburb.

Further points are as follows:

2. c50 new homes only were proposed for Brailsford under the previous Local Plan. The revised Local Plan involves an additional 2000 to be found. A proportional allocation of this additional requirement to Brailsford would suggest an allocation of c30 was warranted.

3. In relation to 2 above, what account has been taken of new approvals since the last draft Local Plan? These amount to around an additional 50 houses.

4. A survey undertaken by the Parish Council as part of the development of the Neighbourhood Plan indicated that there was a demand for specialist accommodation for older residents (allowing them to downsize while staying within the village). What account has been taken of this requirement as current approved applications are for standard market housing?

5. What support will be provided for the greatly expanded village, in the following ways:

   a. What are the expectations for education. The new Brailsford School built for 120 was apparently based on 50 additional homes. Where will secondary education be provided?

   b. Planning law suggests that all development should be sustainable. How will jobs be provided in Brailsford as the employment land allocation is likely to be removed.

   c. What consideration is being given to additional demand for utilities including sewage treatment and the management of flood risk?

6. Finally, what criteria have been used to determine that there are no traffic and road safety implications resulting from the proposed new developments, especially the Luke Lane junction and the Main Road access adjacent to the pedestrian crossing.

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence and confirm that it will be brought to the attention of the Local Plan Advisory Group.

**We should also like you to register that we wish to be considered as formal respondents to any future consultation and that we are notified when the consultation is underway.**

Yours sincerely

Steve and Gilly Wilmot
REPRESENTATION FROM SUSAN & ROLPH WALKER

Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Proposed Housing Development for Brailsford

We are writing to express our concern about your current proposals for housing development relating to our village.

**The size of these sites**, which are outside the village boundary, is **out of proportion** to the village. We started with 247 homes in 2014, which includes the new homes in Saracen’s Court. There are now 50 new Miller Homes under construction on Luke Lane and another 50+ in the pipeline: 20 on the Old Cheese Factory site adjacent to Luke Lane, 15 on land between the funeral director and garage on the Main Road, 10 infills and 10 proposed retirement bungalows. This increases the village by roughly 45%. Together with the extra 150+ in these proposals it would more than double the size of the village.

We do not have the **infrastructure** to support any more development. It would be unsustainable:

**Education**, both primary and secondary. The primary school currently under construction will already be bursting at the seams when the homes already in the pipeline/approved are finished. The usual secondary school for Brailsford children has up to now been QEGS. Due to large-scale development in Ashbourne the catchment area will change and it is highly likely that Brailsford secondary school children will have to be bussed to Wirksworth. This would take away a lot of the attraction for families moving to the village.

**Medical facilities** – The medical practice here is privately owned and, to date, is very close to full capacity. It will have to take patients from new homes here as well as from the Radbourne Gate development. Two of our 4 GPs will retire in the next 5 years and, given the current staffing shortage in the NHS, will be difficult to replace let alone find additional ones.

**Lack of amenities** – There are fewer than there were 20 years ago. The butcher, baker, hairdresser etc have all disappeared. Of those necessary for everyday living we have one small shop-cum-post-office.

**Lack of employment** – Speaks for itself. Possibilities decrease as you take away more land. What about a Derbyshire dales university/school of farming based at Brailsford? Be truly creative…

**Traffic and road safety**. You have ignored all data about accident, casualty and fatality data. You say there is no problem. Police records and media records say differently. What is the cost of even one human life. More development means the roads in Brailsford will be even more dangerous than they are now.

This proposal would saturate and make unsustainable current levels of service. There would be an adverse impact which would far outweigh any benefits when assessed against current policies. Sustainability principles are not met.

**The location of HC2(h)** on the sharp bend at the top of Luke Lane would cause even more chaos than that which will already come - due especially to the lorries and HGVS from the cement works using the lane.
The location of HC2(f) is wrong for development. Access is poor. Either via the track designated from the A52 which is on a very bendy and busy part of the Main Road and has seen its fair share of accidents over the years, or else via Throstlenest Way which would then become a rat-run and has already been designated a restricted route. Will the councillors and planners finally, now acknowledge recorded data of road casualty and fatality figures in and around our village? Again, traffic and safety data has hitherto been ignored.

Although this plot may look neat on your maps, it covers a steep hillside and any building or estate would be over-powering – directly over the village and the Main Road. It is out of character with the village itself and with the environment. This is good quality and scenic agricultural land. The land itself is unsuitable – on an incline which slopes steeply down to the Main Road and may be unstable. We are also given to understand from the former owner of this land that there is an old brick-built reservoir underground which was previously used for the water-supply to the village. The old pumping house which served it is still there. There is also an ancient and well-established footpath going across the land. We would like to know why this site is still an option. It was ruled out as unsuitable by the Council in the last consultation – including a clear statement from the Council Leader.

Brailsford is not Oakwood or Mickleover. It is a beautiful village in the Derbyshire Dales and we hope that you are as proud of it as we are. It already has its fair share of development. We are not a dumping ground for your housing quotas. Please listen to us now and don’t act in a dictatorial or undemocratic manner. No more development of our green fields and green spaces, please. Enough is enough!

Yours sincerely

Susan and Rolph Walker
Objection to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

Draft Local Plan – Proposals for Housing Development

As a resident of the village of Brailsford I am writing to express my concern about the proposals relating to Brailsford which have been published to date.

In addition to the 50 homes approved for Miller Housing, over the last year some additional 25 homes have been approved within the village with a further 20 in the pipeline, including an application by Miller Homes for a further 20 houses on the Old Cheese Factory site adjacent to Luke Lane. This land has previously been designated as Employment Land: new local jobs are needed in the village. These approvals already represent a c50% growth in the size of our village.

Published documents suggest that the Council is proposing an allocation of c100 more homes, and from approaches made by developers this could rise to around 200 plus – more than doubling the size of the village in a very short space of time. Also of concern is that the proposed developments are for large standard estates more suited to an urban environment, and despite reservations raised to the Council by landscape experts, appear to take no account of the preservation of the local environment or landscape character. Neither do they recognise the traffic implications – volumes and related road safety issues. This is a major concern for residents.

While we accept that some further development may be necessary in the village as the Council plans to meet its housing allocation targets, this should be at a much smaller scale and consistent with maintaining the integrity of the village environment. Ahead of the formal consultation on the Council’s proposals, we would like to understand the rationale for the Authority’s current decisions and to make sure that your Local Plan Advisory Committee has taken full account of the expectations of residents which are currently being formulated in our Neighbourhood Plan. We should therefore like answers to the following:

1. The logic of the settlement hierarchy as set out in the DDDC core strategy which risks placing major developments in Brailsford, Dovenidge and Hulland Ward, and the decision taken that there would be no new development in the smaller villages such as Wyaston, Shirley and Longford although a meeting held in Hulland Ward in the Autumn suggested that representatives of the smaller villages are seeking small scale development to keep their villages vibrant. An application for a small development in Clifton was recently refused.

2. The rationale for the density of allocation to Brailsford when c50 new homes only were proposed under the previous Local Plan - an additional 2000 to be found would therefore suggest an allocation of c30 only was needed.

3. In relation to 2 above, what account has been taken of new approvals since the last draft Local Plan, e.g. Cheese Factory, Main Road, equating to around an additional 50 with all infills the cheese factory - 20 homes and land at main Road - 15 homes, plus around 10 infills and 10 proposed retirement bungalows on The Green; thus double the expected requirement and equating to a 50% increase in the size of the village.

4. The village integrity and structure should be maintained. The landscape does not lend itself to further major urban (estate development). What constitutes a ‘tipping’ point for the larger villages, i.e. the effective balance of new estate development (suitable for a town) and economic, social and environmental (sustainable development) which maintains the nature of a village.
5. How have the findings of the Landscape Sensitivity report 2015 by Wardell Armstrong been accommodated in relation to the expansion of the village and particularly the site to the East of Throstlenest Way (SHLAA 236). The landscape assessment shows Amber for the Council’s preferred sites.

6. Why does SHLAA 236 (land to East of Throstlenest Way) remain an Option when it was ruled out as unsuitable by the Council (including a clear statement by the Council Leader in the last consultation?

7. How is Brailsford thought to have sufficient amenity for an additional 200 homes. Who has decided this and what are the criteria for the decision?

8. Which statutory bodies will be consulted about the DDDC proposal and what weighting is given to their input?

9. What criteria have been used to determine that there are no traffic and road safety implications resulting from the proposed new developments, especially the Luke Lane junction and the Main Road access adjacent to the pedestrian crossing?

10. Have the statistics of all road casualty and fatalities in and around the village been acknowledged and taken into account? What does the DDDC consider is the value of even one human life lost on the roads and pavements here?

11. Given that there will be hundreds of additional n homes built in Ashbourne, how does the DDDC think that additional development in Brailsford will help the traffic situation here?

12. What are the expectations for education? The new Brailsford School built for 120 was apparently based on 50 additional homes. Where will secondary education be provided? Most people will have to travel to Derby or one of the bigger towns or cities to get to work and this would suggest that Brailsford is the wrong place for them to settle.

13. Planning law suggests that all development should be sustainable. How will jobs be provided in Brailsford as the employment land allocation is likely to be removed?

14. What consideration is being given to additional demand for utilities including sewage treatment and the management of flood risk?

15. Following these plans, medical facilities in Brailsford would become unstable. The current private medical practice is owned by 2 of the 4 GPs there. It is not just a matter of facilities but also of staffing as the practice is nearly at full capacity already. Half of our GPs will retire in the next 5 years and, given the staffing shortages in the NHS, will be difficult to replace, let alone find additional ones.

We ask therefore, that the planning department act in a responsible manner. There are more suitable places for the type and size of development that you are proposing.

At the village meeting on 2 March attended by a couple of hundred villagers, people were unanimous that there should be no more development in Brailsford. Brailsford is not a dumping ground for homes to fill up the quota you are trying to achieve. Let there be no more development of our green fields and green spaces in and around Brailsford. Enough is enough! We hope you will listen to us this time and not forge ahead in a dictatorial manner. Governments, politicians, councillors and planners come and go BUT if you spoil our village it will be forever!

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence and confirmation that it will be brought to the attention of the Local Plan Advisory Group.

We should also like you to register that we wish to be considered as a formal respondent to any future consultation and that we are notified when the consultation is underway.

Yours sincerely, Susan and Rolph Walker
REPRESENTATION FROM DINAH BRITTON, LOCAL RESIDENT

FAO of all District Councillors, Town Councillors and Planning Committee members attending the Derbyshire Dales full council meeting on 16th March 2016.

I wish to object to the proposed inclusion of sites SHLAA224 and SHLAA225 in the draft local plan for the following reasons

DRAINAGE AND FLOODING

Properties bordering the sites already have serious problems with flooding from standing and run off water from the permanently waterlogged sites. Building here is bound to create further problems for properties in a wider radius.

ROAD SAFETY

If these houses are built there will be many hundreds of extra traffic movements each day on roads which are already very busy. It is difficult at peak times now to exit onto Chesterfield Road and Wellington Street, more traffic would make it a nightmare. The proposed developments at Bentley Bridge, Moorcroft and Asker Lane will compound these problems.

ELEVATED POSITION OF PROPOSED SITES

This area is above the snow line and in bad weather it can be very difficult to travel even when roads further down the hill are passable.

EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE IS INADEQUATE

There are no jobs locally for this influx of people. The doctor's surgeries are already struggling with the number of patients and the schools are virtually full.

These are just some of the objections I have to this proposal (there are many more). I hope you will consider this issue carefully and please do not allow building on these sites. It would turn this area of Matlock into a vast housing estate and cause many problems to the residents.
REPRESENTATION BY ELIZABETH CHAMBERLAIN, LOCAL RESIDENT

Re site SHLAA 225

I am emailing to try to canvass your support to prevent the proposals for the above named site being passed.

I have been a resident in Matlock for more than fifty years and was born and grew up in nearby Darley Dale.

I am acutely aware of the need to build affordable social housing and the pressure councils are under by the Government to deliver the same.

I do however strongly disagree with the proposal to do that upon this site. It would be all to easy to think that my objections were simply about not wanting additional houses built nearby but I want to be very clear this is not the reason for my objections.

If you would take a few minutes to read the rest of my email I will explain my rational.

1. TRAFFIC and ROAD SAFETY. At the present there is no access to the site. Any future access for both ordinary and emergency vehicles would be difficult if not impossible depending on any solutions which may be offered. If this proposal were to proceed for both sites, 224 & 225, this would add a further 500 dwellings to be served with potentially a single access off Gritstone Rd. The access from Gritstone Road onto Chesterfield road is at present difficult and sometimes dangerous given the volume of traffic at peak times. The line of sight is also poor at best for an 'A' road. Both these issues are a current concern with the present number of dwellings let alone the enormous increase which would be incurred with this development. In addition to this any increase in traffic journeying down to Matlock centre would of course further congestion, traffic pressures and inevitably accidents.

2. FLOODING & RUN OFF WATER. As the area of both sites is covered in natural springs, water logged gardens and flooded garages are already a problem and further building would cause even more problems not only for current residents but also for those in the new build properties.

3. LOSS OF WILDLIFE HABITAT. Bats, badgers, foxes and many birds which are on the R.S.P.B's 'Birds of Conservation Concern' are seen regularly in this area. All of these would be affected by any future development.

I have submitted more detailed objections already to the planning committee but feel so strongly about this that I wished to convey this for your up and coming Council meeting on the 16th March.
I refer to the local plan proposals for housing sites in Matlock, and wish to object to the inclusion in the plan of the sites between Pinewood Road and Gritstone Road - Site references SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

The proposed sites lie in open countryside, outside the built framework of the town, where there has always been a planning policy of a presumption against development. The development of these sites would lead to the loss of natural habitat (trees and hedges) and the loss of natural habitat for wildlife - bats, badgers, foxes and a wide variety of birds that frequent the area. The loss of habitat is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (pages 26 & 27).

The sites are on the fringe of Matlock in an elevated and exposed location, high above the town centre, away from shops and other facilities. The Council has published statistics showing that Matlock has an ageing population and the development of these sites would not be suitable for older people. Those without their own transport would effectively be trapped as public transport is limited and is likely to be reduced further under the County Council's recent proposals to remove support for subsidised services.

There are no large-scale opportunities for employment in Matlock. These sites will, therefore, create a dormitory village with the residents commuting elsewhere to work and who would have little affinity with Matlock, and would be encouraging an increase in car use which is the least sustainable form of transport. NPPF, page 9 states that local planning authorities should support a pattern of development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.

There is no direct road access to either of the sites. Access onto the existing roads on the Cavendish estate (Pinewood Road, Hurker Rise and Far Cross), and Cavendish Road itself, are inadequate and would be unable to cope with any additional traffic flows that would result from the development of these two sites. There would be considerable congestion and traffic jams at the junctions of Wolds Rise and Cavendish Road, Cavendish Road and Wellington Street, and Wellington Street/Chesterfield Road. The situation is already chaotic at weekends when football traffic is going to and from the Cavendish playing fields. I understand that road access from Wolds Road onto Chesterfield Road is substandard and would not be suitable to cope with the additional traffic that would arise.

Much of the land comprising SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225 is boggy and waterlogged and contains a number of natural springs. There is a history of water run-off from the sites causing flooding to several properties on both the Cavendish Estate and on Bentley Close. After rainfall, water can be seen running from behind properties on Amberdene and out across Wellington Street causing the road to be flooded. During heavy rainfall, water also runs from the site down Far Cross. So far, the surface water drainage system has managed to cope with this run-off but I am concerned that this will not always be the case. Building on these sites will cause even more flooding problems for existing properties, and more areas of standing water. Where are the developers proposing to install drains and where will the run-off go?
The development of these two sites will have the effect of increasing the population by that of a medium sized village and I am concerned as to the effect that this will have on the existing infrastructure of the town, especially in relation to the schools, doctors' surgeries and other health facilities. These are matters that would need to be properly addressed and resolved before the sites can be approved for development. In addition, a development of this size would need to incorporate open areas for public recreation, and not just filled with houses. To date, I have not seen any evidence of such provision.

For these reasons I would urge the Council at its meeting on 16th March not to approve the inclusion of these two sites in the local plan.
REPRESENTATION FROM ANDREW & ANNE KERNAGHAN

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I am writing to object to your proposals to build over 400 properties at the rear of our property on High Ridge.

Whilst the depreciation in the value of our property and the loss of view may not be valid reasons to object to the proposals, they are of considerable concern that is impossible to quantify.

I have listed below the reasons why I feel development of the land off Pinewood Road should not be approved and the section of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to which I think is most appropriate to:

- Access to the site and surrounding roads—this is a major issue of concern, access on and off Cavendish Park is already an issue and the road network will simply not support the increased volume in traffic. Emergency Services already struggle with access. It would prove almost impossible to move around the top of Matlock bringing Wellington Street/Bank Road/Chesterfield to gridlock. (pages 9 and 10 of the NPPF)

- Safety of residents, the increase in traffic would pose a serious risk to the elderly and children. Many Highfields students walk up and down Wellington Street crossing Cavendish Road, this area already has high volumes of traffic. With the proposed developments not only would there be an increase in home owner/occupier vehicles, there would also be the inevitable increase of delivery vehicles/public transport etc (pages 9 and 10 of the NPPF)

- Natural habitat – the area concerned has considerable wildlife, foxes, badgers and bats. (page 19 NPPF)

- Flooding – the land already regularly floods, it is damp and boggy and at times we have had a flooded conservatory and garage. Building on the area would make this far worse. (pages 23 section 100 NPPF)

- Communications infrastructure – this is already a problem in the area, broadband access in slow and often disrupted. (page 11 – section 44 NPPF).

I can’t express highly enough how much I object to these proposals, if approved it will ruin Matlock and almost turn Cavendish Park and Gritsone Road into a small town, with a totally inadequate transport infrastructure being unsafe for our residents young and old alike.

Yours sincerely

Anne Kernaghan
What planet are these people on. Yes new housing is required but not on beautiful green fields which should remain so.

The land if they had knowledge of is an absolute water sponge and if they had lived up here as many residents have for a long time 30 years in our case they would see what problems we have with excess water coming from it. The wildlife would be totally destroyed and then we would have the situation of not seeing any animals such as the foxes and badgers we occasionally see now or they would be forced into the town centres as elsewhere and then people would complain even more about them.

The traffic situation in the Cavendish Park area is horrendous now, so what would it be with 500 more houses and inadequate roads where would the people go to school work shop etc as there are no shops in the immediate area unless you go down into Matlock itself. It seems that as with the creation of the one way in and out of Matlock over the bridge which forces everyone past Sainsburys and back along Bakewell road (by-passing the town) and putting an extra one mile on every car (I thought we were trying to be greener and cutting down on traffic pollution) the people in charge don’t care about the local peoples views as long as they themselves or the developers are making in the pound notes. There are plenty of brown field areas such as Cavender quarry (oh but they’ve found a problem with that. WELL SORT IT!, or do your job right in the first place before putting such areas forward) Then again money can’t be made out of that so go for an easy Green Site NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO
REPRESENTATION BY ANITA CROFTS, RESIDENT OF GRITSTONE ROAD

Residents are aware of the pressure being put upon Local Councils regarding land for housing development but I wish to register my objections to the above sites being included in the local plan. I believe a planning application for the Gritstone Road site is to be submitted imminently and therefore it is even more important that the above two sites be excluded from the local plan.

Please consider the following important points/objections:

**Drainage/Flooding** - This is a major concern as some existing properties already suffer with flooding and are built on rafts. Other properties have had subsidence issues and are underpinned due to sodden clay.

The SHLAA225 site is covered with natural springs and building on the site will cause even more problems with flooding for existing properties and may even impact on home insurance in the future.

Gritstone Road, Bentley Close, Wellington Close, Amberdene and other areas close to the proposed sites already have problems with run-off water from the proposed site and are consistently boggy & water logged even in summer.

Also any development would include heavy plant machinery and given the history of subsidence on Gritstone Road this could acerbate the problem and cause damage to the foundations of existing properties.

**Loss of trees, hedgerows and wildlife** - Many forms of wildlife have been spotted on the SHLAA225 Gritstone Road site such as bats (which use the site as a hunting ground & for roosting), foxes, badgers, & hedgehogs. Many birds that have been spotted include Tawny Owl, Kestrel, Sparrow Hawk, swift, swallow, house & sand martin. Other birds which are included on the RSPB's Birds of Conservation Concern list such as Fieldfar, redwing. Most common UK finches are seen all year round along with many UK Bee species.

**Loss of Privacy and Light** - Any development could cause significant light pollution to the dark landscapes and nature conservation. Privacy at the rear of our property and also neighbouring properties would be lost.

**Noise Pollution** - Development would cause significant visual and noise related disruption to existing residents for several years and possibly have adverse affects on health and quality of life.

**Road Safety** - The proposed development would result in a significant increase of traffic which in turn will increase the risks to road safety particularly for children and the elderly. Pupils who attend Highfields School walking along Chesterfield Road and also being dropped off on Wolds Road will also be affected with an increase in traffic.

**Access/Visibility/Exit Roads** - There is no clear access to the development site, will this mean that existing properties may be demolished for access or will the developers have to persuade people to sell
some of their garden land to allow access. Sandy Lane next to the SHLAA225 site is nowhere near an acceptable standard to be used as an access to a development site of that scale.

Visibility and exit on to Chesterfield Road from Wolds Road already causes difficulties especially at peak travelling times therefore an increase of hundreds of vehicles would create a backlog of traffic that would stretch back along all roads.

A question mark over whether developers would be able to achieve the required visibilities at the Wolds Road/Chesterfield Road junction, does it mean that homeowners would be required to sell off land in front of their houses for the developers to achieve the necessary visibility splays need to create a safe junction.

Jobs - Matlock no longer offers the same job opportunities as the largest employer Derbyshire County Council is reducing/cutting jobs rather than increasing. This would mean people commuting to nearby towns and cities rather than engaging with Matlock itself.

Other points to consider are the elevated position of the proposed site as roads such as Gritstone and Pinewood tend to become snowbound in the Winter meaning car ownership is a necessity rather than a luxury.

A significant increase in the Matlock population will put increased pressure on schools, doctors and public services which are themselves under constant review.

On a personal note Gritstone Road is a good place to raise a family without many worries over children playing out on the streets with each other, and an increase in traffic flow will mean this will no longer be safe.

As parents we have sat in our back gardens in an evening with the children over the years bat watching as they fly over and like to do this with our grandchilren but this would not be possible if the development goes ahead.

Also the affect it would have on me personally and health wise to be overlooked by other houses in to our back garden and bedroom would not be good. Plus the loss of value in our property.

Thank you for taking time to read this.
REPRESENTATION FROM BARRY TRAVIS, LOCAL RESIDENT

I would like you to take a few minutes to consider my objections to the proposed plans SHLAA 224.

I have lived on Cavendish Park for over 30 years and paid extra money for our house to have the privilege of the open fields and woods.

Over the years I have seen a build up of more traffic and the roads narrow as the cars, vans and lorries have got bigger. I believe you came up to view the site in the middle of the afternoon I would like to invite you for another visit and view the works traffic school traffic and the weekend football traffic. There are times when you can be stuck on Cavendish road for a good 20 minutes waiting to get on the road and then trying to get out onto Chesterfield Road. A lot of the roads around the Cavendish park have very bad corners and are only one car width so care needs to be taken I worry about the extra cars and the impact it would have on all these narrow roads. Also the build up of traffic will be a danger to children coming from All Saints and Highfields.

I have attached photos for my next problem flooding and drainage. My garden both back and front which you can see on the photos is flooded most of the winter we have tried drainage but still the problem persists, my worry is that once the fields have gone which take a lot of the rain water were will all this water go?

My next worry is the building of all these houses who is going to live in them as anybody looked into the fact about jobs for these people? you cannot make people live in these houses so are we going to end up with these houses empty which as happened in areas before.

If and when all these people descend on to the extended estate have you thought about the doctors and schools? Around this area we find it difficult now to get an appointment at the doctors and the schools are full to bursting are the government willing to build new schools and doctors surgery’s to accommodate all these extra people.

My last thing I would like you to consider is the fact there is a lot of wildlife in the fields which would all be destroyed, you cannot tell the wildlife and extremely rare birds to go and find somewhere else to live, these fields are the last bit of green site we have left in this area and we can never get this back.

I hope you can see that this is the wrong thing to do to such an amazing area especially when there are so many other sites were all these houses could be built which wouldn’t impact on anybody or anything

Thankyou
REPRESENTATION FROM COLLEEN MARPLES

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

The March 16th full council meeting gives Derbyshire Dales District councillors the chance to make decisions that will affect the lives of residents for decades to come.

You have the opportunity to simply rubber stamp the current allocation of sites for inclusion on the draft local plan, or you can look more closely at some of the proposed sites and question the suitability of their inclusion.

Dales residents are well aware of the pressure being put upon local councils to allocate land for development. We are not NIMBYS, we are not anti-planning nor are we anti-development.

However we feel that in the fevered rush to allocate land, inappropriate sites have been included on the draft Local Plan that are problematic to develop and will have severe, adverse, and long lasting impacts on the existing communities that border them.

Given that we expect a planning application to be put in for the Gritstone Road site imminently, it is even more important that the two sites below be excluded from the local plan.

This is a lengthy document but this clearly shows the extent of the issues surrounding the viability of two of these sites SHLAA 224 (land off Pinewood Rd) and SHLAA 225 (land off Gritstone Rd).

- **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.

- **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 including that at Asker Lane, that will all exit onto Chesterfield Road.

