SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING TO DISCUSS THE LOCAL PLAN

WEDNESDAY 16 MARCH 2016

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 380

From: Graham W Hall  
Sent: 18 January 2016 12:33  
To: 'Swindell, Colin'  
Subject: FW: Derbyshire Dales Local Plan

Dear Cllr. Swindell,

I addition to the comments registered in our email of 17 January (see below), we wish to draw attention to the opinion expressed in the report of the Corporate Director to be presented to the meeting of the Local Plan Advisory Committee on Wednesday.

We refer to para. 3.79 of the report relating to Land West of Cawdor Quarry (map SHLAA380) which states that this site is “prominent within views from the surroundings. This site has, therefore, been assessed as an area of high landscape sensitivity”. We wholly concur with this assessment and for this reason, we remain of the firm opinion that this suggested site for residential development should be excluded from the Local Plan due to the detrimental visual impact that would result.

We should be grateful if you would register the representations expressed in this and our previous email with the Committee at the forthcoming meeting.

Best regards,

Graham and Pam Hall
Objections to allocation of sites HC2 (aa)

Dear Sir,

I write in connection with proposed residential development site at Snitterton Fields, Matlock and the Permanite site and Halldale Quarry SHLAA435

Cawdor Quarry and Permanite Site

As a brownfield site, adjoining the main Cawdor Quarry (for which consent has already been given), the Permanite site itself is suitable for development as it is well screened from the National Park and the existing development is unsightly. A condition should be that no vehicular access should be allowed to the Oker/Snitterton Road however, as the lane is too narrow for additional transport. Snitterton Fields should not be included in the list of potential sites for housing (or indeed any other development). This site is highly visible from the National Park and the two fields form an important greenspace which prevents Matlock merging into the villages of Snitterton and Oker. There is a long standing commitment of the Derbyshire Dales District Council to preserve the boundaries of existing settlements, and not to permit ‘urban sprawl’ of Matlock. This commitment should be maintained.

Looking at the technical issues, Snitterton Fields should not have been included in the in the provisional list (as opposed to other sites that have been rejected). The failed assessment of site SHLAA381 states (correctly) that this site ‘falls within floodzone 2 & 3 to the north and follows the boundary of the River Derwent. The site to the west consists of open countryside and agricultural fields which stretch as far as Snitterton Road. The site is situated within an unsustainable location, in the countryside and unrelated to existing settlements’. Site SHLAA380 comprises two fields which are adjacent to these fields included in site SHLAA381, and every single reason used to reject site 381 also applies with equal force to site 380. The boundary of the Peak District National Park (which runs along the Snitterton Road) is immediately adjacent to site 380. Site 381 is about 100 yards from the National Park boundary and more visible from it than site 381.

As an owner of farmland in Oker I question the flood risk assessment of site 380 as ‘Green’ – while half of site 380 is on the uphill slope and therefore unlikely to be flooded, the half to the north is close to the river. In recent winters this field has been waterlogged. I doubt it can be ranked as “Green” – “Amber” would be more appropriate.

There is no public transport in Snitterton so the public transport classification as “Green” would also appear to be incorrect – the closest public transport to the site is at Sainsbury’s off Matlock Spa Road; which can only be reached from site 380 by walking through the Permanite site, and then through Cawdor Quarry. It takes me about 30 minutes to walk from Snitterton to Sainsburys – which would suggest at most an “Amber” classification, consistent with the rating for services and shopping.

These changes alone would give site 380 just 6 green, and 6-8 amber and 11-13 red scores on the assessment process. Other sites on the rejected list of sites have many fewer green and/or amber ratings – so it seems unusual that site 380 should still somehow make it to the ‘approved’ list.
For all these reasons, I would urge the committee to remove site SHLAA380 from the list of sites included in the Local Plan.

Halldale Quarry

Permission has already been granted for development of this site. It is potentially suitable provided that the exit onto Snitterton Road can be designed so as to force all traffic to exit via Matlock Spa Road and not through the village of Snitterton as the narrowness of the lane and the sharp bends render it unsuitable for more traffic.

Yours faithfully,

Kate Alcock
REPRESENTATION FROM

Objections to allocation of sites HC2 (aa)

Sir I write to object to the development of the Green Field site in the Historic Hamlet of Snitterton in South Darley.

This site is totally unsuitable for development due to:

1. High Flood Risk.

2. Increased traffic congestion

3. The Site is adjacent to a medieval Moated Site

4. The site is adjacent to the Peak District National Park boundary

5. The site will be highly visible from the the Peak District Nation Park

6. The site will generate light pollution and be highly visible at night from within the Park

7. The site is a Green Field Site

8. The site is out of proportion to the existing settlement of around 15 dwellings

9. Development of the site will require upgrading of existing sewage pumping station creating an even bigger impact on the local environment.

10. The site has no access to public transport as it is at least 1.6km from the nearest bus stop

11. Development of this site will clearly lead to protracted legal challenges at it clearly should have been excluded at an earlier stage.
Objections to allocation of HC2 (aa) and Support SHLAA 176

I write with particular regard to 2 sites within the proposed local plan

Snitterton Fields, West of Cawdor Quarry, South Darley (ref: HC2(aa) ) and SHLAA176, land at Darley Dale, between the Methodist church and Lime Grove.

First, the Stage B assessment of SHLAA380 (Snitterton Fields, the land in west of Cawdor Quarry) is factually incorrect.

a) Flood Risk: The site is not affected by identified areas of indicative flood mapping or is located in flood zone 1. - yet the adjacent fields that have the same elevation were excluded at stage A due to risk of flooding! the summary also states "The site is set low within the flood plain of the River Derwent" in clear contradiction to the first statement.

b) National Park Status/Extent: Site may have impacts on the purpose of the National Park, however these impacts may be overcome/mitigated. The potential for developing the entirety of the western extremity of the site is constrained by the landscape to the west, which lies within the boundary of the Peak District National Park. - This is a clear statement that the site is constrained by land to the west that lies with the National park and that the site should not be developed on the west side. I fail to see why the any part of this site should be developed just because it is a few meters further East!

c) Public transport: Within 5-10 minutes walk of a bus stop (approx.400m). - Factually incorrect, the summary makes it clear by saying "Currently the site is over a 20 minute walk to local services" approx 1.6 km.

d) Other Issues: There are no other issues that would constrain development however mitigation is possible - Did the person that wrote this actually read it? There are no issues but mitigation is possible? the summary also states

"It is prominent within views from the surroundings"

"Woodland in the east is specially designated (Site of Special Scientific Interest, Tree Preservation Order and Local Wildlife Site)"

"This site has been assessed as an area of high landscape sensitivity and high historic environmental importance, particular the likely harmful impact upon a Scheduled Monument"

"The site is close to the boundary of the National Park"

"There are significant issues with access to this site"

"The Highways Authority have advised that currently no satisfactory access can be achieved to a public highway as shown"

As you can see there are indeed many issues, Flood Risk, The site is adjacent to 17 century medieval moated site, list in the Derbyshire Archaeological survey, the site is within the view of a number listed buildings, the site is highly visible from the national
Park etc. However all of these issues seem to have been discounted on the basis that is adjacent to Cawdor Quarry.

It is interesting that the site at Darley Dale (SHLAA176) that was rejected at Stage B Scores

12 Greens, 6 Amber and 7 Red

However the Site in the Hamlet of Snitterton is not rejected and scores

8 Green, 6 Amber and 11 Red

And it is proposed that there could be 50 houses on the site, there are currently around 15 dwelling in Snitterton so this development would be over 300% bigger that the hamlet it is inserted into.

The site at Darley Dale, SHLAA176, is adjacent to a main road, there are bus stops and shops, the adjacent site was clearly developed with a view to allow extension into this site, this is clear by the way that the parts of Lime Grove go up to the boundary of the existing site. In addition the existing Lime Grove site has clearly been developed around the mature trees that existed on the site, yet SHLAA176 seems to have been rejected on the basis that there are a few trees that have preservation orders, and the fact that there is a park nearby. Even though the traffic light assessment (Red , Amber and Green) would score the site as a far better proposition that the site in Snitterton.

Clearly i object to the development of the fields at Snitterton on the land the west of cawdor Quarry.

and support the development of the site SHLAA176 at Darley Dale

regards

Paul Roe
Objections 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 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 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. 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?
2. What are the expectations for education? The new Brailsford School, built for 120 children, was apparently based on 50 additional homes. Where will secondary education be provided?
3. What criteria has 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.
4. What consideration is being given to additional demand for utilities including sewage treatment and the management of flood risk?
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Why does SHLAA 236 (land to East of Throstlenest Way) remain an Option when it was ruled out as unsuitable by the Council?
8. The village integrity and structure should be maintained. The landscape does not lend itself to further major developments.