- **Accessibility to proposed site** – **There is no direct, acceptable access to the development site.** Does this mean that existing properties will need be knocked down to facilitate access or that developers will need to persuade people to sell swathes of garden?

  There are also question marks over the ownership of Sandy Lane, one of the proposed accesses to SHLAA 225 which is currently nowhere near an acceptable standard for access to a site of that scale.

  DDDC’s own Local Plan Advisory Committee have already rejected at least one site proposed for inclusion on the draft local plan citing difficulties with access as a reason for making the site undeliverable.
“The Highways Authority have advised that no access could potentially serve the site due to the constraints, potentially outside the site promoter’s control, it is unlikely acceptable access arrangements could be provided to serve the site without the control over third party land”. (Site assessment for Whitelea nursery SHLAA478)

- **Access and visibility for exits from new site onto existing road network.** Residents neighbouring both sites already have plenty of experience of 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 each day 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 visibilities at the Wolds Rd / Chesterfield Rd junction and previous planning applications for the Wolds Farm area have been refused at appeal as a result of this issue.

Again for this development to be viable, it would require existing homeowners on Chesterfield Rd and Wolds Rd to agree to sell land in front of their homes to allow developers to achieve the necessary "visibility splays" needed to create a safe junction.

- **Drainage / Flooding** – Gritstone Road, Bentley Close, Wellington 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 waterlogged, even in summer.

Despite this the site assessments for both sites is green – no risk of flooding. A claim that all households that border the site strenuously dispute. *Photographic and video evidence clearly disputes this assessment and can be provided on request.*

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

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 potentially impact on home insurance in the future.

Developers may claim to be able to "mitigate" drainage issues, but you only need take a look at the scale of the drainage that was required at the Morledge development at Darley Dale (approx 200 new homes – half the number proposed for our sites).

This entails 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.

Are developers proposing drains this size be installed and if so, where will they be put, who will foot the bill and where will all the run-off water go (as the sites are at the very top of Matlock surely the water can only go flow downwards towards the town?)

- **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 ridiculous for that target audience.

DDDC’s publication 'Your Local Plan, Nov 2015' clearly states RE population that there
will be: "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 and the closest “amenities” on Smedley Street is simply insurmountable for older people.

This year Bank Road will once again host a National cycling hill climb championship - not exactly an easy, “10 - 20 minute walk” to amenities for anybody 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 – the car, in direct contravention of NPPF policies.

- **Distance and gradient from amenities** - The site assessments for SHLAA 224 / 225 rather disingenuously claim a "10-20 minutes walk, approx. 1200m to local shopping centre on Smedley street"

Again this conveniently ignores the severe hill gradient that actually forms part of several national cycling hill championships.

- **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 SHLAA 225 Gritstone Rd site.

- Pipistrelle bats – hunting ground and roosts in local trees
- Badgers
- Foxes
- Many birds including, particularly of note – Raven, Buzzard, Kestrel, Sparrow Hawk, Hobby, Merlin, Tawny owl and all the hunderines (swift, swallow, house and sand martin)
  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”
- Siskin, reed buntings, redpoll, yellowhammer, Brambling and most common UK finches all year
- 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

- **Light pollution – affecting current households.** Any development could significantly extend light pollution on the north edge of Matlock, again contrary to the NPPF. “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

- **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

- **Expanding the boundary of Matlock** – The Gritstone Road / Pinewood Rd proposal is an extension outside of the current Settlement Framework Boundary. This will set a precedent for future expansion and development into further greenfield 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 and amenities for new house holds** – An influx of additional school age pupils will cause overcrowding issues with existing schools. Likewise with GPs, which are already overcrowded and at capacity.

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 our greenfield sites above all others which is why I implore councillors not to hand these sites over to them on a plate.

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
ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION FROM COLLEEN MARPLES, LOCAL RESIDENT

In addition to the objection email I sent last week, I would also like to expand on a particular issue regarding SHLAA 224 (Pinewood Rd) and SHLAA 225 (Gritstone Rd)

Residents feel that one of the many concerns that we have about the development viability of two of the proposed sites is being overlooked and disregarded by the local area planning committee.

That is the risk of flooding to the sites and neighbouring properties. Plus the knock on effect to structural integrity of existing houses and infrastructure.

The Detailed Assessments by Settlement for sites SHLAA 224 Cavendish Rd and SHLAA 225 Gritstone Rd, that were presented as part of the draft local plan allocation at the meeting on January 20th, are both flagged as green for flood risk - namely there is no risk.

However residents who have the benefit of living in close proximity to the sites can testify that this is not true and photographic evidence at the end of this email shows that quite clearly.

While the site may not be in a flood plain, even a cursory glance at the Environment Agency's standing water flood risk clearly shows several areas within the sites that are ranked as at high risk of flooding from standing water.

See below the circle to the right of The Wolds text - the rectangle is the reservoir off Wellington Street and the two smaller dots to the top right are in the fields north of Gritstone and North of Bentley Close. So at least FOUR areas of high risk fall within sites SHLAA 224 / 225.
Standing water and flooding routinely affects both sites and the surrounding properties. This is a year long problem, not just during the wet winter months (although this clearly exacerbates the situation).

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

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 (easy to say on paper), but you only need to take a 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 new drains be installed and where will all the run off water go?! As the sites are at the very top of Matlock, gravity will dictate that it all heads downwards towards the town.

We believe that the existing sewer system for the area is already at domestic capacity and additional new homes cannot be joined to it.

Will the developers actually be forced to commit to ensuring a sustainable system is in place and maintained at their own cost or will the council end up providing a costly new drainage and sewage system, built at a great cost to taxpayers?

The other possible drainage alternative that developers might put forward is that they install drainage systems such as soakways for each new home.
At least two households (myself included) already have experience of this method as we have soakaways in our gardens that were required as a result of our house being extended several years ago.

These soakaways theoretically allow standing water to naturally disperse throughout the surrounding land and ours actually soaks away under our property and towards Gritstone Road.

Due to the site's top layer of heavy clay this is a slow, gradual and constant process and results in permanently wet ground all year round.

Even in summer this water can be seen draining out /soaking away from under our garden wall and onto the pavement onto Gritstone Road.

Potentially installing upto 64 extra soakaways within the SHLAA 225 site (plus hundreds more in the SHLAA 224 site) will not be a simple process due to the underlying geological makeup of the area.

As regards the south easterly side of the SHLAA 225 site (the section that abuts existing properties and is proposed to hold the majority of the new houses), this comprises of approx 2 meters of clay sat on top of an impermeable layer of basalt which water can't soak away through.

This means that any surface water on the site can only "soak away" to a depth of approx 2 meters before it has to follow the natural gradient of the impermeable basalt.

Owing to the sloping nature of the SHLAA 225 site this means it will all run towards, and under, the existing properties that border the site.

The cumulative effect of hundreds of extra properties across two already sodden and waterlogged sites will mean all that displaced surface water will continually have to drain towards existing properties, through wet clay, which will have a potentially destructive and costly impact on householders.

Who will be footing the bill for the subsequent subsidence, additional flooding and difficulties obtaining house insurance in the future? Will it be the developers or Derbyshire Dales District Council?
It is my belief that that new developments should not be at the detriment of existing households.

I would say that approving the development of a site that could potentially lead to costly problems with flooding, subsidence and home insurance issues for existing residents, would be contrary to that aim.

I would reiterate my request that sites SHLAA 224 / 255 are removed from the draft local plan due to serious issues with the site namely flooding but also due to lack of access, traffic and road safety issues and loss of wildlife habitat.

Failing that I would request that the site assessment rating for flood risk on sites SHLAA 224 / 225 be upgraded to RED - at serious risk of flooding from standing and run off water - in preparation for when they are included in the six week public consultation, as this is a true reflection of the actual situation.

Can you please acknowledge receipt of this email and also that you have read and taken on board the concerns of residents who border these sites.

Apologies to those of you who have already seen some of this information before but I feel it is an extremely serious issue that is being marginalised and overlooked by the people making the planning decisions.

Yours Sincerely
Colleen Marples
Gritstone Road resident

SUPPORTING IMAGES

Below is a property on Bentley Close that neighbours the SHLAA 225 Gritstone Rd site and shows the effect of run off water from proposed site SHLAA 225.

There is a near enough year round "pond" in the field behind this property.
Below is the "pond" in SHLAA 225 that caused this flooding, as viewed from number 32 Gritstone Road.
Below are pictures taken behind Amberdene and the severn trent reservoir all clearly showing water logged, sodden and flooded ground within the Cavendish / Pinewood site SHLAA 224. Plus water hungry plants (bog grass) that thrive in wet ground.
Planning Site SHLA 224

09.03.2016

I refer to the above site and raise the following objections.

1. The site can only be accessed by Cavendish Road, this is a narrow road not suitable for the traffic it gets at the moment, it is extremely difficult to get along at busy times and on Saturdays when the playing fields are in use, it can take 20 minutes to get into Pinewood Road from Wellington Street, the local bus is regularly late and on occasions has missed the Cavendish Road/Wolds Rise part of the journey because of the delays.

2. The number of cars and delivery vehicles will more than double with most houses having at least 2 cars and more business is being done online so the delivery vans will keep increasing, there will be hundreds more vehicle movements.

3. The site is a natural drainage area for the land above, in times of heavy rainfall water runs down the Playing Fields, Pinewood Road, Wolds Rise and all the other roads as far as Amberdene and the Reservoir area on Wellington Street, perhaps if the planning committee visited the site during a heavy rainstorm they would take a different view on this site, it can be wet even in dry periods. Where will the water go when the natural run off is blocked by roads and buildings, some houses backing on to the site are already have water problems. The mains drainage down to the river at the bottom of the hill also have problems when we get heavy rain, it is common for the road to be torn up on Dimple Road, Manhole covers are pushed out on Bank Road and water also comes out of the road surface on the corner of Limetree Road near the Convenience shop, this will almost certainly be increased with new roads and when the houses put in Paving Blocks on their gardens to allow for extra parking, with the extra run off it can only get worse.

4. The local schools will have problems taking in extra pupils.

5. Where are the new jobs coming from to sustain this amount of housing, we don’t have an excess of vacancies in the area.

6. Access to the building site will be an enormous problem, at the moment the only way in is via Cavendish Road, even if an alternative entrance is possible the roads around the area Wellington Street/ Gritstone Road/ Chesterfield Road are not good. the visibility from Gritstone Road is poor and not suitable for more vehicles using it.

7. When the Planning Committee viewed this site I did not see any of the members walk the fields to see if the land was wet, they only stood at the gate and looked.

Colin Lomas
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Existing traffic in Cavendish Road and the Cavendish Estate is at times reminiscent of the North Circular Road. This is generally at weekends, and cheerfully borne by residents who understand and value the amenity provided by the former college playing fields, now a community football field and link with open country through listed footpaths, and an upland area, which retains some feeling of the original landscape. However, this same traffic volume – which is likely under the proposals on the table – would be unbearable, and impossible, if repeated constantly – daily. Similarly, the narrow east end of Cavendish Road often causes great difficulty for delivery vehicles, and parked cars now – NB the traffic-hazard of the solid gritstone, very close, on the south side. Would there be a guarantee of no property demolitions or loss of garden frontage? North west of that, the Cavendish Estate is short of space. Overpopulated by stationary cars and trucks – for their owners have no option but to leave them on the road, or stand them on what was meant as community grass. This outcome, again, is a small glimpse of what the extended estate (at the best!) would come to resemble.

Further to the traffic flow: it may ultimately push its way through to the west via Farley Hill, as did the Tour of Britain...Without that escape, there will be need of a gyratory onto the Chesterfield Road – with consequent danger to the school students of Highfield. Or, if the gyratory is south of the proposal, existing traffic from Asker Lane and its expansions will also be feeding in. What quick answer do decision-makers have to fitting in so many corners and connections here? Drain the reservoir? Demolish the Duke Wellington? Emerge dangerously close to the golf course? Any second thoughts? What about lower Lumsdale? With traffic feeding into the Alfreton Road? Not of course amid waterfalls, and ponds and major industrial archaeology, but a development with a clever mix, old and new.

Donald Measham, M Phil; Joan Measham, Ph D (Residents for 50+ years.)
10th March 2016

Dear Sir

DDDC Local Plan 2015-2016

Meeting 16.3.2016

Site SHLAA224 Land Off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road Matlock (West)

I enclose a copy of part of the Councils case when permission for development was refused and upheld by the Minister. I will be obliged if you would let the Councillors see this extract in the Committee papers. My point is that the then Planning Officer gave a true picture of the site and described the many disadvantages; this quite rightly led to refusal. All the problems still exist and you are also being made aware of how much worse the current traffic and pedestrian access is today. I maintain that the writers of your current reports are not giving the Councillors a true picture of the site and are ignoring the disadvantages as in attached extract.

Furthermore I should like to repeat the verbal points I made at last meeting. I said you should take out the site of some 500 houses as it is not deliverable within the meaning of the Local Plan. Access for necessary visibility splays is not available. Any purchase whether by agreement or Compulsory Purchase would in my opinion have to include a large proportion of the development Value (which I put at some Two Million pounds at least) released by the Splays I object to any housing on this site.

Yours faithfully,

P. L. Wilson Esq
Planning Officer
DDDC Council
Matlock Town Hall
The material points are:

23. Part of the appeal site was first put forward for development in 1955, in conjunction with the land which was then permitted and developed as the Cavendish Park estate (the area edged blue on Plan E). Over the years 1961-1978 a number of applications were made to develop various parts of the appeal site, mostly towards the eastern end, and were refused, some on appeal (Document 20(a)-(f)).

24. On receipt of the present application, the County Surveyor raised no objections, subject to improvements to Gritstone Road, both in terms of its width and visibility splay at its junction with Chesterfield Road. The Severn-Trent Water Authority had no objections, provided an aqueduct passing under the site was safeguarded, and any improvements to drainage and water supply found necessary were carried out at the developers' expense. Six objections were received, including one from the Matlock Town Council.

25. The site is very exposed, although it was conceded that the 300 m level mentioned in the first reason for refusal was an exaggeration. It is part of a plateau between the built-up area and the even more exposed area of Matlock Moor. It suffers from adverse climatic conditions, high winds and deep snowfalls being common in winter. Difficult road conditions result, and routes to and from the town centre are often impassable due to snow and ice on the steep gradients.

26. It is true that there are 2 local shops, a public house and a comprehensive school fairly close, but there are no other community facilities nearby; in particular the primary school is at some distance and is understood to be full. The nearest area with such facilities is at Smedley Street, about 1,200 m away to the south by road or 650 m by footpath, and involving the negotiation of steep gradients.

27. New housing in Matlock should be on sites better related to the settlement pattern, and it would be preferable to choose sites at a lower altitude in the corridor between Matlock and Rowsley, where there is a better public transport network, a full range of local services, and a better residential environment with less severe climatic conditions.

28. The appeal site forms part of an area of open rural countryside, the higher land on the north and west of Matlock being ruggedly attractive. Although the existing development already encroaches into this landscape to a degree, the proposed housing would not be a rounding-off, but would substantially extend development limits into countryside which becomes progressively more sensitive.

29. The Derbyshire Structure Plan, covering the period 1976-1996, generally aims to restrict the amount of new housing development in the district, with a view to reducing the recent level of migration into the area. In paragraph 19.12 it suggests that new housing should be in the Matlock/Darley Dale corridor, in order to make the best use of existing town centre, community and transportation facilities.

30. It was jointly agreed with the County Council that the Matlock Local Plan should seek to make provision for about 475 new dwellings, being the residue of the Structure Plan requirement, calculated as set out in paragraph 14 above. In 1985 the Draft Local Plan proposed a number of alternative sites for examination, including that part of the appeal site hatched red on Plan E. Only 6 objections were received to this proposal. After the Local Plan Inquiry the Inspector supported the housing allocation of the appeal site. However when his findings were reported to the council's Local Plan Advisory Group, they were faced with
I am a resident living on Bentley close. I object to the planning applications named above, to develop this land by building 500 houses.

Reasons:
1. Access to this area is already very restricted. Creating access to the new site will impact on all present existing roads. The surrounding area is already difficult and dangerous area to negotiate with a car. These plans will make a large area of upper Matlock an impossible and very dangerous area for both motorists and pedestrians.
2. The plans to build 500 houses will not only be difficult and dangerous for residents but the large increase of cars on the road will impact on the main Chesterfield Road and also on Wellington Street which is a main route into Matlock and effectively a direct route to County Hall. Congestion and accidents are inevitable with the increased number of vehicles using these roads.
3. These plans will also impact on children attending 3 local schools (One large senior school and 2 primary schools) making the daily commute very dangerous for the children and for the large number of vehicles already bringing children to and from school each day.
4. A brook runs across the field behind my house and runs down the border of my land to the reservoir situated at Amberdene. This brook regularly floods and becomes part of my garden. I am concerned that building on this land will cause more flooding to mine and other nearby properties.
10 March 2016

DRAFT LOCAL PLAN - OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SITE
SHLAA 224 LAND OFF PINEWOOD ROAD, MATLOCK

I write with reference to the above site contained within the proposed draft Local Plan which is to be considered by Full Council on 16 March 2016 and wish to register my objection in the strongest possible terms.

As a local government officer with over 30 years experience I fully appreciate the need for local authorities to act in accordance with central government legislation and understand why the District Council must consider all options appropriately.

Whilst I am generally opposed to unnecessary development within the Derbyshire Dales I am not going to get in to an argument about which of the proposed towns/villages, is better placed than the others to be developed.

I will now move on to my main area of concern which is the proposed development of the area of land off Pinewood Road, Matlock (SHLAA 224), running across the back of High Ridge, of which I am a resident. As a starting point and to highlight the strength of public feeling in the area, I would refer you to your own Community Consultations Report of 15 July 2011, which identified on Page 9 that local people specifically wanted to protect the site off Pinewood Road/Wolds Rise.

I do not want to get into arguments about what the best sites in Matlock are. All sites have pro’s and cons and residents in those areas will all object to the development that affects them most, as I indeed will do myself.

My number one concern with the proposed SHLAA 224 development is Highways issues/road safety. Every resident in this area will have a story to tell of difficulties encountered with traffic in this area. Most working mornings at rush hour times, Cavendish Road is a traffic nightmare. Then the weekend comes with junior football when 500 cars descend on Cavendish Playing Fields on a Saturday morning. During this period although unavoidable, access and egress onto Cavendish Road is extremely difficult. There is often gridlock and examples of unacceptable parking on the entire Cavendish area. Many arguments have ensued with residents and the police have been called on many occasions. If there was an emergency during this time period a fire engine/ambulance would have a major problem. An 8 year old junior footballer breaking a leg or an elderly resident having a fall for example. The weekly problems encountered with refuse collection lorries emphasises this. It is nobody’s fault, but just down to the density of traffic in the area. There is only road in and one road out. To suggest increasing the traffic flow by an estimated 300 plus cars in the area makes this proposal flawed before it even gets off the ground. As there are no amenities very close by and at best a limited bus service that will only reduce further in future years due to austerity measures, you cannot realistically manage without a car in this area. The many children who walk to school in this area will be placed at further risk. I have witnessed many a close shave over the years.

Access to the proposed site is also another major issue. Unless I am mistaken there is no suitable access to the proposed development site? To create this will mean
extensive costly and disruptive highways improvements that will impact on all roads
in the vicinity of the site. Can you imagine the problems with the County Hall traffic
on weekday mornings. It is bad enough now!!

If any more reason is needed, i will move on to the issue of drainage/flooding in the
area. I was astonished to read in the consultation papers when this site was first
considered in 2012 that “there wasn’t a problem with drainage/flooding in the area”. I
invite any District Councillor or Officer to come and visit my property during periods
of heavy rainfall. It is widely acknowledged that the land directly behind High Ridge is
a series of culverts and underground streams. Many residents have issues with
flooding during wet periods. The field is often saturated and water standing on it. The
natural boundary to our properties is a 6 foot drainage ditch to catch water that runs
off the field. Unfortunately this isn’t always successful. At the back of one property
on High Ridge is a huge drainage sough through which you can hear water ‘roaring’
during periods of wet weather. If any building took place on this site i can only see
huge problems for more properties in a wider radius with significant damage being
carried. I raised this matter with the District Council many years ago who
acknowledged there was a problem. I understand that previously a Freedom of
Information Request has been made under separate cover by another resident
requesting all information relating to drainage/flooding issues in this area so no doubt
this matter will be cleared up. If this is not the case i would respectfully request this
information myself.

Finally i must mention the biodiversity of the area. The open green fields and
woodland areas must be protected and we should not be extending into green belt
area. The area is also home to many forms of wildlife including birds of prey, foxes,
field mice, frogs, toads and newts, the latter presumably because it is so wet!!

In conclusion, what i cannot understand is why a site that was dismissed as being
unsuitable back in 2012/13 is suddenly ‘ripe’ for development. The arguments
remain the same now as they did then. It smacks of an easy target due to the
number of houses it could hold. If that is the case then it is a very disappointing and
shallow reason for a change of heart.

I therefore strongly ask that you reconsider your proposal for the SHLAA 224 (land
off Pinewood Road) element and similarly for much the same reasons the SHLAA
225 (land off Gritstone Road) sites and that they be removed from the Draft Local
Plan before it goes to public consultation.

Yours sincerely,

Ivan Walters
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

We understand that the above proposal is to be considered by the full Council on the 16th March 2016 and we would like to express our considered view that this would be a totally inappropriate piece of land to consider for housing development for the following reasons:

- Whilst it is understood that there is pressure on the council to make more land available to developers the main issue is surely: is there an identified need? Obviously not when the brownfield sites at Cawdor Quarry and Halldale remain fallow. Whilst contractors will obviously prefer greenfield sites as being easier and cheaper to develop it is time that the development of the old quarries was pushed as meeting any present need and at the same time improving Matlock itself.
- Given the number of jobs likely to be available in Matlock, is this not going to make our town a big dormitory for those who work in Sheffield, Chesterfield and Derby et al. This is surely not what is meant by sustainable development. Certainly it will greatly increase the number of cars circulating on the already congested roads of the town as the location means that owning a car is essential to a realistic modern lifestyle. Interestingly both quarry developments provide reasonable pedestrian access to the town centre, the bus and railway stations.
- Having walked from Matlock to Amberdene on a number of occasions there is no way that the new residents would habitually walk into the town or even to Smedley Street. The old tramway was provided for a reason! Given that people will go into town by car, where will they park? Given the location on the eastern edge of the town there must be a temptation to go straight for Chesterfield – again so much for sustainability!
- Winter weather has to be a consideration for any development in Matlock. Given the height of the site its exposure is increased and how will traffic get on or off the site in bad weather? Where will cars be left which are unable to gain access to the development as it seems that the County no longer clears and grits estate developments?
- There is a question of infrastructure. Has the County Council undertaken to provide a new primary school for a development of this size? The roads are not adequate already and potentially another 500 vehicles (at a minimum rate of one per household) will cause gridlock. There are major doubts about the adequacy of surface water drainage but are the existing trunk foul sewers adequate for the extra loading? Already there are issues on Amberdene with surface water run off. This can only become worse as houses and the inevitable hard surfaces cover what is currently grassland.
- We hear much about pollution these days, mercifully Matlock is spared the worst found in big cities but another 500 vehicles (at least) are bound to increase exhaust fumes to say nothing of fumes from central heating systems and bonfires. Why do we need to make matters worse?
- Are there any proposals to improve the road network. It seems that access will decant traffic at an already congested spot on Wellington Street. Recent comments about traffic problems on Wellington St helping ‘traffic calming’ are fatuous at the least.
- The access route is likely to cross the path of pupils accessing Highfields school. There can only be an increased hazard to these young pedestrians by increasing the traffic without improving the road system.
- Undoubtedly this site would extend the boundary of Matlock unnecessarily as well as removing habitat for wildlife. As a country town this would be of great regret, especially as mentioned earlier there are proposals for brownfield sites already available. It is...
understood that developers may not prefer this option but their profits are surely not a planning consideration. At the very least any options to develop this site should be embargoed until the quarries are developed. No quarry development, no proven need for more housing in Matlock.

Yours faithfully,

James and Rachel Slack
REPRESENTATION FROM JAMES COOPER

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I am writing to you to object to the planning proposal for the area above the Cavendish Park and Gritstone road estates ref SHLAA 224 and 225.

1/ may i suggest that the council attempt to enter or leave the Cavendish Park estate Mon. - Fri. between 8-9.30 and again around 4.30-5.30 as this is commuter time and Cavendish Road is already very busy at these periods. Also weekend mornings and lunchtimes during football season again a very popular road, The proposed housing estate will only make this road far busier. Also i don't believe the junction at Chesterfield road will cope very well with the increased traffic. Wellington street is also another road that will have heavily increased use and already van be difficult to traverse by car.

2/The supposed 20 minute walk to the amenities is a joke as a 20 min walk from the new housing would only get you to Smedley Street which at my last reconnaissance did not have any supermarket or corner shop.

3/ This leads me onto my next concern, the increase in housing for Matlock will lead to an increase in children therefore where are the space places for nursery and schooling etc.

4/What is going to happen to the water that will not be soaked away by the fields that are being torn up. As we have seen in recent years the flood plane in areas lower down in Matlock and Darley Dale are ever increasing. Surely this will only make the matter worse.

5/ Has Matlock got an abundance of jobs to cover the new houses owners or will they be commuting to Chesterfield etc. if so Why not build the houses in Chesterfield etc.

6/ How many of the new house will be for local people and affordable and by affordable i mean under £150000?

7/Also why is there an overwhelming need to dig up green areas especially as the local wildlife needs housing too?

8/ The new estate will also increase light pollution in the area which recently has been raised by Sainsburys and the Arc and soon to be built Mcdonalds will also add top this.

9/ Surely the local brownfield sites should be used before the greenfield sites are used

10/ Finally the increase in pollution will not be good for the environment and health of locals as many more vehicles and houses in the area will obviously add to this.

I hope that these views will be taken into account and not just dismissed as i believe they are important issues that need to be addressed

Yours Sincerely
James Cooper
resident of Pinewood Road
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I am writing to register my objection to the inclusion of sites SHLAA224 and 225 in the Local Plan for the following reasons:

1. In the "Your Local Plan" (Your_Local_Plan_publication_November_2015.pdf) it confirms that Matlock 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. Access to the proposed sites is extremely difficult and will be problematic for larger vehicles such as buses and ambulances (as is the case already due to on street parking and narrow streets).

2. I believe that Appendix 2 Stage B Assessment Schedule is in error in several regards:
   a. It only considers direct access to the SHLAA224 site via Pinewood Road and does not consider the adverse impact on access via Cavendish Road for example. The junction of Cavendish Road and Wellington Street is problematic already.
   b. Consideration of access to local facilities has not been correctly considered as it does not take in to account the very steep approach up Bank Road. It is not reasonable to expect elderly residents (or anyone else for that matter) to walk to local amenities on Smedley Street. Walking is actually hazardous along Cavendish Road due to the on-street and on-pavement parking. Cycling is impossible - indeed Bank Road is considered an endurance challenge by professional cyclists. The report acknowledges that walking is "challenging" yet rates pedestrian and cycling as green.

3. The proposed sites are not easily accessible by any other transport mode except motor cars. The restricted access along Cavendish Road and Gritstone Road is already a bottle neck at peak times and on days when there are football matches on the playing fields. Additional homes will exacerbate this situation. Access by lorries, such as rubbish collection and delivery vehicles is already difficult and I have witnessed paramedics having to stretcher patients to an ambulance as access was not possible.

4. The land behind Georges Road is a designated playing field and has restricted use covenants on it prohibiting its development for housing.

5. The land behind the reservoir in SHLAA224 is prone to flooding and is saturated for most of the year.

6. The sites are in an elevated position and will be visible from most approaches to Matlock and will have a detrimental impact on the aesthetics of the town.

7. The sites are "greenfield". Destruction of our natural environment should be a last resort but it seems that developers are already queuing up to develop these sites. Surely the local plan should be about protecting the environment until all available brownfield sites, such as redundant quarries, have been developed. I fear that the opposite will be true.

8. These sites are in contradiction to the National Planning Policy Framework in several respects:
   a. "Ensuring the vitality of town centres" as private cars will travel anywhere - not just Matlock town centre.
   b. "Promoting sustainable transport" - residents will be dependent on private motor cars - the sites are not within walking distance of any amenities and access to the site will be problematic for buses.
   c. "Promoting healthy communities" as no-one will be able to walk or cycle from the new development.
d. "Conserving and enhancing the natural environment" - building on green belt hardly does that. The sites are rural and there is a multitude of wildlife that can be regularly seen (including bats, foxes and badgers).

e. "Protecting Green Belt land" - these sites do the exact opposite.

In conclusion, I object to the inclusion of SHLAA224 and 225 in the local plan for the reasons stated above and believe that more suitable sites along the A6 corridor exist that would not detract from the town and provide the homes to meet the needs of the expected population increase of the elderly.

The planning committee have an opportunity to shape the development of Matlock for the good of all residents - it would be a great shame if the very nature of this rural town is destroyed rushing through ill thought out proposals.

Regards,

James Johnson
REPRESENTATION FROM JANE WILLIAMSON, LOCAL RESIDENT

Firstly, I am not against the development of new homes for people and families in Matlock. I have loved living in our beautiful town, Matlock for 20 years, I have worked in the community and have respect for everyone who lives and would love to live here too.

I am, however, against any development for new housing in any area that has been turned down previously, even after appeals, by the district council because of:

1. HUGE PROBLEMS with DRAINAGE
2. LACK OF ACCESS, VISIBILITY ISSUES
3. CONCERNS for the ENVIRONMENT and CONSERVATION

Surely these issues remain the same and are more of a concern for the applications this time for the proposal an increase to 500 houses to be built on these sites!

With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework I wish to strongly object to the development of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I believe by developing these sites we are NOT " Achieving sustainable " development.

"Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves don't mean worse lives for future generations"

I so agree with the above comment but it does NOT apply to these particular sites.

My main objection and I don't live within immediate affect, is the detrimental risk of flood damage to homes, drainage and road and traffic issues leads to WORSE lives for future generations not just for us but for those living in their new homes.

1. The HUGE FLOOD risks according to the Environment Agency "greater than 1:30 - high risk"

I do not feel confident that there is enough evidence for this flood risk to be prevented. There is too much evidence (photographs) of existing homes nearby with flooded gardens and flooding issues. The risk is high now, building on these sites will increase this risk!

2. SAFETY TO THE PUBLIC - Access and traffic to these developments.
I can not again be reassured by any reports and new measures that people's safety will be guaranteed.

3. ENVIRONMENT and CONSERVATION.
Wildlife and habitats for animals, insects, plants and trees will be destroyed!
You will NOT be conserving and enhancing the natural environment!

4. GREEN BELT LAND.
You are NOT protecting this Valuable green belt land.

I do hope you take forward these objections for all attendees at DDDC full meeting on 16th.
REPRESENTATION FROM JULIE DAWES - Additional

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I am writing this to oppose planning application for 500+ houses on the back of our garden on Gritstone road.

The site is very exposed, and above snow level after the duke of wellington. We get adverse climatic conditions, high winds constantly, deep snow fall, difficult road conditions, impossible for vehicles due to snow and ice on the steep gradients. Visibility is very poor at the junctions regarding chesterfield rd, and onto cavendish park. With triple the traffic from which these new homes would bring, it would be a nightmare, especially at home time from Highfields school( which is full, so no room for more children). Jobs for local people is very hard to find in matlock and local areas, so once again with the estimated 500 houses, no chance, yes they can travel out, but like i said above the volume of traffic would be horendous.

New housing in Matlock should be on sites preferably lower altitude, where there is a better range of services, buses etc, and better residential enviroment with less severe conditions.

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 is not of high enviromental value.P6NPPF.

Flooding and drainage is a very big issue for Gritstone road and Bentley Close, JANET ROBERTS has sent in an email regarding our severe problems with this, we have photos from residents of flooding gardens etc, If more homes are to be built on these fields our existing home could be liable to subsidence.

Access, there is no access, other than buying some properties on gritstone road, sandy land which is to the left of gritstone road, is a public footpath and belongs to no-one, this was told to a resident by a solicitor a few years ago, it certainly isnt wide enough for constant use of vehichles.

Wildlife in the woods at top of the field, which are protected, will cease, we have bats, rare birds, foxs, badgers, once building work starts they wont stay there were they feel safe in their own homes.

Safety is a major concern as well, at the moment children can play on our residentail street, there will be no way when it becomes a major road. With that amount of homes being built you dont know what people it will bring, the older generation our road are very concerned for their own safety.

One very worried resident
julie dawes
REPRESENTATION FROM JULIE ATKIN

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Sirs/Madams

I object in the strongest possible terms to the development of 500 houses on the area known as The Wolds, Matlock - SHLAA224 and SHLAA225

This proposal will affect the air quality and create pollution, severely affecting the quality of day to day life for residents. The accumulation of extra cars at already over used junctions will increase CO2 emissions and pollutants. This is contrary to NPPF guidelines. Such a development would result in at least a thousand extra traffic movements per day. That is without considering the two new sites at Asker Lane and Quarry Lane which already have planning consent.

Many students who attend Highfields School live in the town and walk to school. Some of the junctions are dangerous, especially the Chesterfield Road / Wellington Street junction and the Wellington Street / Cavendish Road junction. People who live in the area are all aware of these dangers. I often run / walk various circuits, taking in Asker Lane, Sandy Lane and environs. They all necessitate crossing Chesterfield Road, which can take between 5 and ten minutes to cross as it is. The Council must take into account residents' opinions, their health and safety and the health and safety of future generations on this issue. People have a basic right to breathe clean air and we all know that this is an international issue. I refer to the "Core planning and principles" section of the NPPF paragraph 17: New developments should “support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate.”

As the proposed development is 850 feet above sea level, getting around without a car will be difficult; all but the very fittest will find it a challenge to walk down into the town and back. The Council states in its documentation that the site is “twenty minutes walk from amenities on Smedley street” - this may be true for fit people but the elderly and families with push chairs and / or young children would find this a challenge. In any case, unless you want the following; an exclusive hair cut; a manicure; wax; spray tan; facial; newspaper; beer; sandwich or car service, you will need to go further afield!

DDD also state that this proposed development is walkable and cycle-able. As stated on page 5 of the recent Strategic Development Site Policies (Policy DS2) for land off Gritstone Road and Pinewood Road, Matlock - “Preparation of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, including full highways design, specific consideration of public transport routes, improvements to existing and development of new pedestrian / cycle routes.” Interestingly, Matlock is again hosting a section of the British Hill Cycling Championships this year; the course begins by Matlock Post Office and finishes at the top of Wellington Street. Clearly this demonstrates the arduous and challenging nature of the incline which the council claims to be walkable and cycle-able. The claim is a spurious one and I challenge it. People will not walk or cycle, they will get into their cars. Again, this breaches the NPPF “Core Planning Principles” which states that developments should “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling.” Although the council claims to have addressed this point, it is clearly not deliverable in real terms.

DD policy states that any new development should reduce the need to travel, especially by car. It should also ensure that highway problems are not created as a result of new development. It is clear to people who live here that such a massive development will
increase traffic and put pressure on an already over stretched road network, contrary to NPPF guide lines. It is my opinion, as a resident of over twenty years, that the impact on the roads, pollution and quality of life will be severe.

Residents will be adversely affected by noise and light pollution by such a development, another impact on their quality of life. The Wolds is a beautiful, undulating (hence its name) and historical landscape in which sit three listed buildings of historical importance, dating back to the early Seventeenth century (1634). I foresee issues of overlooking, and potential damage to buildings in their setting which have formed an important part of the landscape since the time of Shakespeare. (NBE16 Development affecting a listed building) DD states that the “character and diversity of the countryside should be sustained” and that there is a “need to protect and enhance the natural beauty and amenity of the land.” In addition, you must consider the impact on flora and fauna and historical features. This is an ancient site with earth works and it is said to be the site of a Roman road. Goodwin’s wood and the green fields, hedge rows and traditional dry stone walls are an important habitat for all manner of wild life and it would suffer as a result of this development. By allowing development of this land, the council will not be sustaining or enhancing the beauty of the landscape; on the contrary, it will be an act of destruction.

There is also the Matlock Bank Conservation area to consider and this would also suffer from increased traffic.

Another concern is that there are few employment opportunities in Matlock, so residents of the 500 properties are likely to commute out, creating more traffic but limited integration or loyalty to the town or its amenities. More pressure will be placed on our already overcrowded primary schools and our GP / medical services. Will there be any plans to address these public service issues? We all know how difficult it is at present to get a GP appointment and understand the pressures faced by our doctors and nurses.

The Wolds is a 100% greenfield site, development of which is contrary to NPPF guidelines. If developed, this will mean that underdeveloped brownfield sites will remain brownfield and will never be brought back into full use as “previously developed land or buildings” should be developed “in preference to green field sites.” In support of the Permanite site and the Cawdor Quarry site, they are central to the town and would discourage reliance on the car. They are not greenfield sites and could be developed more densely and effectively. In the assessment documentation it is stated that the average age of the Derbyshire Dales is increasing, so why develop a site 850 feet above sea level? The older generation would benefit from more bungalows and apartments, which could be accommodated by the brownfield sites. The Permanite and Cawdor Quarry sites are above the river and are level; their development would enhance the town and they would be brought back into use instead of lying derelict. Many fine examples of brownfield development can be visited in Manchester canal basin and other inner city areas. It is clear to residents that the issue here is cost; green fields are easy pickings for developers who do not want their profits to be eroded by potentially costly clean up operations. The cost of developing brownfield sites will be more costly in the short term but the cost to our environment will be immeasurable and irreversible if the council allows The Wolds to become a housing estate.

Although under pressure to meet identified housing need, the Council still has a duty of care to protect properties and their electorate who will be adversely affected by their planning decisions and they will be held accountable.

Thank you for taking the time to read my opinions
Yours Faithfully,
Julie Atkin
REPRESENTATION FROM JULIE DAWES

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I am writing on behalf the planning proposal at the site of gritstone road matlock, we live at 26 gritstone road, the fields which are being put forward for building on, are joined at the bottom of our garden. we cannot believe yet again this is up for 500+ houses on leading onto cavendish park.

A couple of weeks ago outside the duke of wellington on chesterfield road, there were a 4 way traffic light system, it caused havoc, on the way home about 5 15 i was queing down bank road, it took me over half an hour to get home, which made me think that if all these houses are being built there will be near enough another 500 plus cars this would cause havoc along with all the county offices traffic.

Schools could not cope with all the extra children this would bring, especially at highfields when the pupils come out of school chesterfield road is bad, waiting for a accident to happen. Doctors you cannot get an appt now, dentist, jobs for local people none around and yet all these people that you are wanting to come and live in our ONLY FIELDS LEFT IN MATLOCK.

The field itself has no access, its constantly water logged with natural springs, the wildlife there is, bats, foxs, pheasants, rare birds etc.

Security also is a big concern with the amount of homes you are wanting to build. The loss of value to our homes which you are not bothered about, but to us its a big thing, a neighbour had her house up for sale before we knew they were wanting to build on was on at 225,000 was sold instantly, as soon as we found out about planning, the clients backed out, and know the house is up for 180,000 45,000 loss but nobody is bothered about that, so wrong, we bought our house for the fantastic view that we have and now its going to be a concrete jungle.

There are plenty of other sites which are available, at a meeting a year ago matlock golf course had 2 fields for sale but they wernt wanted, yet got perfect access.

we are totally gutted about the proposal, we have already seen people in the field last week measuring and putting sticks into the field, this is totally wrong as we havent had a meeting yet.
REPRESENTATION FROM KATIE HAYWOOD, GRITSTONE ROAD RESIDENT

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 are listed below, not only for what deems as valid objections, but, also my personal objections. The new development would impact negatively on my standard of living in Matlock on Gritstone road due to the noise pollution, the aesthetics of 500 buildings obstructing views behind my house, the worry of excess traffic around a popular tourist spot for dog walks and scenic views and the overall impact it will have on devaluing my property.

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 border the sites, but, 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 households, 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 Chesterfield 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 into 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
REPRESENTATION FROM KEVIN KNIGHT, RESIDENT OF HIGH RIDGE

I find it incredulous with the planning history of these sites resulting in the refusal of planning permission at a joint enquiry held on 22 October 1991 and more recently in 2012/13 smaller parts of the site under reference Mat 2 East and Mat 2 West were withdrawn from the local plan on mainly on recommendation by the planning department so how can a much larger site now be considered for inclusion.

Access

One of the main reasons then which still remain is access. Access to the site via an already over trafficked Cavendish Road would lead to considerable congestion. There are already times when the bus cannot get along due to parked cars and passengers have to walk. The same applies at times to delivery vehicles and snow clearing. What would happen if emergency vehicles should be required?

The traffic for Cavendish Playing fields at weekends already causes enough traffic problems without the additional traffic any further development would generate.

Equally Gritstone Road and Wolds Road are merely sufficient access to the existing development.

The potential increase in traffic that a potential additional 1000 cars would bring would effectively be an accident waiting to happen. Congestion would be intolerable.

Additionally where would the traffic then go it is already extremely difficult 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” necessary to create a safe junction.

Local Plan Advisory Committee have already rejected at least one site proposed for inclusion on the draft local plan citing difficulties with access as a reason for making the site undeliverable.

“The Highways Authority have advised that no access could potentially serve the site due to the constraints, potentially outside the site promoter’s control, it is unlikely acceptable access arrangements could be provided to serve the site without the control over third party land”. (Site assessment for Whitelea nursery SHLAA478)

Flooding

The site is shown on the Environment Agency Map as liable to surface flooding. The site is littered with uncharted springs etc and existing properties already suffer from this. Any proposed development could only exacerbate the problem. Indeed some existing properties have already been refused insurance due to potential flooding.

The water issue can be ratified by the number of times play is interrupted on the Cavendish Park Playing fields due to them being water logged.

Disruption during Development

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

If the development stretches over the potential 15 or more years there is a very high percentage of existing residents who will suffer great disruption from commencement for the rest of their lives which is not a very pleasant thought.

**Schools/Doctors etc**

The local schools are already full as are the local doctors so how are the local amenities supposed to cope with such a large influx in population, assuming the properties are actually sold. I am not at all convinced of the need, particularly as there is no evidence of work starting on any of the three local sites where outline planning has been granted.

Surely we do not want a situation where developers merely cherry pick sites where they consider there to be rich pickings.

**Loss of Green Field and Established Trees**

Development of the site would result in the loss of green fields and established trees. The area is also home to bats and many species of birds, some of which are endangered. Also many other wild animals.

**Expansion of Matlock**

Development of these sites would set a dangerous precedent by expanding the existing Town settlement boundary

Regarding the expansion of the Matlock boundary this was discussed by Rural Action Derbyshire and their Community Consultation report dated 15 July 2011 included inter alia:

**Location**
- Further housing on Matlock Moor & behind Cavendish Road is unacceptable, this is an upland area and needs protection.
- Core strategy plan protects the countryside of the Wolds Farm fields from housing development
- An increase in housing must be met by increasing density within existing townscape
- Denser housing inside Matlock
- Higher density housing
- Keep town envelope, develop/redevelop within it.
- Housing needs to be prioritised on brownfield sites.

**Access to Local Amenities**

Claims in the site assessment that local amenities is a 10 - 20 minute walk is an absolute joke. There are limited amenities on Smedley Street but if you take into account the severe gradient the target time is very ambitious and certainly not achievable by elderly people or those pushing a pram and the main amenities are in Matlock which is certainly not achievable within the claimed time.

There is no rush to develop brown field and less attractive sites and developers obviously wish to cherry pick where they see large profits.

I urge the planning advisory committee to remove sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225 from the DDDC draft plan.
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed housing developments:

SHLAA 224 & SHLAA 225.

1. As a resident of Moorfield I will be directly impacted upon by the development of 500 residential properties in my area and on the roads that I use, as a resident of Matlock I have concerns about the proposed amount of properties to be built on both areas and the impact on the town, the environment and the character of the town. Using the guidelines and legislation laid down in the National Planning Policy Framework dated March 2012 my objections are based on the on the following grounds:

2. Core Planning Principles para 17 point 5
   “take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our urban areas, protecting the green belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it”.

The sites SHLAA 224 & SHLAA 225 off Pinewood Road and Gritstone Road have diverse wildlife and birdlife in abundance. This will be lost with the development of these sites. Matlock is a unique jewel within Derbyshire and draws in visitors for its character, beauty, walks and unspoilt surrounding areas.

3. Core Planning Principles para 17 point 6
   “support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change and encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings and encourage the use of renewable resources (for example, by the development of renewable energy”).

An additional 500 households will greatly increase the carbon footprint in the demand for heating, water, street lighting etc.

The land above Matlock greatly reduces the amount of rain and snow melt running off into the town below. The development of these sites and the subsequent reduction in area able to soak up the rain fall and snow will impact upon the current drainage system that channels water from the surrounding hills and springs down Bank Road into the Derwent. The saturated state of the playing fields and fields within the two proposed areas throughout this winter is proof that the water table was at its limit above the town.

There are no existing resources in either area or a renewable energy source.

4. Core Planning Principles para 17 point 7
   “contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution”.

The extra vehicles, on average 2 per household, in the area will in no doubt damage the surrounding environment and air quality in the Matlock valley. Waste disposal and collection will come at a cost
to not only the tax payer but at a cost to the environment and wildlife. The necessary increase in public transport will also impact upon the level of pollution.

5. Core Planning Principles para 17 point 8
“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”

Question 1

Although there is no appetite for companies to increase their costs and time to “clean up” and prepare developed land for housing what alternatives on existing developed land have been investigated and put forward?

6. Promoting sustainable transport para 30
“Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion”.

Current access into Cavendish Road from Wellington Road is poor and constantly congested due to residents parking, council workers and the size of buses and commercial vehicles. Access onto Wolds Rise from Cavendish Road is poor and inaccessible for vehicles of 40ft. The capacity of roads leading through Wolds Rise is limiting. There is an increase in traffic when the playing fields are in use.

7. Promoting sustainable transport para 34
“Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised”.

All residents in these areas will have to use road transport, private or public, to visit the town centre or Chesterfield other areas. There are no other public transport options; therefore there is no minimising of the need to travel or maximisation of sustainable transport.

8. Promoting Sustainable transport para 36
“All developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a Travel Plan”.

Question 2

What is the travel plan for the development of areas SHLAA 224 & SHLAA 225? It must cover safe layouts, accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies, provide access to high quality public transport facilities and consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.

9. Promoting sustainable transport para 37
“Planning policy should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities”.

85
Matlock will not employ or be able to educate the additional 1000+ residents that will come to live in these areas; therefore all residents will be travelling greater distances to their place of work or school.

10. Promoting sustainable transport para 38
“Where practical particularly within large scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties.”

Question 3

What facilities will the residents within these areas have? None of the above facilities listed are within walking distance of either proposed area.

11. Promoting sustainable transport para 40
“Local authorities should seek to improve the quality of parking in town centres”.

Question 4

What will be the plan for the additional circa 1000 vehicles needing to park within the town centre? The current parking situation in Matlock does not have the capacity to accommodate an additional 1000 vehicles.

12. Promoting sustainable transport para 50 points 1-3

Question 5

What is the future demographic need for the Matlock area? Affordable housing will result in the increase in demand for schools. Provision must be in place locally to provide medical emergency services and routine covering all aspects of care for all generations and needs. The current developments along the A6, St Elphin’s Park and housing developments will already place a strain on existing facilities.

Both of the above will require facilities and manpower, resulting in more traffic and development in the town.

13. Summary

The increase in traffic will cause further congestion on the small and narrow roads in and around Cavendish Road and Wellington Road. The additional traffic at any access or egress routes onto the Chesterfield Road will cause congestion on this major route and increase the risk to school children crossing the road from the High School Academy. Pollution and the carbon footprint will increase.

There will be the requirement to increase public transport, adding to the carbon footprint and an increase in cost to the Council.

The town centre does not have the capacity to cope with the additional traffic.

The countryside above Matlock will be blighted by the development and the views and beauty that bring outside tourism and visitors to the town destroyed.

The character and community spirit of the town will be irreversibly and irreparably damaged.
Please find below my objections to the plans for housing developments SHLAA224 and SHLAA225

**Traffic:** Wolds Rise is basically a cul de sac. Traffic, moderate all the time, is constant at peak times in the morning and coming home time. Most households, as both adult members work, have two cars and many, with adult children living at home, have three. The traffic can be at a complete stand still all Saturday mornings when football practice and friendly matches take place at Cavendish fields.

The access to Wolds Rise through Cavendish Road with cars parked all the length of this road, can be a nightmare to drive through, specially for the bus service. Recently, I was in the bus from town and at the entrance to Cavendish all the passengers travelling to the end of Cavendish and Wolds Rise had to get out and walk the rest of the journey with our shopping. This included an old lady who must have been 90 who had to walk up the hill to Wolds Rise. A car, probably a visitor who hadn't taking the care to park as close to the pavement as the other local drivers who know the difficulties made it impossible for the minibus to proceed. It had to back down the road, causing quite a commotion with the other vehicles coming up Wellington Street and normal service was not restored for 2 hours until the driver of the car was located.

This is just one instance. This is our 5th winter here and the first three were absolutely diabolic. This high area gets more snow and ice, takes 3 times as long to thaw due to the sun at Cavendish Road being completely blocked by the houses and driving through is often impossible. I believe there has been at least one instance of ambulance men having to carry someone on a stretcher for 500m about 4 years ago when we had a high snowfall.

Furthermore, emerging from Wolds Rise into Cavendish in the corner opposite the Hydro is very often difficult due to the lack of visibility to see what is coming from the left, because the road dips and it is impossible to see above the cars parked. You emerge with your vehicle only to find that you have to reverse back up the road because of an oncoming driver who can't get out of the way either, because there is nowhere to go into. I have had to do it, I have seen other people do it, and I have been in the mini bus when the driver had to do the same.

With these facts in mind how is it that the Highway Authority has considered to give this category only an Amber rating, stating that "safe access can be achieved with localised highway improvements" and that "Pinewood Road is better suited to provide primary access to the site"?

Even in the event that the traffic would be shared with Gritstone Road. What is going to be the impact of an additional potential 1000 vehicles, to serve a total of 500 dwellings, on the level of traffic in these narrow roads already bursting with parked cars everywhere?

**Location**

According to the national guidelines housing developments should:
"facilitate flexible working practices such as the integration of residential and commercial uses within the same unit." and...

"For larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties."

None of these considerations have taken or planned for in this case

**Loss of Local Character and Natural Landscapes**

Three of the reasons for having a green belt are:

- "to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;"
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;"

In the photos shown below you can see sites of green belt that will be lost forever if this plan is allowed to go ahead.