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

Yours faithfully, Stefanie and Simon Baker
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 233 and SHLAA 235.

Dear Mr Hase,

Please find below my objections to the proposed development of major development in Brailsford.

I would be most appreciative if you could kindly 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.

I agree that some development is inevitable, in carefully selected infill sites, when done sensitively and with respect for the integrity of our village identity, and therefore, this should be at a much smaller scale and consistent with maintaining the integrity of the village environment.

My objections are as follows:

1. The original quota, agreed some years ago in the Local Plan, for Brailsford to absorb development of approx. 50 houses has been fulfilled and exceeded in the current development of 50 properties at Dales View, Luke Lane and other completed and pending development.

2. The additional development of approx. 200+ houses in what is currently green belt land at the edges of the village’s existing boundaries is unanimously objected to by the residents, and will certainly destroy the character and integrity of our village. This is not sustainable and cannot be done without destroying the
landscape and the character of the extant village. The landscape does not lend itself to major urban (estate) development. What constitutes a ‘tipping point’ for the larger villages, ie 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?

3. With particular reference to SHLAA235 and all proposed development to the West of Luke Lane – SHLAA 233, these are green belt fields and are not suited to the imposition of estate-style housing.

4. Regarding the Wardell Armstrong Landscape Sensitivity report 2015, how have its findings been reconciled with expansion of the village on this scale, with particular reference to the proposals for SHLAA 236, land east of Throstlenest Way?

5. And WHY is this site still in contention for development, having been ruled out as unsuitable by the council leader in his statement re the last consultation?

6. Traffic considerations: The A52 is already a busy and dangerous road. With the proposed further development in Ashbourne (1000 houses on the aerodrome) the increase in traffic volume through Brailsford is a certainty. The openings of these developments onto the A52 is not viable.

7. Similarly Luke Lane is unsuited to further traffic density.
8. How have the planners decided that Brailsford – a village of some 200 dwellings – is viable for the doubling of its size? With respect, is it because you are impotent to stand up to the juggernauts that are the developers, and if so, how do you defend this?

9. Planning law suggests that all developments should be sustainable. How will jobs be provided in Brailsford, as the employment land allocation is likely to be removed? How do you justify development of this scale as sustainable?

10. The new school is to accommodate 120 children, and is already without adequate provision for parking and dropping off/picking up facilities. Where do you propose the additional children from the proposed development will be educated, at both primary and secondary level?

11. What consideration have you given to the capacity of the medical centre, which, I understand, cannot absorb further patient load because of the GP shortage?

12. How will the additional demand for utilities be accommodated, with particular reference to the village infrastructure for sewage etc, which is already inadequate – evidenced by the flood water lying on the A52, which occurs with every heavy downpour. What proposals have been given to flood management?

13. Why, in the face of vehement objection, do we, the residents feel utterly impotent to stop the inevitable transformation of our
rural village by the imposition of this major development, when other villages in Derbyshire Dales (eg Clifton) are keen to take some development, but have been rejected.

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?

15. We, the residents are telling you quite categorically that WE DO NOT WANT THIS DEVELOPMENT. Why are our views and our voices ignored? Are you, the civil servants representing the residents of Derbyshire Dales, in fact as powerless in standing up to the juggernaut developers, as we feel in our appeals to you?

16. The allocation of development has been unequally distributed, and we ask why? Whom does this serve? Who decided this?

Thank you for your attention. I hope you will represent the consensus view of the residents of this small rural village in this process, and do all in your power to ensure that our wishes, that our village does not become the next urban sprawl, are honoured in the development plan for Derbyshire Dales.

Yours sincerely, JK Williams
Local Plan Land Allocation in Brailsford H2 (e) (f) (g) and (h)

I should like the following comments to be brought to the attention of Councillors.

Four relatively large sites have been identified for Brailsford capable of accommodating some 150 additional houses and if developed to maximum capacity well in excess of 200 equivalent to twice the size of the current village. The allocation of these sites can be seen by developers to give positive encouragement to applicants for major development, and these are already being submitted. This does not give much credence to the Local Plan consultation process.

When this potential is added to development already approved through greenfield sites and infill, and a possible brownfield development, the village could increase by 300 homes or c120% percent. When does a village (even a tier 3 village as defined By the Council) retain its village status?. The model which sits large in every resident’s mind is that created at Hilton in South Derbyshire.

While Brailsford may not be considered to have fully retained the nature of a truly rural village because of earlier major development, it still has an historic core, conservation areas and reasonable integrity and cohesion. The allocation and dispersal of the proposed sites would allow for major development on the west, east and north sides of the village thus creating unattractive urban sprawl and breaking up the structural integrity of the village.

The size of the sites identified, with little concession to amenity and infrastructure, inevitably suggests that the Council has stepped well outside its own policy parameters (as set out in the Plan), many of which I totally endorse.

Some key examples (and major concerns) are highlighted below.

**Site H2 (h)**

The inclusion of site H2(h) is particularly concerning as this site was deemed unsuitable in the 2013 consultation mainly, we understand, due to the prevailing landscape character, its visibility and access issues.

The 2016 plan shows an access onto the A52 adjacent to a Pelican crossing where a resident was severely injured in a hit and run accident last year; and where many residents (especially the elderly) claim they have a ‘white knuckle’ experience when crossing to use one of the village’s key amenities the PO and store. The access also sits close to bus stops and an area where deliveries to the shop and café are frequent, and any parked vehicle can cause major congestion. In the last 24 months there have been reportable accidents between cars and the bus and a refuse collection vehicle; and a crash caused by a car hitting a line of stationery traffic waiting to cross into Luke Lane.

If the site is developed improvements to the access will be required to comply with highway standards creating a major urban style junction adjacent to the historic centre of the village. While clearly helping improve safety for car drivers, this will not lend itself to maintaining village character.

This site was dismissed in 2013 and no good reasons or changes to the prevailing conditions onsite have been reported to justify its re-entry.

The following issues create a contradictory position to those aspirations set out in the draft Local Plan, and apply to all development sites proposed for Brailsford (H2e-h).

**Urban sprawl.** Policy KI1 states the Plan will protect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the Landscape, Towns and Villages in the Plan area and this is echoed again in Spatial Vision and Aims. This site is a traditional greenfield site, which represents a major expansion to the west of the
village taking the development of new homes away from the core of the traditional village and therefore undermining its integrity and cohesion.

This plan contradicts the statements made about rural parish development in paras 4.62 and 4.64 which seek to retain a rich and varied landscape between parishes and ensure that development does not have a significant and adverse impact upon the character and appearance of these villages and the surrounding countryside captured in Policy S10.

**Character:** This site does not deliver into the spatial policy and aims that *‘care will be taken to ensure that new development is well integrated into its surroundings’*. These sites lend themselves to being developed as large urban-style estates, inconsistent with settlement hierarchy but which deliver the most competitive advantage and profitability to developers. There is no evidence from recent planning approvals that the Council’s ambitions to achieve high design criteria consistent with the prevailing environment and with the creation of a low carbon environment will be factored into any future approvals. This subject was raised by residents in relation the small development at Main Road but was not at the time one of the Officers’ priorities.

**Traffic;** In the absence of a transport infrastructure and local employment plan, new developments will inevitably be accessed by private car leading to a new access at the western end of the village where traffic speed entering the village is a constant problem; as stated in the village centre; and more traffic placed onto Luke Lane which already has a congested and dangerous junction.

While there may be limited employment opportunity in the new employment sites of Ashbourne, Matlock & Wirksworth (although right turns onto the A52 would in any case be a problem) it is likely that any new residents will be commuters, turning left and travelling to Derby and beyond, with the potential to create further congestion at hotspots (such as the Luke Lane or Church lane junctions) in the centre of the village, and especially at peak times. This does not sit well with Policies S2 Sustainable Development Principles which seek to minimise the need to travel by promoting development in locations where there is a broad range of jobs and means of travel without reliance on the private car; the requirement of Policy K13 on climate change, and statements made in section 4 of the draft plan.

**Policy HC17** states that additional growth must be accompanied by accessibility improvements and where highway network can satisfactorily accommodate traffic generated by the development (in this case including additional vehicle movements from the expansion of Ashbourne) without materially harming highway safety, local amenity or affecting the free flow of traffic. No such caveats have been included in relation to Brailsford development and the Highways statement to the SHLAA is caveated by uncertainty about the cumulative effects of development in Ashbourne on the A52. These must be added to congestion created by agricultural vehicles from the rural areas it passes through and HGV movements, and very prone to accidents including fatalities

Sites e, f and g could result in more vehicle movements on Luke Lane already heavily loaded and this before the opening of the new school.

**Size:** the plan suggests a suitable development number for the major new sites—this being the case the size of the site included in the plan should clearly fit the proposed development level and not as it appears to encourage even further expansion – 75 homes have already been suggested for H2e.