**Services and Facilities**

Future housing developments should take into account the fact that the population of Matlock, as it is acknowledged, is getting older. I am in that bracket myself and frankly this end of town is not exactly the most convenient place to live for people who one day might have to give the car up. The bus service although very useful is not the answer to all needs. For example to get to the ARC leisure centre it means a bus ride into Matlock and a 20m walk after that. An hour at the Gym or swimming pool needs 3h, once walking and timetables are taking into consideration.

In the report Smedley Street is presented as a "shopping centre". Hardly, Smedley Street exist servicing council workers, it can't be described as a shopping centre.
REPRESENTATION FROM MICHAEL POMERANTZ

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

This letter is written to raise objections to the draft local plan for house construction in Matlock on sites identified as SHLAA 224 and 225.

I would like to anchor this complaint to the National Planning Policy Framework referring to the following text about promoting sustainable transport on page 10:

35. Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. Therefore, developments should be located and designed where practical to ● accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies; ● 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, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate establishing home zones; ● incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles; and ● consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.

In addition to all the considerable legitimate and pressing problems cited by other writers who are also raising objections I would this appeal to focus on the disadvantages associated with traffic flow along Wellington Street, Cavendish Road, Wolds Rise and Rockside View. I moved to Bentley Close in Matlock in 1975, have lived at 45 Highfield Drive and since 2000 have lived at 8 Rockside View and am therefore familiar with the significant history of traffic congestion, risk assessments and various campaigns about housing construction in this area.

It is most disappointing that plans are being considered to situate 500 new houses in an area that has been seriously disadvantaged for many years by a traffic problem that has not been adequately addressed and resolved. The current new land use proposals cannot be evaluated without reference to the historic social context facing local residents.

Ever since Rockside Hall was renovated the additional car parking on Cavendish Road has effectively reduced that road to single lane traffic with occasional places designated for cars to pull over. This approximates conditions found in very rural places like Cornwall, the Lake District or parts of Scotland where the single lane pattern is tolerated because so few cars actually meet and when they do a convenient layby is available so cars can pass one another.

This is not a suitable arrangement in a built-up area that is already overwhelmed with excessive vehicle congestion. The traffic problems on Cavendish Road are further compounded by several other significant challenges whose impact has increased tidal traffic flow over recent years:

- On Wednesdays the bin lorries travel slowly up and down Cavendish Road exaggerating the demands on drivers who have to wait for long periods for the traffic to calm.

- With more and more residents adopting a pattern of Internet shopping we see more delivery trucks negotiating these local roads.

- This is particularly noticeable with regular weekly home deliveries from food stores.
On Saturday mornings a massive fleet of parents drive their children to and from the football fields situated to the west of existing houses. If anyone ventures out and finds themselves caught up in a lengthy traffic queue they are simply left wondering when the local Authorities will be sorting this problem. Anyone watching the predictable tailbacks of cars at the junction of Wolds Rise and Cavendish Road would see that the traffic flow is chaotic at present and would become far worse with a large home development project.

The construction of 500 homes would entail a large number of heavy-duty lorries entering and leaving these roads to make deliveries and the roads would restricted when digging holes to allow for water, sewage, telephone, gas and electricity installations. When snow falls as it does all over the above becomes even more problematic.

Many residents have given up all hope that a solution to the Saturday morning excessive football traffic problem will be forthcoming. Now to find that new plans will further exacerbate congestion on roads is very hard to contemplate. Patience is running out, not everyone is socially skilled at taking turns and sharing the road and one day someone will experience a serious car accident and possibly a fatality. The elderly, those with disabilities and children would be particularly at risk. If and when that day arises probing questions will be asked about what led up to the excessive road traffic despite evidence based arguments that the local roads could not sustain absurdly greater vehicle movements. Who will bear that responsibility when all the indications were so readily available to decision makers?

The current proposal does not incorporate alternative sites that offer better housing solutions. We suggest that the sites identified as SHLAA 224 and 225 should be omitted from the current draft plan.

Michael Pomerantz
REPRESENTATION FROM MISS J TRAVIS, LOCAL RESIDENT

Objection to SHLAA 224

Road Safety
The proposed plan of the new houses would result in thousands of extra traffic movements at peak times everyday on already small congested residential roads.
When you did your visit to the proposed site you came in the middle of the day and never saw school traffic, works traffic and also weekends football traffic. The weekend football traffic can result in 2 hours of continual congestion.

Access to proposed site
As there is no access to proposed site at minute it worries me about how much it will impact on the roads around Cavendish Park.

Drainage
As a resident of Wolds Rise we already suffer with standing water, what will happen when the fields at the back of Pinewood Road and high ridge that take in a lot of the surface water are taken away with the proposed houses where will all the water be diverted to?

Future of Cavendish Park
I have been on Cavendish Park all my life and because of my upbringing surround by the field and woods i decided to buy a house myself on Wolds Rise as I feel its an amazing place to bring up my own children. This proposal now worries me not only how safe will my children be with all the extra traffic but also if it devalues my house. I paid extra to buy a house in this area for the surrounding country side and if I wanted to be surrounded by heavy traffic and more houses i would of looked at a cheaper alternative.

Thank you For Taking My views into consideration

Miss J Travis
REPRESENTATION FROM MOLLY HOLDICH

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I am a resident of Wolds Rise and as you are probably aware residents in this area have been contacted by Wolds Action Group with regard to the proposed planning proposals for 500 houses on the above sites. I have lived on Wolds Rise since the mid-1980s and since then have steadily seen an increase in traffic around the Cavendish Fields estate, even with just the few houses already built on Rockside View and the south side of Cavendish Road. The access/egress along Cavendish Road leading onto Wellington Street is already congested and difficult to navigate both during the week and at weekends, from parked cars along the whole of Cavendish Road through to Wolds Rise and beyond. There is poor visibility at the junction of Cavendish Road and Wolds Rise at all times of the day due to parked cars. The thought of another 500 households having access via this access (and that of Wolds Road) seems ludicrous to me and adds to the already ongoing safety concerns of a heavily trafficked residential area. I understand that another access will be via Gritstone Road and Wolds Road leading onto Chesterfield Road near the school crossing also adds to the safety concerns of all those children who walk to school.

I can see little or no benefit to the area, or to Matlock itself, of the proposed development on these two sites. I have read through the objections already outlined by Wolds Action Group and can say that I wholeheartedly agree with them - I list these as follows and please accept these as my objections to the proposed two developments.

- **Loss of green field site, established trees and hedgerows as well as loss of wildlife habitat (to include Pipistrelle bats, badgers, foxes, birds (some of which are on the RSPB's conservation concern amber and red lists) and many UK bee species which, as we all are aware, are in decline and need our help.** Loss of such habitat is contrary to the Government’s [National Planning Policy Framework](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/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. Please also see my above comments.

• **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 will host a National cycling hill climb championship – that is not exactly an easy, 20 minute walk to amenities.

• **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** – 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. My cousin and her husband lived on High Ridge until recently and they have suffered with flooding in their garden in the past. I too believe there is a build up of water under my garage floor, which has now risen about a couple of inches.

I am told that 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. I am concerned as to where new drains are to be installed and where will all the run off water go.

- **Distance and gradient from amenities** – The sites assessments 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 forms part of a national cycling hill championships). As an elderly lady living on Wolds Rise (see site on the fringe of town), I am unable to walk the short distance to Smedley Street to do any shopping and then be able to walk back up the hill with said shopping! The majority of my shopping is done in the town centre and at Sainsburys, where there is easy access and car parking available - I do not believe I am the exception to this rule and so this section and the location of the proposed development in an elevated position is also of great concern.

- **Drainage – affecting potable water collection for Rutland St / Wellington St reservoir**
- **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”.\(^{P29\text{ NPPF}}\)
- **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
acceptable 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

- **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.

- **Loss of privacy for current residents (overlooked both ways)** The Gritstone Road and Pinewood Road development proposals will be virtually in existing household’s back gardens (including mine). There would be no way to avoid loss of privacy, loss of light and loss of visual amenity for all concerned.

- **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 for new house holds** – An influx of additional school age pupils will cause overcrowding issues with existing schools

- **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

I trust all these objections will be taken into account at the meeting on 16th March.

Yours sincerely Molly Holdich
Dear Council Members,


Re: Derbyshire Dales Local Plan, Ref: SHLAA 224, (land off Pinewood Road).

I wish to object to the inclusion of the area off Pinewood Road, Matlock in the District Council’s Local Plan, ref SHLAA 224.
I believe that the inclusion of this area will not improve the ever worsening housing crisis that exists both here in the Derbyshire Dales and throughout the country. Indeed, if anything it will only make matters worse, firmly putting extra strain on local residents and Council Tax payers.
There are many issues to be discussed and resolved if a solution is to be found, but a blanket approach to building on green field sites is not the answer, and shameful at the very least when there are brown field sites available within the district, where development for affordable housing is possible and should be considered first.

The first issue is that of local infrastructure. There are already large concerns over road traffic and safety. At present, the Cavendish Park area is accessed only from Wellington Street, along Cavendish Road. The current road system is already at breaking point, being unable to cope with the ever increasing number of vehicles using these minor roads. Effectively, Cavendish Road, and Wolds Rise is a single track with large numbers of parked vehicles along their entire lengths causing problems for residents and local service providers alike. One such service that experiences problems is the local bus service from Matlock town centre. There continues to be many times when the bus simply cannot navigate it’s prescribed route due to blockages caused by the parking of vehicles in a “free for all” manner. The bus not only fails to get round, but is often running late to congestion, again caused by the level of unrestricted parking that is allowed to go on. The bus is not the only vehicle that has difficulty serving Cavendish Park, there is the much more important problem facing access for the Emergency Services. Today, lives are being put at risk because Fire and Ambulance vehicles cannot get to where they are needed. Does somebody have to die before something is done?
If another 500 homes are built on the edges of this area, this situation and potential threat to public safety is clearly unacceptable.
The area concerned is also above the snow line during winter, meaning many would be residents will be housebound in times of heavy snowfall as snowploughs and gritters are either unable to get through the streets, or just don’t even bother trying.
Traffic management needs to be taken seriously, as 500 new homes will mean an increase of more than 500 vehicles, with many households having more than one car, in addition to the increase in visitor numbers to these homes, along with the existing traffic levels which are hugely increased when there are sporting events being held on Cavendish Fields.
There will also be increased demands on local services, such as schools, medical practices etc., many of which are stretched due to the current Government's attitude towards providing quality public services. In the event of these proposed homes being built, will there be an increase in the number of available school places, better access to medical services through the NHS? I fear and expect that the answer to that will be no.

The environment also needs careful consideration. There has always been an issue with drainage in this area, as there are many natural springs which have the potential to cause flooding during periods of heavy and sustained rainfall, and after any winter snow deposits thaw. Large amounts of water already drain down from the higher land above and from Matlock Moor, and collect as the land starts to level off where the proposed site lies. The natural ecosystem is also at risk. There is a large and diverse wildlife population that has been in existence for many generations, and include Pipistrelle Bats, foxes, badgers, and amphibians. There were also, at one time newts to be found in the ditch that runs from the top of Pinewood Road, along the rear of properties on High Ridge.

Birds of various species are also resident in this area and include several that appear on the RSPB's amber list for species in decline, such as the hunderines, along with several birds of prey, Buzzard, Kestrel, Sparrow Hawk, Merlin, and the Tawny Owl amongst them. The area is also frequented in winter by Redwing, which are on the RSPB's red list for species in decline.

Insects are also to be found here, with several species of native bees, dragonflies, butterflies, and moths just to name a few.

Plant life is also vibrant with several old, established trees and hedgerows off woodland, providing a safe habitat for the aforementioend wildlife.

Any loss of such habitat is contrary to the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework, and should therefore be avoided.

I base my objection to the inclusion of site SHLAA 224 on the reasons stated and urge you to consider, and reject any proposals for the development of this green field site.

Yours faithfully,

Mr J Plant
6, Gritstone Rd,
Matlock,
DE4 3GJ

10.3.16
Dear Attendees,

I am writing to object to the proposed housing scheme on SHLAM 225.

One of my concerns is the drainage. In the last 6 yr. we have had to have a complete new floor replaced as even the damp course couldn’t stop the amount of water it poured through our patio walls at times.

The rise of the land is greater at this end of SHLAM 225, would housing be built to look directly down onto our property?

Most evenings we have a barbecue
Visit us for a few peanuts. Are the sets AAB - where near the proposed new development?

My other concern is road safety. As yet we don't know the access points. But clearly gritstone is most configurable in this plan?

What I really want is beautiful green fields being used. Why aren't the brown-field sites being built on first? Then perhaps consider green-field sites?

Thanks for taking the time to read this objection.

Yours

Mr Sheppard

Mr. W.
Planning Site SHLA 224

I wish to object to the above Planning Site on the following grounds.

Cavendish road is a narrow road which already services a large number of houses and any more would create further problems for the residents who already suffer from major traffic congestion at busy times and at the weekend from the extra cars on Saturday bringing children to the playing fields, any extra would be intolerable.

This is also only way at the moment for construction traffic to access this site bringing with it many more vehicles, this time heavy lorries, the prospect is frightening.

A lot of water comes off the hillside whenever there is significant rainfall, rushing down all the roads in the area as far as Amberdene on Wellington Street, Any building work above the present housing will only make this worse with the road works blocking off the natural drainage channelling water to new drainage pipes will cause problems further down the hill towards the centre of Matlock, there are ongoing problems with the road being lifted on Dimple Road on a regular basis because the pipes cannot take the excess water. Water also comes up through the tarmac on Limetree Road on the corner near the Convenience shop as well, this can only get worse.

I understand the local schools will be unable to cope with many more pupils.

Any other solution to the traffic problem by using Gritstone Road will create problems on Chesterfield Road which has a visibility problem, or on Wellington Street which is not capable of taking much more traffic, all the junctions in this area will have problems with a large amount of extra traffic which will be in excess of 1000 cars on a development of this size.
Dear Council Members,

Re: Derbyshire Dales Local Plan, Ref: SHLAA224, (Land off Pinewood Road).

The local infrastructure is inadequate, to say the least. The only present means of access via Cavendish Road cannot cope with an additional traffic load of 500 plus vehicles per day. The original two way roads have long been reduced to a single carriageway. Just by the number of parked cars, not to mention the extra traffic generated when events are being held on Cavendish Fields.

The existing bus service has been struggling to navigate the route due to congestion and increased parking.

The traffic situation is alarming, and poses a risk to public safety. Emergency vehicles already find it difficult to reach their destination in this area, putting lives at considerable risk.

The natural conditions also affect residents. We have also seen an increase in the flooding of both homes and gardens in the last few years.

I urge you to reject any proposals for further development in this area as it is clearly unsustainable.

Birds of various species are also resident in this area and include several that appear on the RSPB’s amber list for species in decline, such as the hunderines, along with several birds of prey, Buzzard, Kestrel, Sparrow Hawk, Merlin, and the Tawny Owl amongst them. The area is also frequented in winter by Redwing, which are on the RSPB’s red list for Species in decline.

I base my objection to the inclusion of site SHLAA 224 on the reasons stated and urge you to Consider, and reject any proposals for the development of this green field site.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs PM Plant
REPRESENTATION FROM PETE LEIGH, RESIDENT OF BIDSTON CLOSE

Good morning.
I wish to comment on the above.

I have no personal issues with these proposed developments, other than how they can or possibly could be safely accessed.

The issues of loss of green space [which I actually don't use]; the loss of privacy for households bordering the sites does not directly impact on me [although it would not be impossible to create a "green" wedge between any new development and existing houses. After all there would have to be an element of public open space within the development and this would seem the place to put it]; and the potential for flooding/drainage are not things I can comment upon [but no doubt there are engineering measures that could be implemented to overcome any potential problems], are all issues for others to decide upon and determine.

I will confine my comments, as I say, to access.

As regards the Pinewood site, clearly, as it stands, no more than a handful of more new properties can be accessed via Cavendish Road. Perhaps a few from the northern end of Pinewood Rd and perhaps a few from Hurker Rise. Otherwise Cavendish Rd would become totally overloaded - if it isn't already to many people. It is too narrow with inadequate footway provision and a poor junction to Wellington St. I believe that already it may be one of the longest residential cul-de-sacs in the Country serving well in excess of 400 dwellings. Adding to this would be irresponsible of the Local Authorities. I presume also the Emergency Services would not wish to see further developments served only from Cavendish as they would have considerable difficulties accessing any incidents.

If the Pinewood site was developed then I can foresee that emergency accesses only could be provided from any extensions of Pinewood Rd & Hurker Rise. The Gritstone Rd site could readily be accessed by an extension of Gritstone Rd beyond the junction with Bentley Close and part of the Pinewood site could be accessed from here. But there is the obvious need for more direct accesses to the local road network, otherwise the same over-long cul-de-sac as Cavendish Rd would be replicated. Amberdene looks a potential - although one or more houses may need demolishing; Quarry Lane is feasible, but again its outside the development site and not available?

Where else are the developers thinking about; and where and importantly how, are DDDC and DCC Highways suggesting that access is available?. There must surely have been some indication from DCC Highways that access[es] are achievable, otherwise DDDC could not possibly have suggested these sites for such massive development. Are DDDC willing to share that information and some detail?

Having said all that, there is a case for providing an alternative route in/out of the existing Wolds Rise area - thus avoiding the congested Cavendish Rd - via a new route through any new development to Chesterfield Rd and perhaps Wellington St. It would certainly "spread the load" and relieve pressure on Cavendish Rd itself. I appreciate that it would not be popular, but could be ameliorated with the use of traffic calming and other engineering measures [on Gritstone Rd for example]. An alternative access would help if ever there was an incident at the eastern end of Cavendish Rd which resulted in the road being closed. The whole estate is then "cut-off".

I have little doubt that as local Members representing the residents of this area you have considered such issues yourselves and had representations from others [including the Wolds Action Group] and will need to take all comments in to account in your future deliberations. I wish you luck!

One other point, I note that part of the Pinewood site includes the former football field off George Rd. DCC were going to develop this as extra parking for the Chatsworth offices site. Has this died a death? If DCC don't provide extra dedicated parking for staff, then any new streets in the proposed developments will only become effective overspill car parks for DCC staff.
REPRESENTATION FROM ROB ATKIN

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Dear Sirs

Local Plan Objections

I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to include Sites SHLAA224 and SHLAA225, located at [The Wolds, Matlock] in the draft local plan for the Derbyshire Dales District.

The proposal is objectionable for a number of reasons, including a number of breaches and contraventions of the Council’s own policies. I particularise each of these breaches below.

The proposal to include this valued area of land breaches the following paragraphs in the NPPF

- NPPF paragraph 7 … Economic, Social and Environmental roles (see later)
- NPPF paragraph 9 … involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people’s quality of life
- NPPF paragraph 17 … support the transition to a low carbon future… contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution… encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)…..make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling
- NPPF paragraph 30 …solutions which support the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion
- NPPF paragraph 32 ….safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people…. residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
- NPPF paragraph 37…people can be encouraged to minimise journey length for employment, shopping leisure, education and other activities.
- NPPF paragraph 38 …key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance....
- NPPF paragraph 64 … improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
- NPPF paragraph 74 Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on...
- NPPF paragraph 75 Planning Policies should protect and enhance public rights of way...
- NPPF paragraph 80 …to assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment…..by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- NPPF paragraph 94 …taking full account of flood risk....
- NPPF paragraph 103 ..local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere....
• NPPF paragraph 109 ….contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment…..protecting and enhancing valued landscapes…

The proposals also breach (but are certainly not restricted to) the following of DDDC’s own currently adopted policies and NPPF guidelines:

• SF1 Development within the Settlement Framework Boundary
• SF2 Protection of important open spaces
• SF4 Development in the Countryside
• H4 Housing Development outside the Settlement Framework Boundaries
• H14 To meet the needs of the elderly and people with disabilities
• NBE4 Protecting features or areas important to wild fauna and flora
• NBE8 Landscape Character
• Retired policy NBE14 Light and Noise Pollution
• Retired Policy NB15 Air Pollution
• NBE16 Development affecting a listed building
• NBE21 Development affecting a conservation area
• TR6 Pedestrian Provision
• TR7 Cycling Provision
• L3 Safeguarding recreational sites and facilities

Referring to the NPPF guideline and SHLAA224 and SHLAA225

Economic role. In the short term it might create some jobs for relatively low paid tradesmen and prospective developers interested in this kind of site already employ their own architects, planners and legal people. Long term it will not further the economic role within the town and Derbyshire Dales in general as many who might live there will out-commute to other centres of employment given prospects in Matlock are shrinking particularly in light of local government at a district and county administrative level shedding jobs.

Social Role encompasses local services reflecting a community’s needs which is not met by any such proposal by any stretch of the imagination. Local services and amenities are not within reasonable walking distance with few on the more accessible Smedley Street to meet the needs of many and cannot meet the needs of the majority. This will encourage the use of the car thereby contravening many of the principles encapsulated in the NPPF guidelines. In particular the residual cumulative impacts would be severe in particular those effects on transport/traffic over a wide ranging area.

Environmental Role – is about protecting and enhancing… adapting to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy. The development of sites which are 100% green field does not protect or enhance the area’s unique environment where other sites which have been abandoned by industry (so called brown field) are available and can be developed more densely to offset the need for this type of site. As stated above the location of the sites (up to 250m above sea level and a very significant distance and elevation above the base level of the town of Matlock) will
merely encourage the use of cars. It is well known that Matlock is the location used for the National Cycling Hill Climb Championship with the course taking in Bank Road, Rutland Street and Wellington Street. It is for good reason this course is selected with gradients up to 1 in 4 to overcome.

Paragraph 9: Is not supporting this paragraph but merely paying lip service to protecting the setting of an historical asset
Paragraph 17: The kind of people who purchase property on developments of this kind are more likely to out-commute and the additional traffic movements generated will cause disruption to the flow of traffic with stationary vehicles significantly increasing the level CO2 emissions. For reasons set out below regarding safe access the sites cannot make the fullest use of activity such as walking and cycling (to centres for employment, shopping and leisure) due to the gradients involved – it is simply not safe for cycling and all but the fittest could tackle the challenging gradients on foot.
Paragraph 30: Inclusion of these sites will NOT reduce greenhouse gas emissions or reduce congestion.
Paragraph 32: Safe and suitable access – this is impossible due to the site being between 200 and 250 metres above sea level and the gradients involved in travelling anywhere. It is well known that areas which are exposed and at this altitude are subject to adverse climactic conditions including ice and deep snow in winter. The residual cumulative impacts of such a development would be severe not only locally on Cavendish Road and Gritstone Road but also over a wide ranging area.
Paragraph 37: Residents of such a development will not be encouraged to minimise journeys, they will simply take the easy option of driving out of town. There are no major centres for employment in Matlock expanding, quite the contrary as the two levels of local authority (the largest employers) in the town are both shrinking their workforce.
Paragraph 38: Primary schools; GP surgeries; local shops are all but inaccessible and the local primary schools are already near or at capacity.
Paragraph 64: Building houses on a valued area of land does nothing to improve the character and quality of the area.
Paragraph 74: On the DDDC published maps there is an area of land labelled Playing Field
Paragraph 75: Sandy Lane is a public right of way not a highway.
Paragraph 80: This proposal does not safeguard countryside from encroachment.
Paragraph 94: The flood risk assessment is clearly wrong.
Paragraph 103: Development of this area will shift the flood risk elsewhere. Sewers and drains are already at capacity.
Paragraph 109: The proposal does not contribute to and enhance the natural environment it simply removes a natural environment. Nor does it protect or enhance a valued landscape.

Further to this I’d like to comment on these paragraphs:

Para 152 of the NPPF states that "local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided." Given the harm to the landscape, the effect of traffic; the harm to the setting of heritage assets (listed
buildings and conservation area); and possible effect on biodiversity the proposed allocation would fail to achieve the environmental dimension.

Furthermore, paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and paragraph 109 requires the planning system to protect and enhance valued landscapes. Section 12 of the NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment, whilst paragraph 32 states that development should (only) be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. I am sure over the next few weeks I will be able to demonstrate that the impacts will be severe?

Re: Goodwin’s Wood and Protected Species - Section 11 of the NPPF requires planning to conserve and enhance the natural environment. Generally, this means that impacts on biodiversity should be minimised. Para 118 states that if significant harm cannot be avoided, mitigated or compensated for, planning permission should be refused.

With regard to the playing field and Sandy Lane footpath, Section 8 of the NPPF promoted healthy communities. This includes the protection of existing sports facilities and rights of way (paras 74 and 75).

Referring to currently adopted policies:

**Policy SF1 – Development within Settlement Framework Boundaries**

The inclusion of sites SHLAA224 and SHLAA 225 is contrary to **Policy SF1**. The area is clearly outside the Settlement Framework Boundary as shown on the map published on the DDDC website (excerpt of relevant section below). Therefore, it goes without saying that these sites should not be considered for inclusion in the Local Plan and should not be earmarked for development before other sites which do lie within the Settlement Framework Boundary.

Policy SF1 also states that “within the Settlement Frameworks shown on the Proposals Map development will be permitted provided that it; ... (a) makes full and effective use of previously developed land or buildings in preference to greenfield sites; ... (c) preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the settlement; ... (h) preserves or enhances the natural and built environment.” None of these are met.
Clearly the proposal to include sites SHLAA224 and SHLAA225, which are both 100% greenfield sites located in a picturesque and important natural and historical area of Matlock, does not accord with the stated criteria of Policy SF1. There are a number of other existing brownfield sites which fall within the Settlement Framework Boundaries which should be identified for redevelopment before the Council even considers including greenfield areas such as SHLAA224 and SHLAA225 in the Local Plan.

Sites SHLAA224 and SHLAA225 should retain the special protection which is afforded to, “open spaces that are important to the character and appearance of the settlement,” because, in the Council’s own words, “development on these areas would be harmful to their open character or to the character of the settlement.” (Paragraph 2.17). These areas have been afforded protection from development in the past for these reasons and there is no cogent reason for the Council’s proposed departure from this approach.

**Policy SF2 – Protection of important open spaces.**

The area of land known as The Wolds is indeed an important open space of which there is precious little left in Matlock. There is a crisscross network of paths across it in many directions from its use by dog walkers and the like. An area such as this is a priceless amenity for the residents on the northern side of the valley and should be afforded protection for continued enjoyment.

**Policy SF4 – Development in the Countryside**

The proposal is also contrary to **Policy SF4**. The proposal fails to meet sections (f), (g) and (h) i.e. that the proposals should be appropriate in nature and scale to a rural area; and should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the countryside; and should minimise any adverse impact on the local environment.

The proposal does not meet any of these requirements and SF4 states that development within the countryside, “will only be permitted if it meets these stated criteria.” On this basis the current proposals should not proceed.

It is noteworthy here that the proposal also fails to meet the objectives set out in **paragraph 64 of the NPPF**, as it clearly fails to improve or enhance the character and quality of the area.

**Policy H4 – Housing Development Outside Settlement Framework Boundaries**

It is also contrary to **policy H4** for the same reasons - that is the sites are outside the settlement framework boundary.

In the published documentation, there is no mention of meeting **policy H14** - this would be impossible since it is a formidable exercise for all but the fittest to ascend from the town to the proposed site(s). Likewise the distance and altitude above the
town will encourage the use of cars contrary to paragraph 30 of the NPPF which states that “Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion.” Introduction of new housing on these sites will introduce residual cumulative impacts at a severe level in and around the local area contrary to paragraph 32 of the NPPF.

I also believe it contravenes policy NBE4 since it is clearly an important area to flora and fauna. In the report associated with the withdrawn proposal adjacent to the county council car park to provide an area of orchard and other amenities, the report document mentions the presence of badgers (in fact there is significant badger activity in our garden which is close to SHLAA224). There are also reports of other rare and protected species in and around the area.

It is contrary to policy NBE8 in that it does NOT protect or enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape - this is why it is labelled on the OS maps as The Wolds - it is distinctive and characterful and worthy of the label.

**Policy NBE14** - the site will have significant adverse light and noise pollution effects upon the area known as Goodwin’s Wood impacting fauna and possibly some protected species.

**Policy NBE15** - Air Quality - development of a site of this magnitude will add significantly to use of the car increasing air pollution and is also contrary to section 1.24 in the introduction to the adopted plan as well as paragraph 109 of the NPPF “The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.”.

**Policy NBE16** - Setting of a listed building. There are in fact 3 listed buildings at Wolds Farm. The Old Farmhouse, North Barn and East Cottage the setting of all of which needs protection.

**Policy NBE21** - The adoption of these sites will have an impact on the adjacent Matlock Bank conservation area with traffic increases bringing about probable severe congestion which is also contrary to the NPPF guidelines contained in paragraph 32 of that document.

**Policies TR6 and TR7** promote walking and cycling to/from the town centre - this is unachievable with sites at this elevation particularly due to the steepness of the gradient and distance from the town centre. There is a complete lack of existing routes for the cyclist with which to merge. Together with the fact it is clearly dangerous cycling down such a steep gradient with current levels of traffic never mind any increased levels due to his and other developments in the surrounding area it is clearly unthinkable that justification could be given supported by these policies. I also refer to NPPF paragraph 17 “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.’ I don’t thinks so!

As is recognised in the site assessments both of them fail to meet the policies regarding Infrastructure and Community Facilities.
Policy L3 is about safeguarding leisure facilities - the field adjacent to the county council car park off Cavendish Road is labelled on the map published by DDDC as Playing Field. Inclusion of the site SHLAA224 is contrary to this policy.

Policy L9 Safeguarding rights of way - Sandy Lane is a public footpath and turning it into a road to access these sites is contrary to this policy.

In DDDC adopted plan there are the following comments:

Chapter 1: “The Process: 1.5 The policies and proposals in the Local Plan will be used to guide the use and the development of land across the District for the period up to 2011. Planning applications for all forms of development will be rigorously examined against the policies and proposals in this Local Plan.”

Chapter 1: “Key Aims and Objectives: 1.16 Sustainable development is quite simply about ensuring a better quality of life for everyone. It is the recognition that the economy, the environment and our social well being are interdependent. It means making decisions that allows necessary development to take place, and at the same time, protect and where possible enhance the environment.... 1.17 The Derbyshire Dales Community Strategy, prepared under the auspices of the Derbyshire Dales and High Peak Local Strategic Partnership has set out a vision for Derbyshire Dales of; "Working in Partnership to keep the Derbyshire Dales one of the best places to live, work and visit”. It sets out two main aims; (1) To safeguard and improve the quality of life of people living in Derbyshire Dales; (2) To protect and enhance the environment of the Derbyshire Dales;"

“1.25 Reduce, recycle and re-use waste: (1) Giving preference to development that makes effective use of previously developed land;"

With respect to the policies contained in the draft document.

The proposal for inclusion breaches the following:

S2 Making efficient use of land by ensuring that the density of development is appropriate.... where possible to do so as to reduce the need to travel.... of jobs, services and facilities which are accessible by foot, cycle or public transport with minimal reliance on the private car.... Minimising the risk of damage to areas of importance for nature conservation and/or landscape value, both directly and indirectly.... a healthy, safe and attractive living environment and the risks from pollution and other potential hazards are minimised.... making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.... enhancing accessibility to a good range of services and facilities, and not putting an unreasonable burden on existing infrastructure and services....

S3 The use of previously developed land and buildings will be encouraged.....
Within the defined settlement development boundaries… the proposal would not appear as an intrusion into the countryside and would retain a sense of transition between the open countryside and the existing settlement’s core…. it would not cause the loss of, or damage to, any open space which is important to the character of the settlement….. it would not result in the loss of locally valued habitat which supports wildlife without equivalent compensatory provision being made elsewhere….. it does not result in substantial harm to, or loss of designated heritage assets and/or their setting…. it preserves and/or enhances the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape….. it will not generate traffic of a type or amount inappropriate for the highway network……

new development is strictly controlled in order to protect and where possible, enhance the landscape’s intrinsic character and distinctiveness, including the character, appearance and integrity of the historic and cultural environment….. it does not result in substantial harm to, or loss of designated heritage assets and/or their setting…… it preserves and/or enhances the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape…..

Supporting development proposals that maximise the potential of the River Derwent as a key asset of Matlock town centre….. Protecting and enhancing the historic environment….. Supporting the development of new housing on sustainable sites…..

Securing new transport infrastructure, including for walking and cycling to encourage modal shift, address traffic congestion….

Requiring that developments are easy to move through and around, incorporating well integrated car parking, pedestrian routes and, where appropriate, cycle routes and facilities….  

Listed Buildings; Conservation Areas:……. Ensuring that development within areas of Archaeological Interest do not have a significant adverse impact on any known or yet to be discovered heritage assets…..

development proposals protect or enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape….  

Promoting the use of appropriately located brownfield land…..The impact of the scheme, together with any cumulative impact (including associated transmission lines, buildings and access roads), on landscape character, visual amenity, water quality and flood risk, historic features and biodiversity…

it will not cause or worsen flooding on the site or elsewhere, and will reduce flood risk elsewhere….  

Promoting the maintenance and introduction of appropriate facilities to support cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders, ensuring that development supports
the use of local cycleway and pathway networks to improve choice of travel and ensuring safe access to developments on foot and by bicycle.....Approving developments provided that the capacity and design of the transport network serving the site will reasonably accommodate the anticipated increase in travel without materially harming highway safety or local amenity. In addition, the traffic generated by the development will not unduly interrupt the safe and free flow of traffic on trunk or primary roads or materially affect existing conditions to an unacceptable extent…

DS4 The land in question has a protracted history of refusal for permission to build for manifold reasons. There are many links (obviously they can only be followed on the electronic version) to be found in the following if further information is required:

1981 – Outline planning permission sought by Lawnswood Properties Ltd for Residential development of approx 200 houses for Wolds Farm Estate, an area behind Pinewood Road, Far Cross, Gritstone Road. Ref: WED/ 381/ 360

1981 objection 1 1981 objection 2 1981 objection result

Result: application WED 381 / 360 WITHDRAWN

1986 – The Wolds Farm area proposed to be deleted off local plan for development by what was then West Derbyshire District Council (WDDC).

local plan 1986 (1)Local plan 1986 2Local plan 1986 3Local plan 1986 4Local plan 1986 5Local plan 1986 6Local plan 1986 7Local plan 1986 8Local plan 1986 9Local plan 1986 10Local plan 1986 11wolds deleted from local plan 1wolds deleted from local plan 1986 2

1987 Lawnswood Properties submitted another application APP / P1045 / A87/70608 despite WDDC proposing to delete the Wolds Estate from the local plan.

They did this before the Secretary of State could approve the new Local Plan proposals.

Result: application APP P1045 / A87/70608 REFUSED by WDDC due to: poor relationship to existing settlement pattern, remoteness and exposed nature of site, site within open countryside, contrary to policy H1 of local plan which identified sufficient land elsewhere.

Lawnswood appealed against the refusal.
Details of Proposed Modification to Local Plan but WDDC decided not to formally adopt the Local Plan in 1987 pending the outcome of the Lawnswood appeal.

Public enquiry into Lawnswood’s latest Wolds planning application held 9/12/1987. Inspector upholds refusal and appeal is dismissed.

Result: Appeal was DISMISSED by Inspector due to technical reasons involving improvement details of the junction between Gritstone Rd / Chesterfield Rd, in particular the provision of visibility splays.

WDDC formally adopted the Local Plan (with Wolds Farm deleted) on 8/12/88 following inquiry result.

Objection from residents RE another application for proposed residential development for Wolds Farm Estate from Lawnswood Properties. REF: WED / 1189/0986

Here’s the documentation RE the 1189/0986 application hearing

And here’s Matlock Town Council’s concerns over the 1189 / 0986 application

Result: Application 1189 / 0986 recommended to be REFUSED due to access and visibility issues
Lawnswood needed to acquire further land at the junction off Chesterfield Rd / Sandy Lane to meet the requirements for improved vision at the junction. (Also applied to junction of Wolds Rd / Chesterfield Rd junction)

1990 – Further application submitted by Lawnswood for proposed development on Wolds Farm Estate with revised access and visibility proposals WED / 1090 / 0881

wolds estate lawnswood new app 1990lawnswood new application 1990matlock town council objection 1990 (1)

1991 – Joint enquiry held on 22/10/1991 by the Department of the Environment RE the two applications from Lawnswood WED 1189/0986 and WED / 1090 / 0881.

The second application was submitted after access rejection of the earlier 1189/0986 application. New application included visibility splays.


Result: Application REFUSED

2012 / 2013 – Draft Local Plan

Gritstone Rd and land behind Cavendish back on the table for inclusion in the new local plan.

Originally both sites featured as MAT 2 East and West – see image below
However the Cavendish site (MAT 2 West) was downgraded to priority 4 meaning no development while the Gritstone (MAT 2 East) was moved down to priority 3 but was still on the plan.

Then it was just the MAT 2 East (Gritstone Rd) site proposed for 40 houses: mat 2 single site 2013

**Result:** WITHDRAWN

The draft plan was withdrawn by DDDC due to central government deciding that the housing allocation was not high enough.

You can find very limited details online of previous planning applications by searching here for Wolds Farm planning applications or by clicking on the headings below.

**RESIDENTIAL (OUTLINE)**
I am confident when all these points are considered and the fundamental and underlying facts that the proposal is counter to NPPF and so many adopted and proposed policies will ensure the council makes absolutely certain it aligns its decision with respect to these sites, omitting from the draft local plan.

If the Council proceeds to include SHLAA224 and/or SHLAA225 in the Local Plan and this results in the granting of planning permission and/or the development of the site, I will continue to object and submit the necessary appeals in order to prevent this from happening. Furthermore, if in the likely event that there is any resulting damage to my property which adjoins the site as a result of flooding, subsidence and the like, I will not hesitate in pursuing the Council for damages.

Sincerely, Rob Atkin
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

As a resident of Cavendish Road for 20 years I am writing to object to planning applications SHLAA224 and SHLAA225. My objections are as follows:-

1. The loss of a greenfield site with well established trees and hedgerows which will have a devastating impact on the wildlife. Many species such as Sparrow Hawk, Buzzard and Tawny Owls along with Fieldfare and Redwing (all of which I have seen and which use the site as a wintering ground) can be found in the area. Some of the species of birds can be found on the RSPB Amber and Red list for Species in Decline. It is also home to many smaller birds and species of bees.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that the planning system should contribute and enhance the natural environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. I understand the Government is supposedly committed to halting the overall decline in biodiversity.

2. The increase in traffic is also a major concern with traffic along Cavendish Road being problematic at certain times of the day (school run, rush hour) and also at the weekends with increased activity on the Cavendish Playing Fields. As I was drafting this objection on Saturday morning I could hear a constant stream of cars. The entrance onto Cavendish Road from Wellington Street is itself too narrow which is exacerbated by parked cars. I have personally witnessed an emergency vehicle on a Saturday morning stuck in gridlock due to volume of traffic and parked vehicles. Construction traffic would only add to the congestion and once the project was completed the increased residential traffic would only continue to be an issue with residents.

3. Disruption during the build would be inevitable, but there would also be the risk of damage to existing foundations from heavy plant/machinery as the area has a history of subsidence. The National Planning Policy Framework states that any planning decision should not put any new or existing development at risk from being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.

4. Drainage itself is an issue as even in recent weeks there has been evidence of water run off from Amberdene. Part of the proposed site has numerous natural springs and there are known problems with flooding, subsidence and standing water. It is boggy and waterlogged even in summer. Developments such as this, in my view, are partly responsible for the increase in flooding seen nationally in recent years.

5. We all know that local councils are under pressure from the Government to meet house building targets but I wonder who will live at this proposed development. The country has an increasing population, but we also have an ageing population. I’m not convinced building homes at the highest point in Matlock would be an ideal place for an elderly person when you think about how accessible it is to local amenities, especially during winter when you take into account the site is situated above the snow line. Is the proposed development aimed at families? If so, do our local schools have places for them. Where are the jobs for the families who are anticipated will live here? The biggest employee in the town (the Council) are contracting out, not expanding. Can the local GP surgery’s cope with the extra hundreds or a thousand patients? I feel it is unlikely the infrastructure of Matlock will cope with this influx and we will need a new school and health centre to cope. Perhaps these will be in the next planning application!

Finally, if this development were to go ahead I fear that it would have set a precedent and that further building on greenfield sites would be deemed to be acceptable.

Sally Scargill
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am emailing to object to the proposal of 500 houses on sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225. I would like to object for the following reasons:

1. Road Safety - By adding 500 houses to the area this would increase traffic movements greatly. There is already a large number of traffic passing due to the use of the Cavendish sports fields for recreational purposes. I believe it would be a danger to residents especially children and the elderly/less able with even more traffic. Many pedestrians in our community enjoy walking and associated activities on the public footpaths which would only be destroyed by your plans.

2. Parking - I and others already experience great difficulty parking in the centre of Matlock. By building an additional 500 houses this will only get worse. Just by driving up to Cavendish you can already see there is problem accessing the Cavendish area with cars parking on the sides of Wellington street and Cavendish Road up to the fields. With more traffic flowing through this area this will only cause delays and backlogs etc.

3. Access to SHLAA 224/SHLAA 225 - I understand there is no direct access to the development sites which means costly and disruptive highway improvements will have to take place. This will again impact on the roads leading up to the area which already experience a large volume of traffic. Safety is also another concern for residents accessing the area.

4. Flooding - There have been problems in the past with drainage of land and flooding in this area. Building on the proposed sites will create further problems for properties such as subsidence and cosmetic damage. A number of properties have already experienced problems with the above and I do not see why you would risk this happening to new homes in the future when we have had serious problems previously.

5. Noise, pollution and wildlife - This is a massive concern. Matlock is supposed to be a town on the edge of the Peak District and always has been a healthy place to live up until this latest proposal. Matlock is known for it's fantastic country side and peacefulness however this will only be ruined by the noise disruption of your plans. Wildlife in the area will also be affected greatly as you will be destroying many habitats.

6. Services - My family and I are already experiencing difficulty when trying to use local services. For example it is becoming increasing difficult to book an appointment in the local doctors surgery. The last time I attempted to make an appointment I had to go to Chesterfield A & E hospital instead as I could not be seen at my local surgery. My doctors surgery is already overwhelmed with patients and adding 500 houses to the area will again impact negatively. The schools are another service which will also be negatively impacted by the high numbers of children wishing to attend.
Due to my reasons above and many more I cannot see any positives in building 500 houses in the sites you propose. I do not understand why they need to be in this area, I believe it would make more sense to build such a large development on a bigger scale of open land out of the town. I would suggest this to be in an area such as between Chesterfield and Matlock as this would give people a choice of whether to use Matlock or other areas to access all necessary services. This would therefore lessen the impact it would have on the Matlock itself, services and it's residents.

I wholeheartedly object to the proposal of 500 houses on the sites SHLAA 224/SHLAA 225 and hope you will agree with this.

Yours faithfully,

Sandra Mills
REPRESENTATION FROM SHARON BRIDDON

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

The March 16th full council meeting Derbyshire Dales District councillors will make decisions that will affect the lives of residents for decades to come, and am writing to object to the proposed plan to build on a green field site off Pinewood Road and to the rear of High Ridge. The proposal to rip up more of the beautiful landscape to build "affordable" housing is totally unacceptable for many reasons, not least of which is that once gone, this environment could never be recovered and the change would have a massive impact to the communities currently living in this area.

This area has already been submitted on a number of occasions, and none of the issues that prevented proposed building before have changed, so why yet again is this area being considered? It would seem that the council are determined to build on here regardless of the opinions of and previous objections by the many resident council tax payers, and with blatant disregard to the previous reports, recommendations and rationale for refusing inclusion in the plan previously. Our objections are listed below:-

1. Development of brown field sites first. I have been informed that there were around 200 sites put forward for proposal for the local plan, but only 31 have made it through. A lot of brown field sites and sites with less impact to the environment and communities were not considered. It is imperative these are used first before the council ever consider destroying prime countryside. Not using this site is directly contravening the Government's National Planning Policy Framework on using brown field sites.

Why are we allowing the development of a McDonalds, which the town does not need instead of building more flats? This would be more acceptable to the residents on Bakewell Road than another unnecessary takeaway.

2. Road congestion & safety. There is only one road accessing the whole of Cavendish Estate, and it is continually busy as it is. Especially at weekends when sports events are taking place on Cavendish Playing fields, it is extremely congested often taking 10 minutes to get from our home on High Ridge onto Wellington Street. The volumes of cars parked along Cavendish Road slow down the flow of traffic as only one lane of traffic can pass. We have already had incidences were buses have not been able to pass through and passengers have had to walk, where emergency vehicles have not been able to access the site, and patients have had to be carried or wheeled off the estate, and an occasion in the last few years where an injured person had to be helped by Mountain rescue! How on earth would a continual stream of heavy plant machinery and trucks affect the traffic, even if it manages to get past the very narrow entry onto Cavendish Road? What impact would this additional heavy traffic have for the foundations of the houses at the bottleneck entrance? Expecting more traffic flow is totally unacceptable on a road that was never built to stand the levels it already has.

If the proposed dwellings were allowed to be built, there would be thousands of extra vehicle movements around the area every single day worsening the existing bottleneck issues even further, not only on Cavendish Road, but also on Wellington Street and Chesterfield Road. It can already sometimes take 10 minutes to exit if you wish to turn right from Wellington Street to go down Chesterfield Road towards Matlock Green, or to turn right from Cavendish Road to go down to Bank Road at peak hours. It is almost impossible as it is to effect road repairs on Cavendish Road as it is
never clear as the council is already well aware. The road will become come significantly more damaged with the increase in traffic.

There are many families with young children, many elderly residents and pets on the estate and the additional traffic would increase danger and the risk of accident. This would mean parents would not be able to allow their children to play out and walk to the local schools as they do now, and the elderly would feel far less safe to go out.

This additional congestion, which would impact the whole town. was cited as a reason for no further development previously. Nothing has changed so why is this no longer an issue?

The resulting affect on air quality, traffic noise and pollution would also be very detrimental to existing residents.

3. Environmental Impact. There is a mass of wildlife making its home in the fields, beautiful trees, hedgerows and historic stone walls covered by sites SHAA 224 & 225. The wildlife supported by the habitat includes:-
- Pipistrelle bats, prevalent from Spring to Autumn every year,
- Badgers and foxes
- A Rookery
- Many birds of prey (Buzzards, Kestrels, Sparrow Hawks and various types of Owl),
- Many types of Bees, Butterflies and other insects,
- Frogs, Toads and occasionally Newts have all been seen in the stream behind High Ridge
- Voles and field mice providing much needed food for the birds of prey,
- A vast array of birds including regularly seen species that are included on the RSPB endangered list such as Fieldfare and Redwings

The site has previously been withdrawn as it has historic interest as the site was included in the enclosures act and it’s layout is archeologically significant. 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

There will also be a significant increase in noise and light pollution affecting the existing communities and wildlife which are all in direct contravention of the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework that states all possible impact must be minimised, but there is no way the proposed development could achieve this as it will significantly affect all the existing communities in a negative way. The air quality will also be severely diminished and become much more polluted which may impact the health of existing residents. I have a dust allergy which will become significantly worse and likely cause asthma attacks as building work started and my home become covered in a constant film of dust.
4. Drainage and Water run off. There is a considerable risk to existing homeowners due to the increase in water run off which will affect our properties. Our garden already becomes severely water logged and flooded despite the fact that we have built a significant soak away beneath our lawn. Our drains have often become flooded and overflowed due to the volume of run off water coming downhill. The increase in tarmac and concrete would make this even worse, unless the whole drainage system is completely overhauled causing even more disruption to the local communities. It will likely also impact further into Matlock as water can only run down. Look at the chaos caused last year on Wellington Street - this could become a common occurrence if we increase the volume of flow downhill.

5. Elevated Location. There are no local shops or amenities that residents can use in the vicinity, meaning all residents will need transport to visit the shops. Walking is not an option for some residents due to the steep location of the route to the nearest shops. As you state a lot of housing may be required due to the ageing population, why are you considering building in such an elevated location on the very fringe of town? It is certainly not a short or easy 10 minute walk to any shop from here as was stated in the submissions. It is a very steep gradient to get back up and certainly not a journey suited to the elderly or infirm. To do most shopping it is necessary to go into Matlock Town Centre and beyond, and it is not a simple journey for residents who cannot drive and so not a suitable location.

The elevated location mean we see significantly worse weather conditions than at even Smedley Street. The infrastructure cannot cope with ensuring our roads are cleared when we have bad snow at the moment leaving many of us stranded and unable to get to work, and this will be even worse if more homes are built here. Public transport often cannot reach the roads here and so there is certainly no way of ensuring sustainable transport routes for additional residents.

6. The lack of visible demand for housing in Matlock. If there is a such demand for more affordable housing in Matlock, why did it take so long to fill the flats that were built at Gateway Court? Some were still empty two years after they were built. In addition, a large number of people living there are from Nottingham and other areas, not from Matlock originally, and are benefit tenants. They have not moved here because there is an open job market with vacancies needing filling. Why should we tear up more of our precious green land to provide more social housing for people from out of the area?

It took years to build the Morledge development with considerable periods of down time indicating there was no rush to fill a need. In addition the sites that have already been approved in the plan at Lumsdale and Asker Lane haven’t even had any development started yet as no developers are interested in building there. Surely if this already has approval, and the demand for extra housing was there, there would be a rush to develop? I believe there are developers keen to rip up the land at sites SHLAA 224 & 225 and build a concrete jungle, and this seems to be the only reason the council are considering this. Why are the same developers not as keen to build where planning is already granted? This is a question that needs serious consideration - who is benefitting here?

There are many houses for sale on the newly developed sites, and these are not being snapped up as quickly as one would expect in a town with a big housing demand, and recently many plots were still vacant in the new Poppyfields development, just like they were at Gateway Court.

7. The lack of available employment in Matlock. People are not moving to Matlock because there is a wealth of job vacancies. The biggest employers are the District and County Council who are
presently cutting jobs! Surely this must be evident from the number of applications you receive for every one of the public sector job vacancies?. So where are the people coming from that need this housing? They clearly will be people who will be commuting out of Matlock to work and so do not need to live in Matlock, or those who require social housing and again do not need to live in Matlock. We should not start ripping up our countryside to provide housing for people who simply would like to live in Matlock because of its beauty, yet destroying it to enable this!.

8. Expanding the boundary of Matlock. Development on this site extends the existing boundary for Matlock and will set a precedent for future expansion and development into further green field sites, effectively allowing further destruction of our green field sites in future generations.