Even 32+ homes is a growth of > 15% on current village size and a cumulative growth (even if taken in isolation).
Suitability: large sites will lend itself only to traditional urban style estate development – inconsistent with the style and character of a village (See Policy KI1 and Spatial Aims). An estate which will be clearly visible demonstrating the urban sprawl which the Plan states that it wishes to avoid and undermining any possibility of retaining a distinct identity and taking account of the developed settlement hierarchy for tier 3 villages as set out in para 4.10 and 4.15 of the Plan.

The development of the western site (H2e) will cumulatively create a 2nd ‘village’ when added to the development which has already been approved.

Landscape characteristics: These are prominent or exposed sites with specific landscape characteristics and rated amber in the SHLAA assessment; therefore development should be considered detrimental. Development here erodes the opportunity for safe use of the rural setting to improve the quality of life as set out in the Spatial Vision which reflects that open countryside around an existing settlement provides important recreational opportunity; and PDS which states that development should be resisted which is detrimental to the wider landscape or the setting of an existing settlement.

Number of homes actually required. On the basis of the 2013 assessment, c60 for 4500 requirement, Brailsford should be expected to take an allocation of c 30 within the additional 2500 the Council is expected to accommodate in its new plan. This 30 can be considered to have already been more than met from approved development on land not accounted for in the original plan. No account seems to have been taken of this.

As a member of the Neighbourhood Planning team our survey identified that a majority of those responding in 2015 recognised that further development would come to Brailsford and that some specific types of home - especially specialist downsizing opportunity for the elderly and truly affordable homes - were needed by the community in small-scale development, but this need has not been met. Approved developments continue to provide standard to large family home which attract incomers to experience the fast waning quality of village life. As there is little or no direct employment opportunity these incomers are commuters and this form of growth does not bring economic advantage to the District as it may do in the market towns and local centres.

New residents for this type of property will also place additional demands for educational and health provision, as well as other services, which do not appear to have been taken into account in the Council’s planning.

Sustainable development means a balance of economic, social and environmental considerations. This site creates no long term substantive economic benefit – there are no local jobs - , is clearly detrimental to the environment and adds little to the overall quality of life as Brailsford becomes simply faceless, sprawling dormer location.

I do hope that Councillors including those who have recognised that there are ‘tipping’ points for the Tier 3 settlements will reflect on the current proposal, take account of the contradictions and reduce the potential allocation to Brailsford.

Yours sincerely

Pat Laughlin (Ms)
Objections to allocation of sites - Brailsford.

As a resident of the village of Brailsford I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed housing development. 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. The landscape does not lend itself to this sort of development which I consider to be urban sprawl.

Fifty houses have been built over the past 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 an additional 20 houses on the old cheese factory site. This land had previously been designated employment land. These approvals already represent a c50% growth in the size of the village.

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

Why is no account ever taken of the views of the people who actually live here? Decisions are being taken that I don’t agree with about the village I live in that will affect daily life and it seems those views are NEVER taken into account.

I feel no thought has been given to traffic and road safety implications at the junction of Luke Lane and the A52. I also envisage traffic backing up on Luke Lane during busy times causing excessive pollution which is injurious to health.

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 my husband and I wish to be considered as a formal respondent to any future consultation and that we are notified when the consultation is underway.

Ruth and Alan Joy
Development of HC2(aa) Snitterton Fields  
West of Cawdor Quarry, South Darley

Representation by Julian Wallbank

I believe that the greenfield site known as Snitterton Fields (West of Cawdor Quarry) in South Darley (HC2(aa)) should not be developed for the following reasons:

1. Small Hamlet

Snitterton is a small hamlet of around 20 dwellings and is, therefore, not a suitable location for a development of some 50 new houses.

The District Council’s “Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy” report of February 2016 sets out five tiers of settlement which could be considered for developments of ten or more houses. All the smaller villages and hamlets, such as Snitterton, are considered as unsuitable. It would be wrong for the District Council to ignore the advice of the Hierarchy Report by approving such a large development at Snitterton.

2. Analysis of Assessments

The District Council’s “Appendix 2 Stage B (North) Assessment” of January 2016 considers 59 sites, of which 25 are noted as Developable or Deliverable and 34 noted as Undevelopable - Constrained.

In the attached analysis, I have listed the sites considered in the form of a "Medals Table" in order of the numbers of ‘red’, ‘amber’ and ‘green’ assessments for each site. It is apparent from this that Site HC2(aa), formerly referred to as SHLAA380, received much the worst assessment, worse than even the worst of the Undevelopable sites. It has almost twice as many ‘red’ assessments as the next worst Developable site (which is also in Snitterton).

From this analysis, it is clear that, based on the District Council's own assessment, this site should not be developed. I, therefore, urge the Committee to reassess HC2(aa) as Undevelopable - Constrained.

3. Visual Intrusion

Development in these agricultural fields would cause unacceptable visual intrusion. The site is prominent within views from the surrounding areas, especially the settlements of Snitterton and Oker. It forms the lower end of Wensley Dale, which is an attractive dale, popular with walkers, lying mainly within the National Park.

The Council's Landscape Officer has concluded that there would be significant impact upon landscape character; it is an area of high landscape sensitivity; problems cannot be overcome through mitigation; and that there is no capacity for development.
4. **Intrusion into the Countryside**

The western boundaries of Cawdor Quarry and the former Permanite plant are well defined, due to the topography and the belt of trees along most of the length. However, the fields beyond (which form Site HC2(aa)) are open to the west and clearly do not form part of the urban area. Development of these fields would be a significant intrusion into open countryside and would bring the urban area of Matlock right up to the hamlet of Snitterton. This would have a very significant impact on Snitterton and would form an unpleasant urban sprawl.

Safeguarding of these fields as a barrier between Matlock and the adjacent villages has been discussed with the District Council in the past. For example, in a letter of 18th November 2011, the Council’s Planning Policy Manager stated that: “The parish council further raised issue with regard to ensuring housing development does not extend beyond Cawdor Quarry and into Oker and Snitterton. As Oker and Snitterton have been defined as an ‘other settlements’ within the Settlement Hierarchy, any development will be strictly limited to that which it essential to be located within the countryside or comprises affordable housing, any other development would therefore be contrary to policy.”

5. **Impact on the National Park**

The road between Snitterton and Oker forms the boundary of the Peak District National Park; this passes within 150m of the affected fields.

As noted above, these fields form the lower end of Wensley Dale and are prominent in the view down the dale. Development would, therefore, have an adverse impact on the National Park. It is difficult to see how this could be mitigated, especially as parts of the fields are elevated well above the valley floor, making houses very prominent.

6. **Access**

There is currently no acceptable access to the proposed site.

Access to the site is by means of a drive off the Snitterton-Oker road, which is very narrow in places and would not accommodate large volumes of traffic. Use of this road by traffic from the proposed site would cause unacceptable problems along the road, especially in Oker and Snitterton hamlets.

The only alternative access is through the Cawdor Quarry development and would, therefore be dependent on that site. It should, however, be noted that this alternative access would constitute a very long cul-de-sac.

Julian Wallbank,  
Bullring Cottage,  
Snitterton
### Analysis of Local Plan Stage B (North) Assessment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC2(aa)</td>
<td>formerly SHLAA380 Snitterton Fields (West of Cawdor Quarry)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Ameycroft Lane, Farley</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>47 Northwood Lane, Northwood</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Lumsdale/Asker Lane, Matlock</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Brook Lea, Matlock Green</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Thatcher’s Lane, Tansley</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Malthouse Close, Wirksworth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Land off A6, Darley Dale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>South of Oake Estate, Darley Dale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>NE Abbey Brook Nurseries, Darley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Willow Cottage, Tansley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Land at Brookfield Farm West End</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Hackney Lane Cottages, Darley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Former Permanite Site (Snitterton)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>SW Bakewell Road, Matlock</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Dungreave Avenue, Northwood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Land East of Millpinch, Bonsall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Matlock Golf Club</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Old Road at Red House, Darley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>14 The Knoll, Tansley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Gritstone Road, Matlock (West)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Stancliffe Hall, Darley Dale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Chesterfield Rd, Matlock</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Strutt Engineering, Northwood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Cromford Road, Wirksworth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Gold Hill, Tansley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>59 Gorsey Bank, Wirksworth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>67 Gorsey Bank, Wirksworth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Stancliffe Quarry, Darley Dale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>The Cascades, Bonsall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Hall Farm, Rowsley</td>
<td>4 10 11</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Slinter Mining, Cromford</td>
<td>4 10 11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>16 Thorncliffe Ave, Northwood</td>
<td>4 10 11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Old Hackney Lane/Rd, Darley</td>
<td>4 9 12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Church St, Tansley</td>
<td>4 5 16</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>New Bath Hotel, Matlock</td>
<td>4 3 18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Butts Lane/Dark Drive, Matlock</td>
<td>4 3 18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Middleton/Cromford Rd Wirksworth</td>
<td>3 12 10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Land at Matlock Green</td>
<td>3 9 13</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Chesterfield Rd Ladygrove, Darley</td>
<td>3 8 14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Matlock Transport, Northwood</td>
<td>3 8 14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Coneygreave House, Wirksworth</td>
<td>3 8 14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Butts Drive, Matlock</td>
<td>3 7 15</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>RBS Snitterton Road, Matlock</td>
<td>3 6 16</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Old Hackney Lane, Darley Dale</td>
<td>3 6 16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Kid Meadow House, Middleton</td>
<td>3 4 18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Thatcher’s Croft, Tansley</td>
<td>3 3 19</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Halldale Quarry</td>
<td>2 16 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Haarlem Mill, Wirksworth</td>
<td>2 14 9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Derby Road, Wirksworth</td>
<td>2 12 11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Gritstone Road, Matlock (East)</td>
<td>2 11 12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Normanhurst Park, Darley Dale</td>
<td>2 9 14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Rear of RBS, Darley Dale</td>
<td>2 9 14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Wheatley Road, Darley Dale</td>
<td>2 8 15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Old Hackney Lane, Darley Dale</td>
<td>1 13 11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>200a Smedley St, Matlock</td>
<td>1 12 12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Park Lane, Darley Dale</td>
<td>1 11 13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Old Hackney Lane, Darley Dale</td>
<td>1 10 14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Bridge Garage, Darley Bridge</td>
<td>0 9 16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPRESENTATION FROM TONY SYMES

Comment to allocation of sites HC2 (aa)

As Vice Chair of South Darley Parish Council, I am writing on their behalf about Site HC2(aa), which I am pleased to see renamed Snitterton Fields, West of Cawdor Quarry, South Darley. This site consists of a green field in the countryside close to the villages of Snitterton and Oaker and on the edge of the Peak District National Park. We object to this site on several grounds:

1. Landscape character – development on this site would be visually intrusive and, according to the Landscape Officer, would have a significant adverse impact on visual amenity;
2. Settlement pattern – Snitterton and Oaker would no longer be separate from Matlock, but would be part of a continuous development from the Town;
3. Proximity of Peak District National Park – this site overlooks and is overlooked by the National Park;
4. Traffic access – the Highways Authority have advised there is no satisfactory access to a public highway;
5. Traffic volume – any possible connection would be to the tortuous, rural Snitterton Road, which together with traffic from the Halldale site would generate an intolerable volume of traffic through the villages.

Furthermore the detailed assessments, which supported the provisional allocation, showed that this site received a worse assessment in terms of the number of reds and ambers than all other sites, even those classified as undevelopable.

Finally just in case the Council considers we are against all development in our ‘back yard’, please note we do not oppose development of the nearby Permanite and Halldale Quarry sites, although we have traffic concerns. We just strongly object to the development of Snitterton Fields and urge the Council to do the same.

Tony Symes
Representations from Paul & Caroline Hibbitt

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

To Whom It May Concern.

I am writing this email reference the plans being put forward for building 500 new homes on the land off Pinewood. SHLAA 224.

I have lived up here now for over 14 years. We chose this area due to the access we have to the surrounding area, the safe quiet area to raise our children away from the busy town and traffic. Over the years we have seen a great increase in the amount of traffic on the estate which has made it a lot more difficult to access and leave the area. There are now more parked cars on Cavendish road causing long queues to get on to Wellington street. If you were to build these 500 houses this will increase the problem immensely. Making it also dangerous as people will become more impatient and risk speeding causing a risk to the young children that have always been safe in this area, and surely it has to be considered how an ambulance and fire brigade would get up to these houses in an emergency, and this potential risk to lives has to be taken very seriously, it cannot be brushed over! Cavendish road cannot cope with that volume of traffic!

Looking at the number of cars extra, the average house now has 2 cars so this would mean looking at an extra 700 cars to cope on a road that struggles now.

There are already issues with emergency vehicles gaining access onto the estate, with a recent case where an ambulance couldn’t get onto the estate and had to park up and carry the patient back to the ambulance! Well if that’s an ambulance how do you get a Fire Engine up here and if time is wasted then that is a risk to life and homes. How do you intend to make this problem any easier with the edition of 500 more homes? This is nothing short of ludicrous, and as a parent I am extremely aware of the risk that this could put on my children.

If you have ever been up here when they are playing football, which brings 350 cars to Cavendish fields you will know the surrounding roads up here become so congested that we either go out before they arrive or wait till it is finished. Which is exactly what it will be like everyday if you go ahead with this ludicrous idea to build 500 houses up here.

Another issue I see is that this area also has a big issue with flooding as we know only too well. We have flooded twice and the second time we lost the bottom of the house, we have had to spend a lot of money to protect our property, and if you put all of these houses above where we live again this is going to exasperate the flooding even more causing more issues in this area. To say this is another very serious issue is an under statement...the field behind us IS a flood risk and we have the photos and video and also newspaper report to prove it. To suggest there is no flood risk up here is a total lie, we are living with this threat every time we get heavy or prolonged rain, you need to speak to the actual residents up here as we no better than anyone else, or you can happily speak to my insurance company who would I am sure tell you the cost it has led to with our claims.

We have got 2 Reservoirs in the fields above us and I would like to know what is to be put into place to make these safe.

I have attached a video to show just what it was like when we flooded.

Yours Sincerely, Paul and Caroline Hibbitt
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I am writing my objections to above planning we have lived on gritstone road for over 33 years.

We have always had problems with the drainage you can hear water running under our lawn, also we spent £2000 on a wooden floor to have to pull it up 2 months later due to the amount of water under the house What will happen with the water that runs off above fields we all have problems with it we can’t put a concrete drive down without planning now so how can it be ok to build 500 houses where there is active springs.

Will the council pay for all the damage that we will have with the water if they go ahead knowing there is a problem we will be able to claim for any damage caused.

Every time you try to pull out onto Chesterfield road from either entrance besides taking ages you can’t see clearly if it is safe to pull out I have had to back back on to Chesterfield road a few times coming in sandy lane end . Crossing over on wolds road you take your life in your hands as cars swing in in from both sides.

Where will all the wildlife go we have seen many birds of prey on the field behind gritstone road . How will schools, doctors etc cope with all the extra volume.

There are many reasons why this is the most unsuitable site for these houses this is just a few B&P hadfield
Objection to sites SHLAA 224 and 225 being included in the “Derbyshire Dales Draft Local Plan April 2016”.

Please accept my apologies for the late arrival of this objection.

Please accept this letter as my formal objection to sites SHLAA 224 and 225 being included in the “Derbyshire Dales Draft Local Plan April 2016”. I understand that the Draft Local Plan is being considered by the Derbyshire Dales District Council Full Council Meeting on Wednesday 16th March 2016.

We live on Wellington Street in Matlock but our drive is accessible via Amberdene. Whenever there is heavy rainfall, the underground reservoir adjacent to 2 Amberdene overflows. On a number of these occasions, friends driving past our house have rung us later in the evening to make sure that we are okay and haven’t been flooded. Fortunately for us, given the position of our house, we have not – yet – been flooded. However a number of houses around us have been.

I am very concerned that the major development that could be undertaken on sites SHLAA 224 and 225 would considerably worsen the risk of flooding, especially given the number of natural springs in the area. A fairly large section of our garden, for example, is already relatively soggy, even in the height of summer.

As you will be aware, Section 10 of the “National Planning Policy Framework” relates to “Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change”. While I accept that the challenges of costal change do not apply to Matlock, flooding is a very real risk. It may seem unusual to claim that there is a risk of flooding at the top of one of Matlock’s hills, but as my previous example demonstrates, there is plenty of water around.

The only conclusion that can be drawn is that the building of properties in sites SHLAA 224 and 225 would significantly increase the risk of flooding in this area. Furthermore, if development was ever allowed on either or both of these sites, I am unsure where any relief drainage would go.

The underground reservoir has been, from what I’ve been told, one of the reasons why development on the land behind Amberdene has not previously been permitted, despite repeated attempts to gain such permission. The reservoir has not changed so the previous reasons for not permitting developments still stand.
My youngest son is at the Sixth Form at Highfields School. Every day my son walks to school along Wellington Street and Chesterfield Road. The traffic along Chesterfield Road is often heavy, especially in the pre- and post- school period. The extra car traffic created by the addition of houses on sites SHLAA 224 and 225 would be a threat to road safety.