9. Schools and Healthcare. Our schools are almost full and it is very difficult to get appointments with GP’s at the moment. A further unnecessary and unplanned population increase will put our services under even more strain.

10. Build upwards not outwards. Rather than extend the town boundaries into green field sites, the council should consider building upwards on brown field sites, developing more flats and apartments similar to Gateway Court, especially in the former quarry and Permanite sites where the visual impact will certainly be preferable to the existing eyesores. This would help increase housing stock without destroying the countryside. Consider these as options when there are more plans submitted for “executive homes” that no-one needs. If there is such a demand for affordable housing then people would be happy to live where they can.

11. Loss of privacy for existing residents. We have all paid a premium to live where we do and worked hard to afford this. Our quality of life will be significantly impacted as we will now all be overlooked by hundreds of other residents meaning no further privacy in our gardens and rear rooms, and significantly more noise. Who will compensate us for the loss of property value and quality of life we will suffer if this proposal goes ahead.

We value our environment and will do everything we can to protect it, and expect our elected councillors to do the same. Matlock and it’s countryside is beautiful and should be protected at all costs, and our children and grand children should be allowed to enjoy it as well. Under no circumstances should any government be allowed to destroy it.

Yours faithfully,

Sharon Briddon (Mrs)
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Residents are aware of the pressure being put upon Local Government regarding land for housing development but I wish to register my objections to the above sites being included in the local plan. I believe a planning application for the Gritstone Road site is to be submitted imminently and therefore it is even more important that the above two sites be excluded from the local plan.

Please consider the following important points/objections:

**Drainage/Flooding** - This is a major concern as some existing properties already suffer with flooding and are built on rafts. Other properties have had subsidence issues and are underpinned due to sodden clay. There has been a case were the retaining back wall has collapsed almost certainly due to drainage issues.

The SHLAA225 site is covered with natural springs and building on the site will cause even more problems with flooding for existing properties and may even impact on home insurance in the future. I have seen the issues and would ask your future assurances to our well beings.

Gritstone Road, Bentley Close, Wellington Close, Amberdene and other areas close to the proposed sites already have problems with run-off water from the proposed site and are consistently boggy & water logged even in summer.

Also any development would include heavy plant machinery and given the history of subsidence on Gritstone Road this could acerbate the problem and cause damage to the foundations of existing properties. What are your answers this please?

**Loss of trees, hedgerows and wildlife** - Many forms of wildlife have been spotted on the SHLAA225 Gritstone Road site such as bats (which use the site as a hunting ground & for roosting), foxes, badgers, & hedgehogs. Many birds that have been spotted include Tawny Owl, Kestrel, Sparrow Hawk, swift, swallow, house & sand martin. Other birds which are included on the RSPB's Birds of Conservation Concern list such as Fieldfar, redwing. Most common UK finches are seen all year round along with many UK Bee species. It is a well known fact that greenland and hedgeland is impacting on our wild life and therefore the removal of these wildlife assets will impact on our natures future.

**Loss of Privacy and Light** - Any development could cause significant light pollution to the dark landscapes and nature conservation. Privacy at the rear of our property and also neighboring properties would be lost.

**Noise Pollution** - Development would cause significant visual and noise related disruption to existing residents for several years and possibly have adverse affects on health and quality of life.

**Road Safety** - The proposed development would result in a significant increase of traffic which in turn will increase the risks to road safety particularly for children and the elderly. Pupils who attend Highfields School walking along Chesterfield Road and also being dropped off on Wolds Road will also be affected with an increase in traffic.

**Access/Visibility/Exit Roads** - Their is no clear access to the development site, will this mean that existing properties may be demolished for access or will the developers have to persuade people to sell some of their garden land to allow access. Sandy Lane next to the SHLAA225 site is nowhere near an acceptable standard to be used as an access to a development site of that scale.

Visibility and exit on to Chesterfield Road from Wolds Road already causes difficulties especially at peak travelling times therefore an increase of hundreds of vehicles would create a backlog of traffic that would stretch back along all roads.

It is probable that in the event of the development that Gritstone Road it will became a main road with many vehicles from the top end of wolds estate using this road along with the new development and any new bus routes leading to hundreds of additional vehicles.
Freedom of choice -
We purchased this property because we did not want to live on a large estate, by inflicting the proposed development you have removed my freedom of choice.
I would also ask if you are forcing social housing on our estate on us without consultation.

Access. A question mark over whether developers would be able to achieve the required visibilities at the Wolds Road/Chesterfield Road junction, does it mean that homeowners would be required to sell off land in front of their houses for the developers to achieve the necessary visibility splays need to create a safe junction.

Jobs - Matlock no longer offers the same job opportunities as the largest employer Derbyshire County Council is reducing/cutting jobs rather than increasing. This would mean people commuting to nearby towns and cities rather than engaging with Matlock itself. Also Derbyshire Dales District Council is downsizing due to government cuts and merges.

Other points to consider are the elevated position of the proposed site as roads such as Gritstone and Pinewood tend to become snowbound in the Winter meaning car ownership is a necessity rather than a luxury.
A significant increase in the Matlock population will put increased pressure on schools, doctors,police and public services which are themselves under constant review usually being cut.
On a personal note Gritstone Road is a good place to raise a family without many worries over children playing out on the streets with each other, and an increase in traffic flow will mean this will no longer be safe.
As parents we have sat in our back gardens in an evening with the children over the years bat watching as they fly over and like to do this with our grandchildren but this would not be possible if the development goes ahead.
Also the affect it would have on me personally and health wise to be overlooked by other houses in to our back garden and bedroom would not be good. I moved here because of the location of the property and would not have done so if I had realised it was going to be part of a huge estate.. Plus the loss of value in our property.

Thank you for taking time to read this.

Stephen Crofts,
For the Attention of all Derbyshire Dales District Councillors, Town Councillors and Planning Committee Members attending the Derbyshire Dales Full Council Meeting on the 16th March 2016.

I set out below my reasons why I object to the proposed allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225 for inclusion in the draft local plan.

1. DRAINAGE / FLOODING

The current draft local plan states there are no issues with flooding for sites SHLAA 224 & SHLAA 225. I feel that this statement is at best inept, and at worse dishonest. I have seen for myself that Gristone Road, Bentley Close and Amberdene all already have problems with run-off water from the proposed sites. The areas are boggy and very water logged, even in summer. Properties adjacent to the sites have a long history of problems with flooding – building many more houses will obviously worsen the situation and create further problems for other properties in a wider radius.

Several existing houses are already built on rafts due to the wet nature of the site, with other homes suffering subsidence and having to be underpinned due to the sodden clay.

I feel that increased volumes and intensity of rainfall, which are forecast in the future, will increase the run-off on a vast new area of tarmac and concrete surfaces. This could overwhelm the sewer systems and result in the sewers ‘backing-up’ with dreadful consequences for any homes affected.

2. ROAD SAFETY

The proposals would dramatically increase the volume of traffic at peak times each day on already busy roads. This increases the danger for residents, especially the elderly and children.

This would increase the danger for pupils walking to and from Highfields School.

500 new homes will result in significantly increased traffic exiting onto Wellington Street and Chesterfield Road. At peak times this is already a problem.

It is well known that there is a serious question over the Wolds Road junction having the required visibility for a safe exit onto Chesterfield Road.

The proposed developments at Asker Lane and Moorcroft will compound all these problems.

3. THE LOSS OF GREEN FIELD LAND

This would also result in the loss of established trees, hedgerows as well as the wildlife habitat.

4. PROPOSED SITES ARE IN AN ELEVATED POSITION

The DCCC ‘Your Local Plan, Nov2015’ clearly states a 43% increase in people aged 60+ and a 88% increase in the 75+ age groups is forecast. Residents of any age without cars will be effectively stuck as public transport is not frequent and Gristone Road in particular is virtually inaccessible during bad weather as the site is above the snow line.

The severe gradient of the hill from the town centre to the new proposed development is simply insurmountable for older people.
The sites behind Gritstone Road and Pinewood Road, due to their elevated situation and tendency to become snow bound means that car ownership is absolutely necessary in winter. This means that any development here is effectively encouraging increased use of the least sustainable method of transport.

5. INADEQUATE EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE

The doctors, schools and shops could not cope with an influx of people from 500 new households.

There are no jobs in Matlock for these additional people. Hence they would have to commute, bringing added congestion to our inadequate roads.

Thank-you for reading my letter.

10\textsuperscript{th} March 2016
REPRESENTATION FROM SUE, DAVID & CALLUM ROSE

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Dear Sirs / Madams

You will be ratifying the Derbyshire Dales District draft local plan at the March 16th full council meeting.

As such, please find listed below our objections to sites SHLAA 224 (land off Pinewood Road) and SHLAA 225 (land off Gritstone Road) being allocated as development sites on the draft local plan.

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.

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.

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.

Finally what type of houses/housing will this development consist off?

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.

We look forward to hearing the District Council's response to our objections.

Regards
Sue, David and Callum Rose
By Email

Mike Hase
Planning Policy Manager
Planning Department
Town Hall
Bank Road
Matlock
Derbyshire
DE4 3NN

14 March 2016

Dear Mr Hase (mike.hase@derbyshire.gov.uk)

Proposed Housing Development for Brailsford

As a very regular visitor to the village of Brailsford and the surrounding area I am writing to express my concern about the current and proposed housing developments in the village of Brailsford.

I have always considered the A52 as the Gateway to the Peaks, and Brailsford one of the villages that contribute to rural character of the area.

I was surprised to become aware of the 50 homes approved for Miller Housing when ground was originally broken. My concerns were justified now that we can see the development and in my view the houses are neither in the style or character of much of the surrounding village, in terms of housing density and materials used. It has the clear appearance of an urban estate. It would have been relatively easy to build in a more sympathetic style to the region and the typically used building materials.

I understand that there are further requests for planning permission for similar developments within the village. My research indicates that an additional 25 homes have been approved within the village with a further 20 are being considered in the pipeline and there is an application by Miller Homes for a further 20 houses on the Old Cheese Factory site adjacent to Luke Lane and 75 houses by Gladman Homes.

I am very concerned that the style and density of the proposed developments are typical of large standard estates more suited to an urban environment, and as I understand that despite reservations raised to the Council by landscape experts, appear to take no account of the preservation of the local environment or landscape character. Surely, this cannot be the correct course of action. I would urge the council to address this aspect of the developments.

In my mind a number of key issues are raised by the current and future development:

- A fundamental question must be that given the limited new employment opportunities in the area what is the true demand for these houses. I understand that one of the sites being considered for housing development has been designated as Employment Land. It
It would be madness to put houses on such a site when new local jobs are so desperately needed in the village. Planning law is very clear in requiring all new developments to be sustainable and from an employment basis this does not appear to be the situation for Brailsford.

- The village integrity and structure should be maintained. The landscape does not lend itself to further major urban estate development. My concern is that with these proposed developments Brailsford risks going beyond the natural 'tipping' point for a village and rapidly takes on the character of a "town". We should absolutely ensure Brailsford remains a village.

- To what extent has planning considered the needs of current residents that may wish to remain in the village but "downsize". The proposed new developments would be the opportunity to meet this need and reinforce the sustainability of the existing community.

- In addition to the proposed housing developments; what local community infrastructure (excluding the primary school) is planned? I am unaware if a community centre and/or whether recreational facilities are planned. Without these basic components there is a high risk that the housing developments will attract undesirable activities and boredom among young people in particular and isolate elderly residents.

- I am unaware of any proposed changes to the effected roads and junction with the A52 despite the obvious likely increase in traffic volumes. What criteria have been used to determine that there are no traffic and road safety implications resulting from the proposed new developments, especially the Luke Lane junction and the Main Road access adjacent to the pedestrian crossing?

I understand that in total if all the proposed planning permissions are granted the village will increase in size by close to 100% yet I understand that no explicit provision has been made for community infrastructure, highways and road safety, water and sewage provision. Rightly, both visitors and residents of Brailsford should have major concerns if this is indeed the situation.

Please acknowledge receipt of this correspondence and confirmation that it will be brought to the attention of the Local Plan Advisory Group.

I should also like you to register that I wish to be considered as a formal respondent to any future consultation and that we are notified when the consultation is underway.

Mr John Goddard

CC:  lewis.rose@derbyshiredales.gov.uk
      angus.jenkins@derbyshiredales.gov.uk
      bandepe@virginmedia.com
Proposed development to site SHLAA 225 – land off Gritstone Rd, Matlock

To whom it may concern

My objections along with those of others who will be directly affected by the above are many and here are but a few.

With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, point No. 9 states that “pursuing sustainable development involves improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure”.

Well, the conditions in which existing Gritstone residents (council tax payers all)

a: live will certainly not be improved – our homes will be devalued because the plans automatically remove a substantial part of the natural beauty that makes this area such an attractive and sought after place to buy.

b: Our gardens in which we often like to work already have drainage problems making any kind of work during the winter months often impossible – a problem highly likely to be worsened with the increase in hard-standing areas there will be on the sloping ground where building will take place and the consequent removal of trees and hedgerows.

c: Travel will be adversely affected at busy times by the sheer volume of vehicles exiting/ entering the Chesterfield road – dangerous too for the many school children pedestrians using the road twice daily.

d: Leisure – an area of outstanding beauty will be gone forever.

No. 17 “planning shouldenhance and improve the places in which people live their lives”. How? Can this plan have anything but a detrimental impact on the lives of existing residents and their homes? “planning shouldrecognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and support thriving rural communities within it” Well our peaceful surroundings are going to be taken away!

No.51 “Local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housesthey should normally approve planning applications for change to residential use and any associated development from commercial buildings.” The area known as Tansley Wood Mill is for sale and is an eyesore at the end of the beautiful Lumsdale Valley – crying out for development – why have our green fields taken precedence over this brown field site??
No. 58 “Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments.................will function well and add to the overall quality of the area” Well rest assured this planning will do nothing of the sort for this particular area.

No. 77 Local Green Space Designation should be applied where the green area is “demonstrably special to a local community” – AND IT IS – “because of its beauty...............tranquillity or richness of wild life.”

No. 80 “Green Belt serves to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”

By going ahead with this development planners will grossly undermine just these few and how many more of the guidelines laid down by the NPPF. It seems to me the attitude is “green light, go ahead – it’s not happening in my back yard”.
My objection to the proposed building plans around here are that the ground isn't suitable; it is like a clay pit. When we bought the plot here plot 59 in 1966, the first to be built, we watched it being built step by step. Over the last 2 years or so and with so much heavy rain, I have watched things go from bad to worse with damaged concrete slabs and broken Tarmac drive. The grates and sewers can't cope and they all overflow. It is a mess to live with and no one can do anything to alter that.

Mrs D Britland
14-3-2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you to oppose the planning of building 500 houses in the fields at the back of my house.

I bought the house as I loved the view of the country at the back of my house. I also would hate extra traffic on the roads surrounding my home.

Yours Sincerely,

A Mann

Mrs E Mann
Sir/Madam,

I wish to raise objections against the proposed development NO. SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225, in accordance with and in accordance to the National Planning Policy Framework, hereafter referred to as NPPF, as follows:

1) Road Safety - These proposals will increase traffic to alarming rates increasing dangers for all residents, especially children and the elderly. Their reliance to Westfield School will increase dangers for students walking to and from school particularly with the cumulative effect of other nearby proposed development. Accidents are inevitable.

Accessibility to the site. Rush hour now in these areas is daily regarding. We are facing 1,000's of extra traffic movements on already congested roads with difficult junctions to exit and enter. Visibility is poor.

Location of site. We are above the green line, public transport is infrequent and we have no amenities in its area. To call Snrddly St a shopping centre is laughable.

P.A NPPF "Facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport." These elevated positions mean car use.

Ownership is essential and 500 houses would equal 1,000 more cars at least.

2) Damage/Flooding. The focus, not notice of flood risk makes this an issue. Building here would increase the problem for existing and new residents. Consider 2016's warning and the flooding we have witnessed throughout the country in recent years and the misery it brings. A future problem for us if building goes ahead!

Pollution where to start? From extra cars and the
services the new sites will need: Light pollution
linked to P29 NPPF — linked to P26, 27 NPPF.
Native Conservation These sites don’t comply with the
following: “Contribute to and enhance the natural and local
environment, protect and enhance valued landscapes”
also the effect on local wildlife could be devastating
any birds we attract here are on the RSPB
“birds of conservation concern” list.
3.) Health and wellbeing of existing residents and indeed
the whole of Nattwold. This would have a significant
detrimental effect on health and quality of life.
29 NPPF “Decisions should aim to avoid or mitigate giving
rise to significant impacts on health and quality of
life.” Pollution would impact on health and loss of “nature/
peace” areas likewise.
Practicability which don’t seem to have been considered:
A.) Schools for new households: Schools locally would be
swamped causing overcrowding and a decline in
educational standards.
B.) Where are these new residents to work? Or are we
to create a dormitory town in Nattwold where people live,
but work and shop elsewhere. Once again volume of traffic
would increase and be problematic.
C.) Medical facilities. It is already a die problem seeing/
making an appointment locally. 1,000, 2,000 new patients
cont. going to help. Ambulance / Emergency Services access
to existing sites is poor to dangerous.
D.) We have one decent supermarket in Nattwold will this
need to expand causing more locals / traffic to supply
increased needs?
Finally to note NPPF page 6 “The planning system should
encourage the effective use of land by revising
and that has previously used — “Brownfield land.”
This is clearly not the case with the proposed sites. I believe realistically we shouldn't see these proposed sites in isolation, the future of the whole of Mattishall is at stake.

What is being proposed will have a profound effect and would overwhelm, overload and literally destroy Mattishall as a place to live.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

140
Mrs H. Gilbert.

31, Pinewood Road,
Matlock,
DE4 3HN.

To Whom It May Concern,

I wish to put forward my objections to the proposed building of houses on sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225. They are as follows:

Traffic - already a problem with parked cars on narrow roads making passing difficult. More cars will only add to the problem. Even if new road systems are put in place, ultimately they are all going to converge on either Wellington St. or a busy Chesterfield Rd. where large numbers of children walk and travel down each day.

Access - no direct access to these sites. Creating access is going to be costly and disruptive, affecting roads close to the sites and a potential danger to residents especially children.

Draining and flooding - these fields are waterlogged and sudden heavy downpours of rain have caused flooding in gardens and I understand, houses too. In my own case, I have witnessed water gushing through the wall from the field on site SHLAA 224, which borders my property and very quickly flooding the driveway. What I wonder will happen if this development goes ahead?

Facilities - are schools able to cope with an influx of pupils? Recruiting of teachers is at an all-time low. The same with GPs. There are two surgeries in Matlock. Doctors are already known to be overstretched. Extra numbers would be an additional burden.

Environmental impact - loss of another green space and its flora and fauna. An historic landscape gone, swamped under vast swathes of houses, totally out of character for a small place like Matlock.
Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to raise objections against the proposed developments NO. SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225, in accordance with and accordance to the National Planning Policy Framework, hereafter referred to as NPPF.

As follows:

1) **Road Safety** - These proposals will increase traffic to an alarming rate, increasing dangers for all residents, especially children and the elderly. Their journeys to Highfield School will increase dangers for students walking to and from school potentially with the cumulative effect of other nearby proposed development. Accidents are inevitable.

2) **Accessibility to the site** - Rush hour now in these areas is a daily concern. We already face 10,000+ cars extra daily movements potentially on already congested roads with difficult junctions to exit and enter. Visibility is poor.

3) **Location of site** - We are above the snow line, public transport is infrequent and we have 14 amenities in the area. To call Smeadley St "a shopping centre is laughable.

4) **P.A NPPF** - "Facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport". These elevated positions mean car usage and ownership is essential and 500 houses would equal 1,000 more cars at least.

5) **Damage/Flooding** - The low, wet nature of both sites makes this an issue. Building here would increase the problem for existing and new residents. Consider global warming and the flooding we have witnessed throughout the country in recent years and the misery this brings. A future problem for us if building goes ahead!

6) **Pollution** - Where to start? From extra cars and the
services the new sites will need. Light pollution
linked to 1.29 NPPF. Linked to 1.26, 2.7 NPPF.

7. Native Conservation. These sites don't comply with the
following: "Contribute to and enhance the natural and local
environment, protect and enhance valued landscapes, and
also the effect on local wildlife would be devastating.
Many birds we attract here are on the RSPB
"birds of conservation concern" list.

8. Health and Wellbeing of existing residents and indeed
the whole of Mattok. This would have a significant
detrimental effect on health and quality of life.

1.29 NPPF. "Decisions should aim to avoid or reduce
giving rise to significant impacts on health and quality of life.
Pollution would impact on health and loss of "nature/
green" areas likewise.

Practicalities which don't seem to have been considered:

a) Schools for new households. Schools locally would be
swamped causing overcrowding and a decline in
educational standards.

b) Where are these new residents to work? Or are we
to create a dormitory town in Mattok where people live
but work and shop elsewhere. Once again volume of traffic
would increase and be problematic.

c) Medical facilities. It is already a dire problem seeing
making an appointment locally. 1/000 2,000 new patients
can't get help. Ambulance/ Emergency Services access
to existing sites is poor to dangerous.

d) We have one decent supermarket in Mattok will this
need to expand causing more homes/ traffic to supply
increased needs?

Finally to write NPPF page 6 "The planning system should
encourage the effective use of land by reusing
land that has previously used — "Brownfield land". 2/50
This is clearly not the case with the proposed sites. I believe realistically we shouldn't see these proposed sites in isolation; the future of the whole of Mattock is at stake. What is being proposed will have a profound effect and would overwhelm, overload and literally destroy Mattock as a place to live.

Yours sincerely,
H. M. Saleiffe, née
(Helen Saleiffe)
Sir
I object in the strongest possible terms to the development of 500 houses on the area known as The Wolds, Matlock - SHLAA224 and SHLAA225

This proposal will affect the air quality and create pollution, severely affecting the quality of day to day life for residents. The accumulation of extra cars at already over used junctions will increase CO2 emissions and pollutants. This is contrary to NPPF guidelines. Such a development would result in at least a thousand extra traffic movements per day. That is without considering the two new sites at Asker Lane and Quarry Lane which already have planning consent.

Many students who attend Highfields School live in the town and walk to school. Some of the junctions are dangerous, especially the Chesterfield Road / Wellington Street junction and the Wellington Street / Cavendish Road junction. People who live in the area are all aware of these dangers. I often run / walk various circuits, taking in Asker Lane, Sandy Lane and environs. They all necessitate crossing Chesterfield Road, which can take between 5 and ten minutes to cross as it is. The Council must take into account residents’ opinions, their health and safety and the health and safety of future generations on this issue. People have a basic right to breathe clean air and we all know that this is an international issue. I refer to the “Core planning and principles” section of the NPPF paragraph 17: New developments should “support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate.”

As the proposed development is 850 feet above sea level, getting around without a car will be difficult; all but the very fittest will find it a challenge to walk down into the town and back. The Council states in its documentation that the site is “twenty minutes walk from amenities on Smedley street” - this may be true for fit people but the elderly and families with push chairs and / or young children would find this a challenge. In any case, unless you want the following; an exclusive hair cut; a manicure; wax; spray tan; facial; newspaper; beer; sandwich or car service, you will need to go further afield!

DDDC also state that this proposed development is walkable and cycle-able. As stated on page 5 of the recent Strategic Development Site Policies (Policy DS2) for land off Gritstone Road and Pinewood Road, Matlock: “Preparation of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, including full highways design, specific consideration of public transport routes, improvements to existing and development of new pedestrian / cycle routes.” Interestingly, Matlock is again hosting a section of the British Hill Cycling Championships this year; the course begins by Matlock Post Office and finishes at the top of Wellington Street. Clearly this demonstrates the arduous and challenging nature of the incline which the council claims to be walkable and cycle-able. The claim is a spurious one and I challenge it. People will not walk or cycle, they will get into their cars. Again, this breaches the NPPF “Core Planning Principles” which states that developments should “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling.” Although the council claims to have addressed this point, it is clearly not deliverable in real terms.

DD policy states that any new development should reduce the need to travel, especially by car. It should also ensure that highway problems are not created as a result of new development. It is clear to people who live here that such a massive development will increase traffic and put pressure on an already over stretched road network, contrary to NPPF guide lines. It is my opinion, as a resident of over twenty years, that the impact on the roads, pollution and quality of life will be severe.

Residents will be adversely affected by noise and light pollution by such a development, another impact on their quality of life. The Wolds is a beautiful, undulating ( hence its name ) and historical landscape in which sit three listed buildings of historical importance, dating back to the early Seventeenth century (1634). I foresee issues of overlooking, and potential damage to buildings in their setting which have formed an important part of the landscape since the time of Shakespeare. (NBE16 Development affecting a listed building)
DD states that the "character and diversity of the countryside should be sustained" and that there is a "need to protect and enhance the natural beauty and amenity of the land."

In addition, you must consider the impact on flora and fauna and historical features. This is an ancient site with earth works and it is said to be the site of a Roman road. Goodwin’s wood and the green fields, hedge rows and traditional dry stone walls are an important habitat for all manner of wild life and it would suffer as a result of this development. By allowing development of this land, the council will not be sustaining or enhancing the beauty of the landscape; on the contrary, it will be an act of destruction.

There is also the Matlock Bank Conservation area to consider and this would also suffer from increased traffic.

Another concern is that there are few employment opportunities in Matlock, so residents of the 500 properties are likely to commute out, creating more traffic but limited integration or loyalty to the town or its amenities. More pressure will be placed on our already overcrowded primary schools and our GP / medical services. Will there be any plans to address these public service issues? We all know how difficult it is at present to get a GP appointment and understand the pressures faced by our doctors and nurses.