Similarly, I work in County Hall so walk across the Wellington Street/Cavendish Road junction twice daily. As you will be aware, the Wellington Street/Cavendish Road junction provides the only road access to what must be one of the country’s largest cul-de-sacs as well as the County Council Car Park and the Cavendish Playing Fields. Development on sites SHLAA 224 and 225 will result in hundreds if not thousands of extra car journeys through this junction. This YouTube video show one example of the current dangers of the junction - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdn_7nDBuJ4.

A large part of Wellington Street only allows one car along at a time. Dangers to pedestrians have been noted for many years with cars regularly mounting the curb to get past each other. A couple of years ago two posts were put on the northern side of the road to reduce the risk of accidents caused by pavement driving. Last month a large chunk of garden wall was knocked down by a car/van driving past. This incident was reported to the police under collision reference number 18051.

Sites SHLAA 224 and 225 have no direct access to a main road. The existing junctions with Chesterfield Road and Wellington Street/Cavendish Road are overused and or dangerous. I am unsure how traffic – both construction and, eventually, residential - to/from the sites would access the main road.

As stated in Section 11 of the “National Planning Policy Framework”, your “Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land).” Please consider the re-development of brown field sites before resorting to permitting development on green field sites like SHLAA 224 and 225.

Please note my formal objection to the inclusion of sites SHLAA 224 and 225 on the “Derbyshire Dales Draft Local Plan April 2016”.

I request that sites SHLAA 224 and 225 be removed from “Derbyshire Dales Draft Local Plan April 2016”.

I look forward to hearing the outcome of the meeting.

Yours faithfully, Chris Cookman.
Dear Planning Office

Re: Gritstone Road Site SHLAA 225 and Pinewood Road/Cavendish Road Site SHLAA 224

I'm objecting to the proposed plan to build over 500 homes on the green fields behind Gritstone Road and Bentley Close (SHLAA 225) which also includes the joined up land for the plans for the Cavendish Road site (SHLAA 224). These sites are unsuitable for new homes for the following reasons:-

These sites are outside the defined settlement development boundary and 500 + houses is not a small extension to the existing boundary.

There are no facilities that serve the current homes on Gritstone Road and Cavendish Road, the nearest "shops" are on Smedley Street. In winter residents quite often walk down into Matlock to get the basics and walk back again when the roads are treacherous.

The access to several hundred homes behind Gritstone Road, and the large amount of traffic this will bring, will make daily life very difficult for existing residents and also people travelling to and from Matlock for work each day. These are small streets that have cars parked on both sides of the road, thus narrowing access for emergency vehicles and creating chaos getting on and off the already busy Chesterfield Road. Gritstone Road/Bentley Close has a mixture of young families and elderly residents. An increase in traffic will endanger life and increase the risk for pupils at Highfield School, St Joseph's School, Nagle Nursery and Castle View Primary School on Chesterfield Road. This should be considered as part of the National Planning Policy Framework. This will be a high risk area for accidents to pedestrians and motorists. There is also no access from the Gritstone Road site through to the proposed sites at the moment. This will mean some properties will be demolished to make way for a road through to Chesterfield Road. This will create hundreds of extra vehicular movements each day and also reducing the air quality with pollution from cars.

Access on and off Cavendish Road isn't easy for the properties already using the road. The parked cars on Wellington Street together with the large number of cars parked all the way round the Cavendish housing estate make access very difficult and will result in a number of accidents to cars and pedestrians and also difficulty for the Emergency Services. Again, this contradicts the current National Planning Policy Framework.

There is a risk of flooding to properties, even though Gritstone Road is at the top of a very large hill it isn't built on solid rock. The land has been surveyed and sits on sandstone cemented by quartz overgrowths interspersed with layers of basalt. Intergranular clays develop which retains water which is unable to drain away. The land also has a wealth of underground springs, which will make it difficult for houses to be
effectively built as existing properties also suffer from an excess of water under their foundations. The land should be removed from the local plan and be assessed as Red – serious risk of flooding from standing and run off water. Does the Council or the Developers wish to be subjected to lengthy litigation from existing householders and tax payers as they allowed a development to go ahead knowing of the risks?

Matlock and Matlock Bank in particular were developed as a Spa Town where people came to take the waters and water treatments. A number of Hydros were built including Smedley's Hydro and Malvern House on Smedley Street, one on Rutland Street in the former Tax Office, Chatsworth Hall had a hydro along with Ullby Bank - both on Chesterfield Road, Roakside and Claremont on Cavendish Road, Bridge Hall (now the Town Hall) on Bank Road along and Wyvern House (became Ernest Bailey's School) with a number of private homes who also offered treatments. The reason these were so successful is that Matlock has a large amount of underwater springs on the hillside. Even during the worst drought the lawn on my garden doesn't dry out and frogs are found all year round despite there being no ponds in the immediate vicinity.

Developers may claim to be able to “mitigate” drainage, but the drainage that was required at the Mowridge development at Darley Dale (approx 200 new homes) required huge drains that run under the A6 and expel water into a pond at the other side. This is for a development half the size of the Gritstone Road/Cavendish sites. Where on earth are they proposing these drains to be installed and where will all the run off water go? Surely it will cost the developers a huge amount, not to say the disruption to three rows of houses from Gritstone Road through to Chesterfield Road. Has any thought been put into the increase in sewage and drains for run off water? The drains from the 1930’s houses on Gritstone Road run underneath the gardens of the 1960’s houses and then under the 1930’s houses on Chesterfield Road to the main sewer. Presumably a lot of disruption for the existing residents.

There is a brook that runs nearby and Matlock Golf Course had to put additional drainage in as the water runs down from the area above them. When there is heavy rain, a small river of water gushes down from the fields at the side of the houses on Amberdene creating a huge puddle on Wellington Street. Cavendish Road playing fields had extra drainage put in and they have had to cancel football matches this winter due to flooding as the land is saturated with rain with nowhere to run off. I hope the developers take note of residents’ concerns as all the signs are there regarding flooding. Some Gritstone Road/Bentley Close residents have their houses built on rafts, extra deep foundations and pumps under the house to deal with the underground springs.

Why are green fields being earmarked for building on? Once they have been built on they are gone forever affecting the flora and fauna that is so diverse. This 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

It seems ironic that the EU is being blamed for some of the flooding this winter in other parts of the country as the Environment Agency haven’t been allowed to dredge rivers and yet Matlock is prepared to let Cawdor Quarry and other brownfield sites stand empty and undeveloped. 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.” p8 NPPF

The Gritstone Road 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. The Gritstone...
Road and Cavendish Road development proposals will be virtually in existing householder’s back gardens. There
would be no way to avoid loss of privacy, loss of light and loss of visual amenity for all concerned.

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.

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

Noise pollution that will affect 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.

Matlock isn’t currently large enough to absorb the increase to its population in terms of jobs, schools, health
care, parking, leisure. Although Secondary school numbers have been falling over the years this isn’t the case
with Primary schools. The elderly population is increasing and building at the top of Matlock will mean bad
weather hampering everyday life as public transport is very limited.

Matlock will be ruined when it loses its green fields and the existing residents face years of disruption to their
current quality of life and damage to their properties with flooding and subsidence. When insurers start
avoiding paying out to put right the damage will the Council have additional funds available for the Civil action
that will follow and will potential developers be aware of the additional costs required to build on two very
difficult sites?

Finally, you are existing ordinary taxpayers to come up with alternative sites. Why is Halldale Quarry not being
put forward for development? This site doesn’t need cleaning up like Cawdor Quarry. Surely Halldale Quarry
and Cawdor Quarry would be more suitable sites for development and the corridor between Matlock and
Darley Dale has more public transport links than the Gritstone Road and Pinewood Road/Cavendish Road sites.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Christine Martin
23 Gritstone Road
Matlock
Derbyshire
DE4 3GB
01629 55332
13th March 2016

Derbyshire Dales District Council
Planning Office
Town Hall
Matlock
Derbyshire
DE4 3NN

Dear Planning Office

Re: Gritstone Road Site SHLAA 225 and Pinewood Road/Cavendish Road Site SHLAA 224

I'm objecting to the proposed plan to build over 500 homes on the green fields behind Gritstone Road and Bentley Close (SHLAA 225) which also includes the joined up land for the plans for the Cavendish Road site (SHLAA 224). These sites are unsuitable for new homes for the following reasons:-

These sites are outside the defined settlement development boundary and 500+ houses is not a small extension to the existing boundary.

There are no facilities that serve the current homes on Gritstone Road and Cavendish Road, the nearest "shops" are on Smedley Street. In winter residents quite often walk down into Matlock to get the basics and walk back again when the roads are treacherous.

The access to several hundred homes behind Gritstone Road, and the large amount of traffic this will bring, will make daily life very difficult for existing residents and also people travelling to and from Matlock for work each day. These are small streets that have cars parked on both sides of the road, thus narrowing access for emergency vehicles and creating chaos getting on and off the already busy Chesterfield Road. Gritstone Road/Bentley Close has a mixture of young families and elderly residents. An increase in traffic will endanger life and increase the risk for pupils at Highfield School, St Joseph's School, Nagle Nursery and Castle View Primary School on Chesterfield Road. This should be considered as part of the National Planning Policy Framework. This will be a high risk area for accidents to pedestrians and motorists. There is also no access from the Gritstone Road site through to the proposed sites at the moment. This will mean some properties will be demolished to make way for a road through to Chesterfield Road. This will create hundreds of extra vehicular movements each day and also reducing the air quality with pollution from cars.

Access on and off Cavendish Road isn't easy for the properties already using the road. The parked cars on Wellington Street together with the large number of cars parked all the way round the Cavendish housing estate make access very difficult and will result in a number of accidents to cars and pedestrians and also difficulty for the Emergency Services. Again, this contradicts the current National Planning Policy Framework.

There is a risk of flooding to properties, even though Gritstone Road is at the top of a very large hill it isn't built on solid rock. The land has been surveyed and sits on sandstone cemented by quartz overgrowths interspersed with layers of basalt. Intergranular clays develop which retains water which is unable to drain away. The land also has a wealth of underground springs, which will make it difficult for houses to be
effectively built as existing properties also suffer from an excess of water under their foundations. The land should be removed from the local plan and be assessed as Red — serious risk of flooding from standing and run off water. Does the Council or the Developers wish to be subjected to lengthy litigation from existing householder and tax payers as they allowed a development to go ahead knowing of the risks?

Matlock and Matlock Bank in particular were developed as a Spa Town where people came to take the waters and water treatments. A number of Hydros were built including Smedley’s Hydro and Malvern House on Smedley Street, one on Rutland Street in the former Tax Office, Chatsworth Hall had a hydro along with Lilybank – both on Chesterfield Road, Rockside and Claremont on Cavendish Road, Bridge Hall (now the Town Hall) on Bank Road along and Wyvern House (became Ernest Bailey’s School) with a number of private homes who also offered treatments. The reason these were so successful is that Matlock has a large amount of underwater springs on the hillside. Even during the worst drought the lawn on my garden doesn’t dry out and frogs are found all year round despite there being no ponds in the immediate vicinity.

Developers may claim to be able to “mitigate” drainage, but the drainage that was required at the Morledge development at Darley Dale (approx 200 new homes) required huge drains that run under the A6 and expel water into a pond at the other side. This is for a development half the size of the Gritstone Road/Cavendish sites. Where on earth are they proposing these drains to be installed and where will all the run off water go? Surely it will cost the developers a huge amount, not to say the disruption to three rows of houses from Gritstone Road through to Chesterfield Road. Has any thought been put into the increase in sewage and drains for run off water? The drains from the 1930’s houses on Gritstone Road run underneath the gardens of the 1960’s houses and then under the 1930’s houses on Chesterfield Road to the main sewer. Presumably a lot of disruption for the existing residents.

There is a brook that runs nearby and Matlock Golf Course had to put additional drainage in as the water runs down from the area above them. When there is heavy rain, a small river of water rushes down from the fields at the side of the houses on Amberdene creating a huge puddle on Wellington Street. Cavendish Road playing fields had extra drainage put in and they have had to cancel football matches this winter due to flooding as the land is saturated with rain with nowhere to run off. I hope the developers take note of residents concerns as all the signs are there regarding flooding. Some Gritstone Road/Bentley Close residents have their houses built on rafts, extra deep foundations and pumps under the house to deal with the underground springs.

Why are green fields being earmarked for building on? Once they have been built on they are gone forever affecting the flora and fauna that is so diverse. This 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.” P16/17 NPPF

It seems ironic that the EU is being blamed for some of the flooding this winter in other parts of the country as the Environment Agency haven’t been allowed to dredge rivers and yet Matlock is prepared to let Cawdor Quarry and other brownfield sites stand empty and undeveloped. 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

The Gritstone Road 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. The Gristone
Road and Cavendish Road development proposals will be virtually in existing household’s back gardens. There would be no way to avoid loss of privacy, loss of light and loss of visual amenity for all concerned.

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 80% 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.

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

Noise pollution that will affect 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.

Matlock isn’t currently large enough to absorb the increase to its population in terms of jobs, schools, health care, parking, leisure. Although Secondary school numbers have been falling over the years this isn’t the case with Primary schools. The elderly population is increasing and building at the top of Matlock will mean bad weather hampering everyday life as public transport is very limited.

Matlock will be ruined when it loses its green fields and the existing residents face years of disruption to their current quality of life and damage to their properties with flooding and subsidence. When insurers start avoiding paying out to put right the damage will the Council have additional funds available for the Civil action that will follow and will potential developers be aware of the additional costs required to build on two very difficult sites?

Finally, you are existing ordinary taxpayers to come up with alternative sites. Why is Halldale Quarry not being put forward for development? This site doesn’t need cleaning up like Cawdor Quarry. Surely Halldale Quarry and Cawdor Quarry would be more suitable sites for development and the corridor between Matlock and Darley Dale has more public transport links than the Gritstone Road and Pinewood Road/Cavendish Road sites.

Yours sincerely

Des Martin
Dear Planning Office

Re: Gritstone Road Site SHLAA 225 and Pinewood Road/Cavendish Road Site SHLAA 224

I'm objecting to the proposed plan to build over 500 homes on the green fields behind Gritstone Road and Bentley Close (SHLAA 225) which also includes the joined up land for the plans for the Cavendish Road site (SHLAA 224). These sites are unsuitable for new homes for the following reasons:

These sites are outside the defined settlement development boundary and 500+ houses is not a small extension to the existing boundary.

There are no facilities that serve the current homes on Gritstone Road and Cavendish Road, the nearest "shops" are on Smedley Street. In winter residents quite often walk down into Matlock to get the basics and walk back again when the roads are treacherous.

The access to several hundred homes behind Gritstone Road, and the large amount of traffic this will bring, will make daily life very difficult for existing residents and also people travelling to and from Matlock for work each day. These are small streets that have cars parked on both sides of the road, thus narrowing access for emergency vehicles and creating chaos getting on and off the already busy Chesterfield Road. Gritstone Road/Bentley Close has a mixture of young families and elderly residents. An increase in traffic will endanger life and increase the risk for pupils at Highfield School, St Joseph's School, Nagle Nursery and Castle View Primary School on Chesterfield Road. This should be considered as part of the National Planning Policy Framework. This will be a high risk area for accidents to pedestrians and motorists. There is also no access from the Gritstone Road site though to the proposed sites at the moment. This will mean some properties will be demolished to make way for a road through to Chesterfield Road. This will create hundreds of extra vehicular movements each day and also reducing the air quality with pollution from cars.

Access on and off Cavendish Road isn't easy for the properties already using the road. The parked cars on Wellington Street together with the large number of cars parked all the way round the Cavendish housing estate make access very difficult and will result in a number of accidents to cars and pedestrians and also difficulty for the Emergency Services. Again, this contradicts the current National Planning Policy Framework.

There is a risk of flooding to properties, even though Gritstone Road is at the top of a very large hill it isn't built on solid rock. The land has been surveyed and sits on sandstone cemented by quartz overgrowths interspersed with layers of basalt. Intergranular clays develop which retains water which is unable to drain away. The land also has a wealth of underground springs, which will make it difficult for houses to be
effectively built as existing properties also suffer from an excess of water under their foundations. The land should be removed from the local plan and be assessed as Red – serious risk of flooding from standing and run off water. Does the Council or the Developers wish to be subjected to lengthy litigation from existing householder and tax payers as they allowed a development to go ahead knowing of the risks?

Matlock and Matlock Bank in particular were developed as a Spa Town where people came to take the waters and water treatments. A number of Hydro's were built including Smedley's Hydro and Malvern House on Smedley Street, one on Rutland Street in the former Tax Office, Chatsworth Hall had a hydro along with Lilybank - both on Chesterfield Road, Rockside and Claremont on Cavendish Road, Bridge Hall (now the Town Hall) on Bank Road along and Wyvern House (became Ernest Bailey's School) with a number of private homes who also offered treatments. The reason these were so successful is that Matlock has a large amount of underwater springs on the hillside. Even during the worst drought the lawn on my garden doesn't dry out and frigs are found all year round despite there being no ponds in the immediate vicinity.

Developers may claim to be able to "mitigate" drainage, but the drainage that was required at the Morledge development at Darley Dale (approx 200 new homes) required huge drains that run under the A6 and expel water into a pond at the other side. This is for a development half the size of the Gritstone Road/Cavendish sites. Where on earth are they proposing these drains to be installed and where will all the run off water go? Surely it will cost the developers a huge amount, not to say the disruption to three rows of houses from Gritstone Road through to Chesterfield Road. Has any thought been put into the increase in sewage and drains for run off water? The drains from the 1930's houses on Gritstone Road run underneath the gardens of the 1960's houses and then under the 1930's houses on Chesterfield Road to the main sewer. Presumably a lot of disruption for the existing residents.