The Wolds is a 100% greenfield site, development of which is contrary to NPPF guidelines. If developed, this will mean that underdeveloped brownfield sites will remain brownfield and will never be brought back into full use as “previously developed land or buildings” should be developed “in preference to greenfield sites.” In support of the Permanite site and the Cawdor Quarry site, they are central to the town and would discourage reliance on the car. They are not greenfield sites and could be developed more densely and effectively. In the assessment documentation it is stated that the average age of the Derbyshire Dales is increasing, so why develop a site 850 feet above sea level? The older generation would benefit from more bungalows and apartments, which could be accommodated by the brownfield sites. The Permanite and Cawdor Quarry sites are above the river and are level; their development would enhance the town and they would be brought back into use instead of lying derelict. Many fine examples of brownfield development can be visited in Manchester canal basin and other inner city areas. It is clear to residents that the issue here is cost; green fields are easy pickings for developers who do not want their profits to be eroded by potentially costly clean up operations. The cost of developing brownfield sites will be more costly in the short term but the cost to our environment will be immeasurable and irreversible if the council allows The Wolds to become a housing estate.

Although under pressure to meet identified housing need, the Council still has a duty of care to protect properties and their electorate who will be adversely affected by their planning decisions and they will be held accountable.

Thank you for taking the time to read my opinions

Yours Faithfully,

Julie Atkin, resident of Farm Lane, Matlock.
Sir

I object in the strongest possible terms to the development of 500 houses on the area known as The Wolds, Matlock - SHLAA224 and SHLAA225.

This proposal will affect the air quality and create pollution, severely affecting the quality of day to day life for residents. The accumulation of extra cars at already over used junctions will increase CO2 emissions and pollutants. This is contrary to NPPF guidelines. Such a development would result in at least a thousand extra traffic movements per day. That is without considering the two new sites at Asker Lane and Quarry Lane which already have planning consent.

Many students who attend Highfields School live in the town and walk to school. Some of the junctions are dangerous, especially the Chesterfield Road / Wellington Street junction and the Wellington Street / Cavendish Road junction. People who live in the area are all aware of these dangers. I often run/walk various circuits, taking in Asker Lane, Sandy Lane and environs. They all necessitate crossing Chesterfield Road, which can take between 5 and ten minutes to cross as it is. The Council must take into account residents’ opinions, their health and safety and the health and safety of future generations on this issue. People have a basic right to breathe clean air and we all know that this is an international issue. I refer to the “Core planning and principles” section of the NPPF paragraph 17: New developments should “support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate.”

As the proposed development is 850 feet above sea level, getting around without a car will be difficult; all but the very fittest will find it a challenge to walk down into the town and back. The Council states in its documentation that the site is “twenty minutes walk from amenities on Smedley street” - this may be true for fit people but the elderly and families with push chairs and/or young children would find this a challenge. In any case, unless you want the following: an exclusive hair cut; a manicure; wax; spray tan; facial; newspaper; beer; sandwich or car service, you will need to go further afield!

DDDC also state that this proposed development is walkable and cycle-able. As stated on page 5 of the recent Strategic Development Site Policies (Policy DS2) for land off Gritstone Road and Pinewood Road, Matlock - “Preparation of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, including full highways design, specific consideration of public transport routes, improvements to existing and development of new pedestrian/cycle routes.” Interestingly, Matlock is again hosting a section of the British Hill Cycling Championships this year; the course begins by Matlock Post Office and finishes at the top of Wellington Street. Clearly, this demonstrates the arduous and challenging nature of the incline which the council claims to be walkable and cycle-able. The claim is a spurious one and I challenge it. People will not walk or cycle, they will get into their cars. Again, this breaches the NPPF “Core Planning Principles” which states that developments should “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling.” Although the council claims to have addressed this point, it is clearly not deliverable in real terms.

DD policy states that any new development should reduce the need to travel, especially by car. It should also ensure that highway problems are not created as a result of new development. It is clear to people who live here that such a massive development will increase traffic and put pressure on an already over stretched road network, contrary to NPPF guidelines. It is my opinion, as a resident of over twenty years, that the impact on the roads, pollution and quality of life will be severe.

Residents will be adversely affected by noise and light pollution by such a development, another impact on their quality of life. The Wolds is a beautiful, undulating (hence its name) and historical landscape in which sit three listed buildings of historical importance, dating back to the early Seventeenth century (1634). I foresee issues of overlooking, and potential damage to buildings in their setting which have formed an important part of the landscape since the time of Shakespeare. (NBE16 Development affecting a listed building)
DD states that the "character and diversity of the countryside should be sustained" and that there is a "need to protect and enhance the natural beauty and amenity of the land."

In addition, you must consider the impact on flora and fauna and historical features. This is an ancient site with earth works and it is said to be the site of a Roman road. Goodwin's wood and the green fields, hedge rows and traditional dry stone walls are an important habitat for all manner of wild life and it would suffer as a result of this development. By allowing development of this land, the council will not be sustaining or enhancing the beauty of the landscape; on the contrary, it will be an act of destruction.

There is also the Matlock Bank Conservation area to consider and this would also suffer from increased traffic.

Another concern is that there are few employment opportunities in Matlock, so residents of the 500 properties are likely to commute out, creating more traffic but limited integration or loyalty to the town or its amenities. More pressure will be placed on our already overcrowded primary schools and our GP / medical services. Will there be any plans to address these public service issues? We all know how difficult it is at present to get a GP appointment and understand the pressures faced by our doctors and nurses.

The Wolds is a 100% greenfield site. development of which is contrary to NPPF guidelines. If developed, this will mean that underdeveloped brownfield sites will remain brownfield and will never be brought back into full use as "previously developed land or buildings" should be developed "in preference to greenfield sites." In support of the Permanite site and the Cawdor Quarry site, they are central to the town and would discourage reliance on the car. They are not greenfield sites and could be developed more densely and effectively. In the assessment documentation it is stated that the average age of the Derbyshire Dales is increasing, so why develop a site 850 feet above sea level? The older generation would benefit from more bungalows and apartments, which could be accommodated by the brownfield sites. The Permanite and Cawdor Quarry sites are above the river and are level; their development would enhance the town and they would be brought back into use instead of lying derelict. Many fine examples of brownfield development can be visited in Manchester canal basin and other inner city areas. It is clear to residents that the issue here is cost; green fields are easy pickings for developers who do not want their profits to be eroded by potentially costly clean up operations. The cost of developing brownfield sites will be more costly in the short term but the cost to our environment will be immeasurable and irreversible if the council allows The Wolds to become a housing estate.

Although under pressure to meet identified housing need, the Council still has a duty of care to protect properties and their electorate who will be adversely affected by their planning decisions and they will be held accountable.

Thank you for taking the time to read my opinions

Yours Faithfully,

Julie Atkin, resident of Farm Lane, Matlock.
Mr. P. Birch
83, Wolds Rise
Matlock
DE4 3HJ

Development of Sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225

I strongly object to these plans as I think it will cause so many problems mainly due to the increase of traffic around this site. It gets very congested at times and as we only have one exit off Wolds Rise then I think it will have a huge impact on everyone who lives here.

My other big concern is with drainage and flooding. This will affect a lot of households.

I just feel this whole development would be one big disaster!!
I imagine these developers do not live locally. They will have no idea how this will affect all the local people. All they will be thinking of is the money they will be making. This development should not be allowed.

Yours faithfully

P Birch
Subject: Objection Letter
For Representation to be Considered at the full Council Meeting
March 16th. Against Proposals to include Sites
STLAA 224/22S in The Dertyhorne Dales Local Plan.

Dear Committee,

I refer to N.P.P.F. P6. States that 1st effective use of Land (Brownfield land) should be
Reused as priority over Greenfield Sites!!

It makes no sense to me and my friends
that (CAWDER QUARRY) Now Disused, Close to Matlock,
On the level, with facilities Close by. Accessible,
is Not your 1st Choice.

I find the excuse, Of Expense to
clear the Site, Unbelievable, knowing that the
benefit to the eventual Residents would be immense!

I personally will consider it a
Crime if STL 224/225 is your final Decision.
We will be Stuck with a Rotting Industrial Site
and Another Construction Site to last 10 or 15 Years
This Cannot be right for Matlock.

I again personally will hold you
Councillors Wholly Responsible for the wrong Decision
The 'Cawder Village' is the only option
I list other Major Reasons for Building
"CAWDER VILLAGE" Pro
1. Access Along Cavendish Road Allready Diabolical so Very Busy All Week

2. SHL224/225 Are Above the Snow line (900ft Approx Above Sea Level) People Rarely Walk to Matlock it's too Steep, 2000 Plus Extra People Trying to Get their Cars out will Cause Mayhem!!

3. Flooding to this Site is Awfull, Where is the Water Going to Go

4. How Many Shops, Pubs, Doctors Surgerys, Play Areas etc Are Included in the Build!!

"CAWDOR VILLAGE" PLEASE

Yours Sincerely

Roger Taylor

Corner Chairman, Cavendish Field Sports Association

Life President!!

07834.063918
FAO all attendees at March 16th full council meeting.
Proposed housing developments SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

My name is Stuart Kirk and I wish to object to the above housing developments on the grounds of their detrimental effect on my personal health. It is fact that such an increase in housing will produce a significant increase in vehicle traffic particularly in the area of Chesterfield Road and therefore a relative increase in air pollution.

I have COPD (Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease) which in my case is Emphysema. This disease is worsened by air pollution and because in my case it is potentially a life span shortening disease the proposed developments will potentially shorten my life span further and generally reduce my quality of life. I therefore object to the proposals.
REPRESENTATION TO BE CONSIDERED AT FULL COUNCIL MEETING 16th MARCH 2010. OBJECTION TO PROPOSAL TO INCORPORATE SITES SH/PLAN 224/225 IN THE DERRYSHIRE OAKS LOCAL PLAN.

I am writing to object to the proposed development of 500 houses in the area of Matlock known as the Wolds, SH/PLAN 224/225.

The proposal to create a sprawling development will not only destroy this beautiful open countryside with its many historical features i.e. ancient earthworks, possible site of a Roman road, but also have an impact on the wildlife found there.

0.0. Stated that "the character and diversity of the countryside shall be sustained" and that there is a "need to protect and enhance the natural beauty and amenity of the land". This development will totally diminish the quality of life for residents who live in this area for the very reason of its location.

There are already severe problems with the access roads to these sites. Cinderbank Rd. is a bottleneck reduced to a single track by constant street parking, in fact on the occasion of 17/2/10 around 9.00am the road was totally gridlocked due to an ambulance with sirens and flashing lights unable to get through. This development will result in 1000's of extra traffic movement per day at the location is 800 feet above sea level and accessing it without a car or public transport will be extremely difficult. Add to that the constant deliveries of online shopping. There are problems with the visibility, slopes, for development of the Gritstone Rd site which will require existing homeowners to create a safe junction by selling their land.
There are many children who walk to school. What about their safety not only from increased traffic as there are already two other proposed developments at Askew Lane and Moorcroft which will exit at Chesterfield Rd but also from pollution contrary to NPPF guideline. Residents will also suffer from noise pollution and disruption as it will result in living in the midst of a continuous building site for the next 10 years as the existing access will be through the residential area an roads totally unsuitable for large construction vehicles. There may be damage caused by heavy construction vehicles accessing the sites. 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, noise, pollution or land instability. NPPF p 26.

Development of these sites could result in increased flooding. The woods are full of natural springs, Melthorpe was built around its Hydros!!! How will this excess water be drained? Pinewood Rd, High Ridge, Turker Rise, Gristhorne Rd, Rentsly Close, Amberdene and Farm Lane already have problems with run off water from the proposed sites. There is evidence of water in gardens and garages and several houses are already built on rafts and underpinned. Severn Trent have already identified names which are liable to flood which could have an impact on home insurance in the future. How will this water be controlled and what will be the impact on the existing infrastructure.

The male population is forecast to be an ageing one at 2050's your local plan 2013 clearly states so therefore developing houses on one of the highest points above the town centre is senseless. Public transport is being cut
and residents of any age will be stuck without cars. Both sites are virtually inaccessible in bad weather as are above the snowline. The site assessments for SHMA 224/225 claim that it is a 10-20 minute walk to closest amenities on Smedley Street not taking into consideration a steep gradient which makes Matlock a host to the National Hill Cycling Championship. If this area forms part of an arduous challenge how can it be easily walkable, especially for the elderly? What provision is being made for schools and surgeries and what about employment opportunities. Is everyone going to commute out of Matlock? The sites SHMA 224/225 are an extension beyond the edge of the current settlement framework boundary. Will this set a precedent for future expansion and development with further 'greenfield sites', the world is of a greenfield site, development of which is contrary to NPPF guidelines if developed it will mean the vast brownfield site already available at Cauldon Quarry perronite site will be overlooked. This site would accommodate not only the necessary housing but also include retail development which would be vital in providing employment for all the new residents. It is in easy walking distance to local amenities on level ground and close to the railway station and hospital making it much more suitable for development.

Please, urge you to reconsider and leave greenfield sites SHMA 224/225 and use the brownfield site of Cauldon for redevelopment.

Yours faithfully,

TARINA JOHNSON - RESIDENT OF WINDMORE ROAD.
objections to \underline{SHLAA 92K} land off Pinewood Rd.

Mr. M. Plessar
12, High Ridge

I have lived on High Ridge since 1969.

From the days we moved in we had water problems, from the fields behind on Highridge which is a flood plane.

If they build 500 houses on this land, Highridge Pinewood Hurkarwise Farcross Worlds Rise the water would be horrendous.

The field at the back of Highridge in the last 10 to 15 years has started to slip slightly in the bottom of the field.

Also Pinewood Rd, High Ridge, Hurkarwise Worlds rise forcross cavendish Rd.

Would not stand up to any more traffic Cavendish road is only a single track with passing places because of parked cars.

The fields between Pinewood Rd across to Gritstone Rd are totally unsuitable for building a house on, due to very wet land.

Is it not possible to build a new housing estate on the outskirts of Malloch where it is not putting any more stress on people's lives and road structure?

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
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Objections to SHLAA224
Land off Pinewood Rd.

I think this planning for 500 houses has not been looked into for the fores and Against such has building on a flood plane, expense on access on to all roads, the volume of traffic on and off Cavendish Rd Bellingham St Chesterfield Rd. Earl-stone Rd. looking after surfaces that will take excessive wear with the volume of traffic.

There is also extra traffic at weekends because of the children's football on the playing fields. Also because of the extra volume of traffic it could be very dangerous for the young and elderly to cope with.

I think it will make the drainage problem worse by putting more concrete block pave drives new roads pavements. Who is going to help us with more flooding problems please take all into consideration and take it away and make a new estate on some good land. I am sure it would be less expensive and not affecting all of us that have had enough off traffic and flooding.

Mrs J. Lester
Dear Sir,

I am writing about the above planning application. Apart from access to safe outlets onto Chesterfield Road (having in mind Highfield School) the problem of flooding from the already boggy ground needs to be carefully considered.

With the recent freak flooding over Christmas and the chance warning this could become more frequent the flooding question needs to be very technically investigated before any large number of houses are built on this site. Yours sincerely

Avril Cooper (Mrs)
10th MARCH 2016

Dear Sirs  LOCAL PLAN, BRAILSFORD

As a consultee for the new local plan, I attended a meeting re Brailsford on 17th February 2016. Like the other members of the public who were there, I was horrified at the huge amount of new building which has been dumped on Brailsford. It would appear to us that consultation only takes place after decisions have already been made. No-one at that meeting voted for the proposed developments.

The number of new houses seems to be increasing with every passing day. The map on the east side indicated that 32 houses might be built. We have since heard that 75 are now contemplated.

My objections are as follows:

Roads

The A52 is a narrow road, not designed for the amount of traffic which would be generated by further development. It is used by large lorries from Hulland works and there is little room for them to pass each other. This road would be adversely affected by building in Ashbourne as well as in Brailsford and we fear a large increase in the number of accidents.

Services

The doctor’s surgery would have difficulty coping with the extra people, which would mean longer waiting times and more frustration for patients. It was mentioned at the meeting that the new school had no parking room for the parents and some felt it would prove too small for the increase children wishing to attend. There is insufficient land for the school to ‘grow’ in the future.

The sewers are likely to prove inadequate as well. New gas, water pipes and electricity will also be needed. Building firms sometimes say that
they will deal with such matters but, in practice they do not like to spend more than they are obliged to.

Employment

There are very few well paid jobs in Brailsford. Most of the businesses located there are ‘one man’ operated. People already living here have to commute, sometimes long distances, to find suitable jobs. Incommers are likely to do the same, which is against the policy of localism and people living near their places of work. Every house built in Brailsford will mean at least two extra cars on the road or even more.

Wildlife

The woods near Throstle Nest Way are home to a variety of wildlife, many woodland birds, owls etc., also foxes and bats. There is a rumour that Throstle’s Nest plantation, which has existed for hundreds of years, may be cut down if this site is approved. There is also a large reservoir on the site, which once supplied water to all households in Brailsford. Since I live near the site I am concerned about where this water is likely to go, as my house has been flooded twice when building work has taken place above it i.e. The Plain and The Elms. The proposed exit onto the A52 appears too dangerous as it will be almost on the pedestrian crossing, our only haven when crossing a dangerous road, too near the entrance to Saracens Court and on a bend, and the visibility would be poor.

Brailsford, where I have lived for 73 years, is a pleasant village with open views. It has grown over the years but still remains a village. The number of houses classed as infill would be sufficient for its future needs. I feel it is now at the ‘tipping point’ where it will cease to be a village and become a large soulless housing estate.

Like many other villagers, I hope the Council will think again before this becomes a reality.

M E Kent
10 Gritstone Road  
MATLOCK  
Derbyshire  
DE4 3GB  

12th March 2016  

Dear Sir/Madam  

**Proposed Development Site Reference SSLAA 225**  

I am writing to you to voice my concerns about the above proposed development site.  

I and my family have lived on Gritstone Road for most of our lives and it is fair to say that I have enjoyed my time here. I have several pets and find my current house the ideal place to be. I believe that the inclusion of 500 extra houses on the estate will change the whole area and not in a beneficial way.

**Loss of Privacy** – The proposed development will over look our property and almost certainly affect our privacy and lighting.

**Traffic** – The hundreds of extra vehicles generated by the new development along with the diverted traffic from the Wolds end of the estate can only add to the danger and chaos on the roads and limited junctions especially on Chesterfield Road. This will be a significant issue at school times and peak work times and will cause delays and jams. There will also be a significant increase in the number of larger vehicles including Lorries and buses. I used to walk my dog up Sandy Lane like many other people but believe that if this became a main access site to the proposed development it will present dangers to people and animals taking this route. The extra traffic will also pose significant dangers to all pedestrians in particular the elderly and children. Road safety will become a serious problem.

**Loss of wildlife and Natural Habitat** – The large scale removal of trees, Hedgerows and fields is bound to have an impact on our already struggling nature with significant repercussions in the future. We have even had newts in our back garden but suspect this will not be the case if the development takes place.

**Natural Springs and Drainage** – Drainage has always been a problem with some properties being flooded on a regular basis. There are also natural springs in the area and any interference with these will also impact on drainage

**Noise Pollution** – A long term building site with its lorries and industrial machinery along with the hundreds of extra vehicles would generate a significant level of noise pollution. There would also be visual issues, all of which will impact on peoples health and well being.

**Employment Opportunities** – With continuing reduction and redeployment in two of the towns bigger employers, Derbyshire County Council and Derbyshire Dales District Council, along with the continuing decline in industry I cannot see were many jobs are going to come from.

**Infrastructure** – The increased pressure on the already stretched infrastructure can only add to the existing problems with increased demands being put on roads, hospitals, doctors,
schools, police and fire services to mention just a few.

I do not wish to be part of a large estate for the reasons mentioned above and I hope you will give careful consideration to my and I am sure many other peoples concerns.

Thank you.

Victoria Rose Croft

Derbyshire Dales District Council
Town Hall
MATLOCK
FAO all attendees at March 15th full council meeting
10 Gritstone Road  
MATLOCK  
Derbyshire  
DE4 3GB  

12th March 2016  

Dear Sir/Madam  

**Objection To Proposed Development Site Reference SSLAA 225**  

I write to you with regard to the proposed development site.  

I have lived on Gritstone Road all my life and have enjoyed and appreciated my time here. The above proposal will change much of that. From being a quite and safe place to live it will turn Gritstone Road into part of a huge sprawling estate and with it, will bring in all the associated problems.  

I list below my main concerns and the reasons.  

**Additional traffic** - The proposed development of 500 new properties will almost certainly produce at least the same number of additional vehicles. I also believe that by opening up the estate many vehicles from Wolds Rise, Pinewood Road etc. will also use Gritstone Road, this has the potential to increase still further the amount of vehicles using this road. It is already difficult to access Chesterfield at certain times of the day, i.e school times, and the inclusion of many hundreds of extra vehicles can only increase delays and traffic build up. The extra traffic will create significant extra risks to vehicle users, cyclists and pedestrians.  

**Drainage and Natural Springs** - I am aware that there are several natural springs in the area and that along with the current drainage problems can only make the current flooding problems worse. I have also seen walls collapse due to drainage issues.  

**Privacy** - Some parts of the proposed development site are raised above the levels of existing properties and this must intrude on our privacy and will also create light issues.  

**Noise** - It is pleasant to sit outside in peace and quite watching bats and other wildlife, all this will go if we become part of a large estate, along with all the industrial vehicles involved in the site development. I believe this will impact on peoples wellbeing.  

**Fields, Trees and Hedgerows** - The removal all of these will impact on all areas of wildlife especially with the removal of hedgerows which are dissappearing at an alarming rate.  

**Work Opportunities** - I myself have struggled to get a part-time job recently in Matlock and with what appear to be declining work opportunities, councils downsizing and a steady decline in Industry, I believe the inclusion of hundreds of new properties can only make work harder to come by.  

I have only briefly listed my main reasons for objecting to the proposed development but believe the creation of a huge estate, which along with the new properties already built, will not be of any significant benefit to the area.
I also believe the extra houses, people and vehicles will put a huge pressure on our already stretched services, resources and infrastructure.

As a young person and part of the future of this area I hope you will carefully consider the contents of this letter.

Thank you.

Ryan Crofts

FAO Committee Meeting 16/03/2016

Derbyshire Dales District Council

Town Hall

Matlock
Dear Mr Hase,

I would be grateful if you could please acknowledge receipt of this email and confirmation that it will be brought to the attention of the Local Plan Advisory Group.

I should also like you to register that I wish to be considered as a formal respondent to any future consultation and that I am notified when the consultation is underway.

As a resident of the village of Brailsford I am writing to express my concern about the proposals relating to Brailsford which have been published to date.

In addition to the 50 homes approved for Miller Homes, over the last year some additional 25 homes have been approved within the village with a further 20 in the pipeline, including an application by Miller Homes for a further 20 houses on the Old Cheese Factory site adjacent to Luke Lane. This land has previously been designated as Employment Land: new local jobs are needed in the village.

These housing development approvals already represent around 50% growth in the size of our village.

Published documents suggest that the Council is proposing an allocation of around 100 more homes. From approaches made by developers this could rise to around 200 plus – more than doubling the size of the village in a very short space of time.

Also of concern is that the proposed developments are for large standard estates more suited to an urban environment. Despite reservations raised to the Council by landscape experts the proposals appear to take no account of the preservation of the local environment or landscape character. Neither do they recognise the traffic implications, both volumes and related road safety issues.

This is a major concern for residents.

While I accept that some further development may be necessary in the village as the Council plans to meet its housing allocation targets, this should be at a much smaller scale and consistent with maintaining the integrity of the village environment.

Ahead of the formal consultation on the Council’s proposals, I would like to understand the rationale for the Authority’s current decisions and to make sure that your Local Plan Advisory Committee has taken full account of the expectations of residents which are currently being formulated in our Neighbourhood Plan. I should therefore like answers to the following:-

1. The logic of the settlement hierarchy as set out in the DDDC core strategy which risks placing major developments in Brailsford, Doveridge and Hulland Ward, and the decision taken that there would be no new development in the smaller villages such as Wyaston, Shirley and Longford although a meeting held in Hulland Ward in the Autumn suggested that representatives of the smaller villages are seeking small scale development to keep their villages vibrant. An application for a small development in Clifton was recently refused.
2. The rationale for the density of allocation to Brailsford when c50 new homes only were proposed under the previous Local Plan - an additional 2000 to be found would therefore suggest an allocation of c30 only was needed.

3. In relation to 2 above, what account has been taken of new approvals since the last draft Local Plan, e.g. Cheese Factory, Main Road, equating to around an additional 50 with all infills the cheese factory - 20 homes and land at main Road - 15 homes, plus around 10 infills and 10 proposed retirement bungalows on The Green; thus double the expected requirement and equating to a 50% increase in the size of the village.

4. The village integrity and structure should be maintained. The landscape does not lend itself to further major urban (estate development). What constitutes a ‘tipping’ point for the larger villages, i.e. the effective balance of new estate development (suitable for a town) and economic, social and environmental (sustainable development) which maintains the nature of a village.

5. How have the findings of the Landscape Sensitivity report 2015 by Wardell Armstrong been accommodated in relation to the expansion of the village and particularly the site to the East of Throstlenest Way (SHLAA 236). The landscape assessment shows Amber for the Council’s preferred sites.