There is a brook that runs nearby and Matlock Golf Course had to put additional drainage in as the water runs down from the area above them. When there is heavy rain, a small river of water rushes down from the fields at the side of the houses on Amberdene creating a huge puddle on Wellington Street. Cavendish Road playing fields had extra drainage put in and they have had to cancel football matches this winter due to flooding as the land is saturated with rain with nowhere to run off. I hope the developers take note of residents concerns as all the signs are there regarding flooding. Some Gritstone Road/Bentley Close residents have their houses built on rafts, extra deep foundations and pumps under the house to deal with the underground springs.

Why are green fields being earmarked for building on? Once they have been built on they are gone forever affecting the flora and fauna that is so diverse. This 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

It seems ironic that the EU is being blamed for some of the flooding this winter in other parts of the country as the Environment Agency haven't been allowed to dredge rivers and yet Matlock is prepared to let Cawdor Quarry and other brownfield sites stand empty and undeveloped. 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

The Gritstone Road 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. The Gritstone
Road and Cavendish Road development proposals will be virtually in existing household’s back gardens. There would be no way to avoid loss of privacy, loss of light and loss of visual amenity for all concerned.

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.

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

Noise pollution that will affect 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.

Matlock isn’t currently large enough to absorb the increase to its population in terms of jobs, schools, health care, parking, leisure. Although Secondary school numbers have been falling over the years this isn’t the case with Primary schools. The elderly population is increasing and building at the top of Matlock will mean bad weather hampering everyday life as public transport is very limited.

Matlock will be ruined when it loses its green fields and the existing residents face years of disruption to their current quality of life and damage to their properties with flooding and subsidence. When insurers start avoiding paying out to put right the damage will the Council have additional funds available for the Civil action that will follow and will potential developers be aware of the additional costs required to build on two very difficult sites?

Finally, you are existing ordinary taxpayers to come up with alternative sites. Why is Halldale Quarry not being put forward for development? This site doesn’t need cleaning up like Cawdor Quarry. Surely Halldale Quarry and Cawdor Quarry would be more suitable sites for development and the corridor between Matlock and Darley Dale has more public transport links than the Gritstone Road and Pinewood Road/Cavendish Road sites.

Yours sincerely

Emily Martin
Dear Derbyshire District Council

I'm writing to you to tell you that I am very concerned about these 400 odd houses behind me and I am shocked because my house has been flooded and I don't want it to happen again. I love walking in the fields and the park but now it might be dangerous and it might get too busy with cars and things.

Kind Regards

Eve Hibbert
age 11
Objections/Comments Re Draft Local Plan

SHLAA224 and SHLAA 225

The 2 areas under consideration for building 500 houses have been discussed as possible areas for Development on many occasions in the past.

The rejections of these 2 sites as suitable for building are well documented and concerned local Infrastructure, Roads, Facilities and Amenities.

25/30 years on what has changed that has made these issues preventing development then, become less significant now?

We have in Matlock considerable space for Development. Hall Dale and Cawdor Quarry as a start and there are pockets of land that can be filled. Yet in spite of all the considerable evidence that these 2 sites, SHLAA 224 and 225 are completely unsuitable for Building the Brown Field Sites appear to be being ignored.

We note that in today’s budget the Government pre Budget briefing includes a potential £1.2 billion being released to help develop brown field sites. Are the Council doing everything in their power to access this and therefore enable building on sites that are not green and on the edge of the town? If there is no intention of accessing this potential funding why not?

Our objections to the development of Green Field sites SHLAA 224 and 225 are the same as they have been in the past only now exacerbated by the increase in traffic and the lack of forward planning re Amenities and facilities in the town

Access... From Wolds Rd to Chesterfield. Difficult normally, made more difficult by speeding cars coming up the hill. Site lines are very poor and when wet dangerous.

From Cavendish rd to Wellington Street....

From Gritstone Rd/Sandy Lane to Chesterfield Rd

And finally Wellington Street to Chesterfield Rd/Asker Lane.

None of these junctions are straight forward, have poor/poorish lines of vision involving slopes or bends.

Movement. Driving along Wellington Street. Well documented

Driving along Cavendish rd and on the roads behind there. Well documented

Driving along Gritstone Rd to Bentley Close, bends, cars parked, narrow
Movement of People. Pupils walking to and from Highfields, lack of pavement for the bus shelter opposite the Duke of Wellington to the Highfields entrance. A pelican crossing there but not by the bus stops.

Along Cavendish Rd. Families, buggies, bikes etc. Alongside parked cars and single file traffic.

Speed on Chesterfield Rd. Is there seriously not an issue with excess speed on this Road? Why is the 40mph limit only enacted by the Golf Course. It needs to be 30mph all along there.

Drainage and Flooding. This is a regular feature of life where we live on Bentley Close, but more so on Gritstone Rd. What plans are being included that will prohibit run off that will exacerbate the problem?

We strongly object to these areas being included in the Draft Local Plan. The objections have been well documented over 30 years, why when all the inhibiders have got considerably more complex are these areas even being considered and even more so when there are potential brown field sites in the locality.

Chris and Julie Hartley
Derbyshire Dales Draft Local Plan

This Objection refers to:
Draft Plan pages 212/213 “Policy HC2(v) and DS4 Housing Land Allocations
Site allocation at Land off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road, Matlock”

Objection to inclusion of the site in the Draft Plan and availability for planning
permission

Request for exclusion from the Plan

Request for protection from planning approval and future development

Janet Roberts FRSA, CIPS Affiliate, CIPD Affiliate MSA
(Was resident at number 30 Gritstone Road for 28 years 3 months)
This Objection refers to:
Draft Plan pages 212/213 “Policy HC2(v) and DS4 Housing Land Allocations
Site allocation at Land off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road, Matlock”
This is the Eastern of the two fields identified in Site Reference SHLAA225 on page 62 of Appendix 2 to the Plan “Site Assessment” (Referred to in this document as SHLAA 225)

This paper is to support and provide reasons for a formal objection to the inclusion of the land identified above in the draft plan, and also with regard to any current or future planning application.

Unfortunately, due to business commitments my husband and I are unable to attend the meeting to be held at 6 pm on 16th March 2016. This paper updates a paper on the same subject which was prepared in January 2013. The situation relating to flood risk remains, and indeed is exacerbated by increasingly wet winters.

This objection addresses the allocation of “Flood risk – green: The site is not affected by identified areas of indicative flood mapping or is located in Flood Zone 1.

We dispute this statement to the extent that the flood risk should be red and is so serious in its potential to affect properties on both sides of Gritstone Road and Bentley Close that SHLAA225 should not just be removed from the plan, but that any current or future applications to build on this land should be refused for the flooding risk alone.

Background to the Author
Janet Roberts Studied Geology to GCE A level and subsequently taught the subject to the same level. Since 1998 she has spent up to 12 weeks each year travelling and studying the geology of the American Western States in particular the volcanic, hydraulic and desert structures. In the past year she was approved as a member of the Mineralogical Society of America. With her husband she jointly owns an American company "Mountains Deserts and Minerals LLC". As a resident of 30 Gritstone Road for more than 28 years she has been able to study the land in question closely and in all weathers. Mrs Roberts moved from 30 Gritstone Road on 2nd November 2015, as a result she has no direct interest in the proposed development of or potential planning applications.

Background
The Topography section of the assessment states
From the west of site slopes towards the east. Rolling landscape.
This is misleading. The land in question forms a micro-environment which has very distinctive features which are not addressed in the assessment. Indeed this microenvironment should be considered as an entity which is separate and has different characteristics from SHLAA224 where different where Geological conditions apply. For example there is no spring line in this particular section of the site which is in the form of a clay “cap” on basalt and quartz.
Far from being “rolling landscape” from the bend in Sandy Land at (OS sheet 119) Ref: 312614 (the bend in Sandy Lane) the land slopes towards the properties along the north and east sides of Gritstone Road and Bentley Close. The contours on the map show a raised
area of land which amounts to a sharp rise in height of more than 40 metres between the houses in Gritstone Road and the proposed NW corner of the site. All of this steeply raised area drains directly towards the houses in Gritstone Road and Bentley Close. The Eastern side of the raised area which drains into a small water course is not included within the curtilage of the site.

It is this drainage pattern which appears not to have been taken into account in the sustainability appraisal which applies to the micro-environment of the SHLAA225 land. The lie of the land and the consequent drainage pattern already lead to a number of problems for the residents on the north side of Gritstone Road, problems which would be considerably exacerbated by the proposed development of the land SHLAA225. It has been noted that the precise nature of the drainage or the singular implications which result from the geological structure appears not been recorded in the assessment.