6. Why does SHLAA 236 (land to East of Throstlenest Way) remain an Option when it was ruled out as unsuitable by the Council (including a clear statement by the Council Leader in the last consultation?)

7. How is Brailsford thought to have sufficient amenities for an additional 200 homes. Who has decided this and what are the criteria for the decision? Broadband is already painfully slow, the water pressure frequently stops altogether, I understand that drainage is a major concern, the school is already over-subscribed.

8. Which statutory bodies will be consulted about the DDDC proposal and what weighting is given to their input?

9. What criteria have been used to determine that there are no traffic and road safety implications resulting from the proposed new developments, especially the Luke Lane junction and the Main Road access adjacent to the pedestrian crossing. There are frequent accidents with several deaths over recent years. More housing in Brailsford coupled with the huge proposed development on the outskirts of Ashbourne will create a traffic hazard.

10. What are the expectations for education. The new Brailsford School built for 120 was apparently based on 50 additional homes. Where will secondary education be provided?

12. Planning law suggests that all development should be sustainable. How will jobs be provided in Brailsford as the employment land allocation is likely to be removed.

13. What consideration is being given to additional demand for utilities including sewage treatment and the management of flood risk?

14. A survey undertaken by the Parish Council as part of the development of the Neighbourhood Plan indicated that there was a demand for specialist accommodation for older residents (allowing them to downsize while staying within the village). What account has been taken of this requirement as current approved applications are for standard market housing?

Thank you for taking the time to read this. There is an overall acceptance of the need for some more housing, however the disproportionate amount being proposed in Brailsford is not sustainable. There are many other areas of Derbyshire that can accommodate housing. Split the requirement over more villages and areas and do not concentrate it all into one area, Brailsford.

Yours faithfully, David Newnes
REPRESENTATION FROM ANDY FULLER

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I would like to submit my objections to the proposal for building of 500 houses on the sites DHLAA224 (Pinewood Road) and SHLAA 225 (Gritstone Road):

Please do not rush these proposals through to the detriment of future generations and the loss of the beautiful surrounding area of Matlock itself. Take a walk around the Pinewoods to see for yourselves our beautiful heritage.

Flooding:

The nature of the land around the proposed site has caused my own and several properties on Moorfield to flood in recent years due to the drainage and run-off from the fields above. With the extra building and concrete infrastructure I am concerned for my own home. The drainage from property development of only 200 houses at the Morledge site has caused a massive drainage problem that could not be solved so easily at this proposed site with so many homes below the area. Added to which this area has been identified by Severn Trent as a flood area with natural springs and a clay soil. Being in such an elevated position, during severe winters it is usual to be snowed in for several days. It is above the ‘snow line’ difficult enough if you are mobile but could cause people to be housebound as it is inaccessible to public transport at these times.

The road safety around Highfields School should be of great concern:

With increase of traffic along Chesterfield Road and wherever the access point for these new houses is situated. This will also have an impact on the catchment area for Highfields causing the need for expansion and further expense. There will be hundreds if not thousands of traffic movements especially at peak times. Access onto Chesterfield Road will be dangerous and expensive to adapt as the road to and from Chesterfield is not situated to accommodate the extra traffic for the actual building work and afterwards for the extra road-users. The increased traffic on Chesterfield Road will also cause build ups from the roads leading on to Chesterfield Road.

Facilities:

The facilities for shopping and recreation are all in town and the area proposed is not accommodating for older people that are not independently mobile. For families that will need to take their car into town this will cause extra traffic in the town centre for shopping – what improvements are expected to accommodate this? The increase of so many houses in the area in a short time mean that the boundary of Matlock will extend the current Settlement Framework Boundary and set a precedent for future expansion
and development for further green fields sites to be destroyed. Employment opportunities in the area will not support the extra housing and therefore people will be commuting (and shopping) to nearby towns and cities with little affiliation to Matlock.

Wildlife:

The last and least to be considered but what is the expense to loss of wildlife around the area? And loss of greenfield site for walking and recreation?

- Loss of green field site, established trees and hedgerows as well as loss of wildlife habitat
  - Wildlife spotted at the SHLAA 225 Gritstone Rd site. Pipistrelle bats – hunting ground and roosts in local trees
- Badgers
- Foxes
- Many birds including, particularly of note – Raven, Buzzard, Kestrel, Sparrow Hawk, Hobby, Merlin, Tawny owl and all the hunderines (swift, swallow, house and sand martin) 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”,
- Siskin, reed buntings, redpoll, yellowhammer, Brambling and most common UK finches all year
- Many UK bee species.
- Increased pollution and loss of trees

Alternative Brownfield sites are available within the Town, closer to Sainsburys and the Railway part of town which would develop the area and increase the footfall within the town without increasing the traffic problems.
At the Meeting of the Local Plan Advisory Committee on 20 January 2016 you will recall my wife spoke on my behalf regarding sites SHLAA224 & SHLAA225.

The particular aspect brought to your attention was the unacceptable impact that the volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing development will bring to the local road network, particularly Cavendish Road.

Incidentally, Item no.4 of that Meeting (Derbyshire Dales Local Plan – Allocation of sites ---- etc) page 13, referring to SHLA224, Clause 3.55 States “The Highways Authority - - - - - mitigate any effects on Cavendish Drive” - Cavendish Drive is in fact in Ashbourne !! – Do we really know where we are ??

More significantly in Appendix 2 Stage B, the assessment schedule, SHLAA224 page 59, Highway Infrastructure. The Highways Authority state that safe access can be achieved by highway improvements – reference is made to Pinewood Road being better suited as an access .

As this road has extremely wide verges/footpaths it can be readily seen a there is scope for the construction of a widened carriageway that would be more suitable for the increased volume of traffic generated by the housing development.

But where does Pinewood Road/Wolds Rise lead to – Cavendish Road. The Highway Authority refers to the existing traffic problems on Cavendish Road but offers no mitigation for the increased traffic volumes – why because there isn’t any !!

Cavendish Road will simply be overwhelmed and become non-operational. Given current traffic growth figures the situation on Cavendish Road will reach this state soon enough.

This is why I have already suggested that no traffic from this section of SHLA224 should have access onto the Cavendish Estate.

On 4 February I received a response from DDDC’s Policy Manager, to my earlier email, advising me that a ‘Traffic & Transportation Study’ is to be carried out covering the whole of the Local Plan area. I have already stated that I consider this would not be satisfactory for use in a small localised area. (although ‘boundary’ information could be used)

I have already advocated the use of a traffic microsimulation model for this purpose – which I note the DDDC’s Policy Manager is indicating would be submitted with a Planning Application (with DCC preparing the brief and content required)

I suggest it will be difficult to achieve any ‘coherent picture’ of the traffic flows and evaluate the possible accesses with the above approach primarily because of the fact there are two sites (which may have separate Developers) and the phasing’s of the building stages.

I suggest this should be given more consideration in order to ensure that the effects of the volume of traffic generated by the housing development are evaluated by recognised acceptable methods in order that meaningful judgements can be made.

David Elsworth
Mr Gareth Clarke & Mrs Rose Clarke
2 Gritstone Road
Matlock, DE4 3GB
roseclarke37@yahoo.co.uk

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

14th March 2016

Re: Derbyshire Dales Revised Local Plan

Dear Councillor

I wish to object to the proposal to include sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225 in the revised 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.

- **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 undeveloped 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. 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.”

- **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.”

  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.

Thank you

Yours sincerely
Rose and Gareth Clarke.
REPRESENTATION FROM JULIE BARWICK

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Dear Members of the Council, I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to include SHLAA224 and SHLAA 225 in the local plan. I have very strong concerns regarding this proposal which do not seem to be being taken into account. My concerns are as follows:

- Increased Risk of Flooding: being a resident of Moorfield, both of my next door neighbours have been flooded costing tens of thousands of pounds damage to their ground floors and renovation work required to try and avoid future flooding and also led to them being refused house insurance for 5 years. I myself have been very lucky so far in that my property has not actually been flooded, though my garden has and many times myself and my neighbours have been out in all weathers sweeping the water away from our houses and redirecting the flow of water towards manhole covers and drains, and placing sandbags against the wall to the field where the plans are now to build on site SHLAA224. This area is already permanently waterlogged and covered with a large number of natural springs. The resulting building work being proposed will overload our already inadequate drainage systems.

- Inadequate Access: From what I have been able to determine, if these sites go ahead access to SHLAA224 will be via Pinewood Road (off Cavendish Road) and access to SHLAA225 will be via Sandy Lane (off Gritstone Road) both of these are small residential roads, but with regards to Cavendish Road which leads onto Wellington Street, this is already a bottleneck and causes lots of issues for the current residents. Due to the housing on Cavendish Road/Wellington Street, nothing can be done to improve this access. The thought that there will be potentially thousands more vehicles travelling along this road fills me with dread and will be logistically impossible to manage. Only last week, a bin wagon was stuck and an ambulance could not get through to an emergency meaning that the ambulance drivers had to carry the stretcher with the patient on a considerable distance. In the interim whilst the building work was being carried out there would be a massive increase in trucks transporting building supplies to the area travelling along a road which is not built for these types of use. The increase in vehicles using these roads plus the additional vehicles which will need access and egress to the developments at Moorcroft and Asker Lane will increase risk of accidents to our children who walk to Highfields School and severely impact on their safety. This will also increase pollution and the knock on effect of this from queueing traffic will again impact on our young and elderly.
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

To whom it may concern

I wish to register my objection to the council’s proposals to plan to build houses on sites SHLAA 224 and 225 in Matlock.

With reference to page 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework as cited below, as a resident living on Rockside View in Matlock I am particularly concerned about the car and pedestrian safety of myself, members of my family whose ages range from 3 years – 88 years and include those who are registered disabled that would be incurred. I refer to:

35. Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. Therefore, developments should be located and designed where practical to ● accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies; ● 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, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate establishing home zones; ● incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles; and ● consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.

More specifically I would argue that as Cavendish road, being the only access road onto our estate and to these proposed developments sites, is extremely narrow and has cars parked down one side and one narrow pavement, the proposed development would contravene the above policy by increasing risk of accidents. The vastly increased volume of traffic incurred if this development goes ahead would have serious implications for:

- The safety of school children (including my grandchildren) walking to local primary schools and to Highfields Upper School site and the bus stop to take children to Highfields Lower School site
- The safety of parents and grandparents (myself included) with pre school and young children walking to the small play area off Cavendish road
- The safety of adults (including myself) who walk from home to work and back
- The extreme congestion problems that already exist every Saturday morning when families come down Cavendish road to access the football field
- The difficulties that exist for drivers trying to get out of the estate on Wednesday mornings when refuse is collected
- The risk posed to elderly disabled residents (my mother included) travelling safely on pavements whilst on a motorised scooter
- The existing traffic difficulties already encountered with delivery trucks that often get stuck coming up Cavendish road at any time, but especially on Fridays
due to supermarket grocery deliveries and at seasonal times of the year such as Christmas due to the high volume of deliveries.

I therefore strongly object to these proposed building developments on the above grounds.

Dr Kathryn Pomerantz
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I am writing to object to the planning reference SHLAA 225 for 500 new homes. I have lived on Gritstone Road or 17 years, my house is the second one in from the Wolds Rise entrance.

My objections are based on a number of issues, firstly safety: 500 new houses will mean at the least 800 cars that will use the Wolds Road entrance. I believe it will be unsafe as the access is not sufficient. At busy times in the morning and evening the volume of traffic already using this entrance makes it difficult to exit left safely onto the busy Chesterfield Road. School children crossing this road with no pelican crossing inevitably there will be accidents due to the additional number of cars.

The second issue I have is the plan to build so many houses with no facilities. My question is how can a town like Matlock sustain an increase in people of this magnitude. Where will people work, go to school? It is already impossible to get an appointment at the Doctors in Imperial road as the queues at 8 am will prove. There is just not the infrastructure for such an influx of people. If no utilities are to be built on an estate of this size more and more traffic will go up and down the narrow Wellington Street, Smedley Street, Chesterfield Road and Bank Road which is already very busy and hazardous to negotiate in order to get to the shops etc. The whole town will be a car park.

The biggest problem that will affect this new estate is the fact that the fields they plan to build on gets very waterlogged, this may cause problems for the houses in Bentley close and Gritstone Road to become flooded.

Basically Matlock is too small and does not have anything to offer this number of new people unless the plans include schools, doctors, shops and businesses.

Regards
Lynn Eatherden
REPRESENTATION FROM PAUL WALBANK

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Please accept this email as my objections to the proposed planning application on the above sites.

I feel disappointed that we have to revisit the same ridiculous proposals that were only turned down recently, but this time are on a larger scale. Does the local council not respect the opinions of their constituents by constantly going over the same disputes.

Firstly the access on Cavendish is already difficult without the added load of an extra 500 to 1000 cars that the proposed development would bring. Also the detrimental affects to road safety this massive increase in traffic would have on the estates, especially to the young children who live here. I am deeply concerned for my own children’s safety on Pinewood Road which would be reduced to a busy through road. The local roads would also find it really hard to deal with the increase in traffic, especially the busy Duke Wellington junction, Cavendish/Wellington Street and Gritstone Road/Chesterfield Road Junctions.

Why are we building on green sites when suitable brown sites exist, which have previously had plans passed such as the Cawdor Quarry site? Also this building on the green sites would remove the natural drainage of the local area, so adding to the problems of local flooding, which is a real issue already.

Finally how would the local infrastructure cope with the massive 500 houses development that he been proposed and all the extra strain on the local services such as the schools and doctor’s surgery’s.

Can this please be the last time these ridiculous proposals are considered. It is causing a lot of distress to local people and the fact that they were turned down previously only adds to our annoyance!

Yours Disgruntled

Paul Walbank
Pinewood Road
Dear Councillors and Committee, I am a Matlock resident and I wish to submit my objections to the development plans for sites SHLAA224 and 225, and particularly the Cavendish Road site. The development area is large and is a greenfield site. Previous planners have deemed it unsuitable for development. I am aware that there is already a problem with flooding, waterlogged soil and run-off water in the area north of Cavendish Road. This would be greatly exacerbated.

On environmental grounds, all development should aim to minimise car use, by developing areas which have walking access to shops and local facilities like doctors' surgeries. This development would put houses out of pedestrian reach of the town centre, as well as significantly extending the town boundary. Brownfield sites within the existing town boundary would be a far more long-term environmentally friendly solution.

Car ownership for this proposed development would be a necessity and would greatly add to the existing congestion on Cavendish Road, Wellington Street and the main junctions. The land is agricultural and also supports a variety of wild-life. The effect of development on Britain's wild-life has been well documented recently with huge loss of various species numbers. We are the custodians of the country for future generations and we should be looking at ways of preserving what we still have, rather than developing any greenfield sites.

Yours sincerely, Penelope Brown (Mrs).
Derbyshire Dales District Councillors

14th March 2016

We the above hereby wish to raise our objections to the proposed plans to build 500 houses on sites SHLAA224 and SHLAA225.

The reasons for our objections are as follows:-

Limited access to the sites –
Disruption by building contractors (large lorries and diggers etc) trying to access the sites on already over congested and narrow roads. Cavendish Road and Wolds Rise already have a problem particularly at weekends when there is a large increase in volume of traffic accessing the playing fields. Non residents insist on parking on the roads and verges causing residents difficulty in entering and exiting their premises. Entry on and off Cavendish Road is by a single access via Wellington Street causing disruption to traffic as it tries to navigate the roadway between parked cars.
If the houses are built the access will become untenable. 500 houses could mean as many as an extra 1000 vehicles as most household these days have at least 2 vehicles.

Road safety –
Living across from the park on Cavendish Road we see many a car speed around the corner in an area where small children are playing. There is not only the park but the local playing fields with children constantly accessing both. There is also concern for the elderly residents on the street. The pavements are narrow and of many occasions residents have to step into the road in order to pass other pavement uses. If there is an increase in traffic that posses a risk to all concerned whether children, elderly or any resident of the area.

Access to Chesterfield Road –
The access from Wellington St, Asker Lane and Gritstone Road on to Chesterfield Road is already difficult particularly at peak times and has proved to be a black spot on numerous occasions. An increase in traffic from the proposed sites will massively increase the traffic volume making the task even more difficult. Will the county office staff whom live in Chesterfield and surrounding areas make it to work on time?

Schools –
Where will the increase in children attend school? There is a crossing on Chesterfield Road which backs up with traffic at peak times with the increase in houses/cars this will result in more problems on the roads around the area.
Work –
Where will the people taking up residence in these houses work? There is only limited amount of work in the area so these people will have to travel thereby once again increasing the volume of traffic on our already busy local roads. Will these new residents ultimately take work away from existing local people.
During the winter months our local roads suffer due to the break up of the road surface with freezing conditions. If there is more traffic over these roads then the damage to the roads could increase significantly thereby costing the council more money in road repairs.

Flooding –
The run off of water from the fields and hills around the area is significant causing flooding. The local drainage can not keep up with the demand during wet weather and as a result water pours down the roads and footpaths like a river. I have known the area around the park on Cavendish Road to flood across the road making it difficult for traffic to pass safely. Flooding and run off water also has the potential to devalue all existing properties in the area.

House values –
The increase in properties in the area will decrease the value of existing properties. We currently have our house on the market and with the proposed plans for 500 more houses in the area this will impact on our ability to sell our property. There are plenty of houses in Matlock for sale why do we need 500 more new houses? There has been a significant amount of new houses already built in the last few years why do we need more?

What about water supply and sewage??
An increase in houses will impact on the water supply demand which ultimately could reduce the water pressure to existing houses. Will the existing sewers be able to cope with the increase demand resulting in more flooding from the roadside drains? Will this increase in demand for water supplies yet again result in our local roads being dug up to extended the Severn Trent water systems.

Local wildlife –
We have bats flying past our windows at night, the increase in houses could potential reduce the habitat for these animals.

Yours sincerely

Philip & Helen Endean
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Please accept this email as my objections to the proposed planing application on the above site.

I can't believe that plans have been proposed as a suitable site, when the access is very restrictive, have Williams Davis ever tried to gain access on a football match day? Or when the County Offices arrive for work in the morning or at 5pm?

Building 500 houses with the potential of creating in-excess of 1000 extra cars on the already congested and busy estate. The immediate surrounding road network is also at times impossible to access from Cavendish, so the extra flow of cars will cause further chaos.

Drainage up on Cavendish is a known problem with a number of properties being flooding the new builds will cause flooding to the surrounding properties as the drainage will be restricted by building on all the green fields.

The infrastructure and facilities of Matlock are already at busting point, have you tried to get a doctors appointment, the schools are already about full. Surely wouldn't it make sense to build out of town a new build which can incorporate the much needed facilities?

I have 3 children whom I would worry for there safety on the roads should the build go ahead, they will no longer be able to play outside as our road would become a through road to hundreds of cars.

I cannot understand why the council would grant permission to build on green fields when there is still brown sites out there that haven’t been developed on. Previous plans for fewer houses were turned down previously so what has changed the access and infrastructure certainly hasn’t changed in fact has got worse!

Regards

Rachel Walbank
Pinewood Road
Telephone:

Stephen + Jo
4 moorfield
Cavendish Pl
Matlock
Derbyshire
DE4 3HF

14.3.16

F. A. O. all Councillors attending the Derbyshire Dales Full Council meeting on 16.3.16

Re: Meeting regarding Derbyshire Dales Local Plan for development, to sites SHLAA 224/225 Proposal

As we have just come back from holiday would you take into consideration our objections for the above proposal.

Our objections are as follows:

ACCESS

- Cavendish Road and Wolds Rise are single tc roads due to parked cars. They are gridlocked almost any time of the day and even worse when children are ferried to and from Cavendish Playing Fields for footbual training and match at the weekend.

- Condition of the roads - the possibility of extra 1000 vehicles will have an impact on already disgraceful roads (Cavendish Road in particular).

- The Services (Refuse lorry) already causes a gridlock. It is even a struggle for an emergency vehicle (fire engine) to get round at times.
(Access continued)

- Access from Cavendish Road onto Wellington is already difficult at certain times of the day, due to the angle of the junction and the volume of traffic onto Wellington Street.

- There will be an influx of pollution and excessive noise due to the extra volume of traffic.

Flooding

- Houses on the topside of Moorfield, where we have been flooded in the past. How will Mull of tons of concrete etc impact on this?

- This is already classed as a flood area causing insurance policies to rise.

Winter Weather Conditions

- Cavendish Road and Wolds Rise are so congested at times that the snowplough cannot always get round. This is due to parked cars on the road. During the last bad winter when we snowed in for a week, all the residents had to dig their own roads out.

Loss of Greenfields

- The animals/wildlife, including the owls we see most nights and the bats we regularly see disappear.
Population

- There are potentially going to be 1,000 adults plus children in the proposed new building. The people already living in Matlock have trouble in getting a doctor's appointment. How would a potential 1,000 plus people impact the already overcrowded surgeries?

- The schools in Matlock are not big enough to take any extra children.

- The infrastructure at the top of Matlock is not capable of taking this amount of extra people.

Please register our objections against the proposed planning application to siten SHLAA 224/225.

We look forward to hearing your response too.

Yours faithfully,

Stephen and Joy Kay (Residents on Moor for 35 years)
REPRESENTATION FROM GEOFFREY HARDY

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Dear Mr Elsworth,

1 Drainage and Flooding

I have resided on Far Cross since they were built in 1963 and I am more aware of the problems of this site then most of the other residents on the estate.

Shortly after moving in I came home one morning to find the back yard full of water and just about to enter the property, due to heavy rainfall, and water running off the field at the side of my property.

Since then I have seen this field with running water in it on numerous occasions, as it is this morning, this water then finds its way out via Amberdene, I have also witnessed water spouting out of the middle of the field.

This morning once again water is rushing down the road outside from either a natural spring or an overloaded land drain, this on previous occasions has been reported to STWA as a water leak (by people who do not know the true source).

2. Road Safety

Access to the proposed site is horrendous, cars parked on Cavendish Road make free passage along it from the Junction at Wellington Street to Wolds Rise impossible.

You only have to try and negotiate Cavendish Road on a Saturday morning when the football traffic is accessing Cavendish Fields (it is not unknown to have to wait in excess of 10 minutes) to get on or off the estate to realise what problems ten times the amount of traffic, on a daily basis, will cause. There is also the problem of visibility where Cavendish Road joins Wellington Street.

3. Access to the proposed site

As Cavendish Road is currently the only access to the proposed site how are large lorries bringing materials to the site going to access it, already the residents of the properties on the left hand side of Cavendish Road as you approach Wolds Rise suffer damage to the front walls and fences from large vehicles struggling to pass parked vehicles.

With the increase in traffic on this narrow road lives are at risk with Emergency vehicles struggling to gain access quickly, which could result in someone losing their life.

Cavendish Road is certainly not suitable for articulated vehicles or 40 ton lorries

If you should require further information I can be contacted via the above Email address or on 07738754899.

yours sincerely G Hardy
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

As a resident of Cavendish Road for 20 years I am writing to object to planning applications SHLAA224 and SHLAA225. My objections are as follows:-

1. The loss of a greenfield site with well established trees and hedgerows which will have a devastating impact on the wildlife. Many species such as Sparrow Hawk, Buzzard and Tawny Owls along with Fieldfare and Redwing (all of which I have seen and which use the site as a wintering ground) can be found in the area. Some of the species of birds can be found on the RSPB Amber and Red list for Species in Decline. It is also home to many smaller birds and species of bees.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that the planning system should contribute and enhance the natural environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. I understand the Government is supposedly committed to halting the overall decline in biodiversity.

2. The increase in traffic is also a major concern with traffic along Cavendish Road being problematic at certain times of the day (school run, rush hour) and also at the weekends with increased activity on the Cavendish Playing Fields. As I was drafting this objection on Saturday morning I could hear a constant stream of cars. The entrance onto Cavendish Road from Wellington Street is itself too narrow which is exacerbated by parked cars. I have personally witnessed an emergency vehicle on a Saturday morning stuck in gridlock due to volume of traffic and parked vehicles. Construction traffic would only add to the congestion and once the project was completed the increased residential traffic would only continue to be an issue with residents.

3. Disruption during the build would be inevitable, but there would also be the risk of damage to existing foundations from heavy plant/machinery as the area has a history of subsidence. The National Planning Policy Framework states that any planning decision should not put any new or existing development at risk from being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.

4. Drainage itself is an issue as even in recent weeks there has been evidence of water run off from Amberdene. Part of the proposed site has numerous natural springs and there are known problems with flooding, subsidence and standing water. It is boggy and waterlogged even in summer. Developments such as this, in my view, are partly responsible for the increase in flooding seen nationally in recent years.

5. We all know that local councils are under pressure from the Government to meet house building targets but I wonder who will live at this proposed development. The country has an increasing population, but we also have an ageing population. I'm not convinced building homes at the highest point in Matlock would be an ideal place for an elderly person when you think about how accessible it is to local amenities, especially during winter when you take into account the site is situated above the snow line. Is the proposed development aimed at families? If so, do our local schools have places for them. Where are the jobs for the families who are anticipated will live here? The biggest employee in the town (the Council) are
contracting out, not expanding. Can the local GP surgery's cope with the extra hundreds or a thousand patients? I feel it is unlikely the infrastructure of Matlock will cope with this influx and we will need a new school and health centre to cope. Perhaps these will be in the next planning application!

Finally, if this development were to go ahead I fear that it would have set a precedent and that further building on greenfield sites would be deemed to be acceptable.

Sally Scargill