Geological Base

The difficulties which are encountered by the current residents of the North side of Gritstone Road arise from the precise geological nature of this piece of land. The properties numbered 2 to 32 were built in 1939. It was not until sometime after the properties were built that the nature of the underlying rock structures were fully described. The background to these structures is described in The British Geological Survey (BGS) Publication “The Hydrology of Chesterfield, Matlock and Mansfield District (Geological Map Sheet 112)” [HMSO 2007]

Extracts from this description of the Gritstones are as follows:
“The Millstone Grit [Gritstone] sandstones are typically cemented by quartz overgrowths. The resultant sandstones are closely packed and the combined effect of quartz overgrowths and pressure welding results in low intra-granular porosity. In addition the layers of sandstone are interspersed with layers of basalt which has little to no porosity”.

The item goes on to describe how intergranular clays develop which include kaolin. These arise from the breakdown of feldspar which produces “dissolution porosity.” This occurs “especially near the surface of the zone of weathering”, In essence the weathering of feldspar crystals which have grown over the basalt forms a layer similar to clay. Whilst water can travel through this material its progress is slow. Water is retained over long periods forming water tables in the clay above the Gritstone basalt layer. It is unable to drain away, especially under buildings, where it forms pools which are often stagnant. Water retention in the clay leads to an unstable consistency, especially when it contains a high proportion of water.

The BGS description has been confirmed by field research and samples collected from the block of land SHLAA225. (Please see photographic evidence)
- Photograph 1) Example of layered sandstone and basalt with basalt cap;
- Photograph 2) Example of quartz with pink feldspar crystals prior to the break down into clay;
- Photograph 3) Example sandstone layered between impervious quartz crystals.

In Summary: the raised area which comprises all of the block of land SHLAA225 consists of:
(a) A raised area of Gritstone. This consists of interspersed layers of sandstone and basalt overgrown with quartz. This Gritstone has very little to no porosity
(b) Lying on top of the Gritstone is a layer of intergranular clay which is approximately 2 metres deep. This clay layer demonstrates a medium degree of porosity with slow drainage.
As the clay layer is shallow (approximately 2 metres) the effect is for rain water to fall, sink barely two metres, then meet the impervious Gritstone. The water then follows its own rule and drains through the slightly more porous clay down the easterly slope through the properties which form the boundary of the SHLAA225 block of land. But as the degree of porosity of the clay is limited, water does not drain away immediately. After heavy rain the effect of the inability of the water to drain down into the rocks is that where it meets the Gritstone layer it spreads laterally through the clay forming a “water table”. which is visible at the surface.

In summary the basalt layer with its quartz overgrowth forms an impermeable “cap” on the land to the east of and underlying Gritstone Road. The rounded surface of the land which is raised to a height of around 40m lies to the north north west of SHLAA225. The underlying Gritstone is covered in a layer of clay which is of medium porosity. The result is that all of the rainwater landing on the proposed development site will drain to the south and east through the 2 metre deep layer of clay, towards, under and through the properties in Gritstone Road and Bentley Close.

Even without further development of the land which comprises SHLAA225, this water table rises and is visible at the surface along the boundary of the Gritstone Road properties (please see photograph 5). It takes a small amount of rain for a “lake” to be formed where the land adjoins the rear of the properties in Bentley Close (please see photograph 4). During most of the past 25 years the raised water table has been a visible feature in every month of the year. The wet summer of 2012 has provided further evidence of waterlogging and the limited ability of the clay to adequately drain the land, with water hungry “bog grass” establishing itself (please see photograph 6). The water table rises regularly and visibly under the floorboards of the Gritstone Road properties, which adjoin SHLAA225 sometimes becoming stagnant. In some cases this has necessitated the replacement of damp and water damaged floor boards, whilst in hot summer days the odour of stagnant water is an ever present feature. In 2006 the waterlogged nature of the clay became so bad that the western corner of an outhouse adjoining number 32 Gritstone Road started to sink into the clay and pulled away from the wall of the house. This could be rectified only by costly underpinning work.

The inevitable paving over of the proposed development will have the effect of increasing the surface water runoff towards the properties to the north of Gritstone Road with the considerable risk that the problems of property damage faced in number 32 will be replicated for most of the properties aligned with the Eastern SHLAA225 boundary. Difficulties have already been experienced in obtaining buildings insurance for properties. It is impossible to estimate how severe the increase in water damage created by the development will become. It is certain that the geological structure of the land will have a significant detrimental effect upon properties to the north of Gritstone Road and also in Bentley Close. It is clear that if this development is to proceed, increased water flows will cause damage to properties with the cost remediation difficult quantify. It is naïve to assume that flooding cannot occur at altitudes higher than a flood plain. The author has observed similar situations at altitudes of over 6,000 feet.

The following case study provides graphic evidence of the potential for flooding in Gritstone Road.
Case Study
In 2004 the owners of numbers 30 and 32 Gritstone Road received planning permission to build substantial extensions to the rear of their properties. Planning Regulation H3 (3) requires that rainwater from properties shall discharge to:
(a) An adequate soak away;
(b) A watercourse; or
(c) A sewer.

As the building was being undertaken the Building Inspector required that, in compliance with Building Regulation H3(3) rain water from the new (rear) roof area of both properties should not be allowed to drain into a sewer but should be fed into soak aways to the rear of both properties (Please see photograph 7). The required dimensions of each soak away were 2m x 2m x 3m. In the event the depth was just over 2m as this was the level at which the Gritstone was reached thus limiting the available depth. On enquiring of the Inspector he advised that the water would “disperse”. Indeed this happens. However water being unable to find its way down through the Gritstone follows the slope of the underlying rock, travelling under the two properties and draining across the pavement into the road (Please see Photograph 8). This is a year round problem, the “dispersal” being most obvious during the summer months where, due to the slow rate of drainage through the clay there is rarely any month when water is not visible draining across the pavement.

Whilst building was taking place the basalt layer and quartz overgrowth was clear and limited options with regard to foundations, options which were approved by the Building Inspector

Implications for the Plan

The assessment of the site as:
“Flood risk – green: The site is not affected by identified areas of indicatie (sic) flood mapping or is located in Flood Zone 1.

Ignores the geology and assumes that because the site is not in Flood Zone 1 it is incapable of flood risk. As drawn, this block forms a micro-environment where surrounding properties already suffer from flood related problems. These arise from the rocks on which the properties are built and relate directly to the precise nature of the underlying geological structure and which have not been taken into account in the Assessment.

The effect of compliance with Regulation H3(3)(a) and installing a soakaways within the curtilage of two properties is already clear and visible for all to see. It is also clear that houses built on the proposed area of land will similarly be required to comply with Planning Regulation H3(3)(a) thereby creating similar problems. The options will be:
a) Each new property will be required to drain all rainwater in a soak away from which it will “disperse”. This dispersal will drain slowly through the clay, down the slope of the Gritstone under and through the properties to Gritstone Road and Bentley Close. Flooding problems for existing properties in Gritstone Road and Bentley Close will be exacerbated to a significant extent. Given the experience observed in Number 32 eight years ago it is not unreasonable to suppose that similar, flood related, permanent structural damage to the existing properties is a very likely outcome. These will replicate and exacerbate the problems faced by the residents at number 32 which resulted in a considerable cost to deal with the damage and significantly increased insurance costs. An increase in the number of soakaways to 64, can have no other result in the medium to long term than costly water damage to all of the properties in Gritstone Road and Bentley Close with the associated rise in insurance costs;
b) There are no adjacent water courses which could be used

c) Available sewers leading to and down Chesterfield Road are of domestic capacity.

Policy PD8 “The Flood Risk Management and Water Quality” section of the Draft Plan (paras 5.58 – 5.60 (pages 76 to 78) references the Catchment Flood Management Plans and the Local Flood Strategy Risk Management and appears to be based on the Technical Guidance in the NPPF.

However the Policy document states that the Council will only permit development within areas if:

*It will not cause damage or worsen flooding on the site or elsewhere.*

**It appears that the inclusion in the plan of site SHLAA225 contravenes existing Council policy.**

The approach taken in the Assessment fails to take into consideration the detailed guidance on the Planning Portal. The Buildings Regulations 2000, *Approved Document H – Drainage and Waste Disposal*

This document sets out the requirement for soakaways to collect water from roofs, and prohibits (except in exceptional circumstances and at a last resort) the channelling of such water into waste sewers. Sewer sizes for domestic and rainwater drainage purposes are also set out.

It is clear that if approval for development and/or planning permission is given then option H3(3)c) could be employed to avoid the demonstrable problems of the installation of soak away water dispersal from the properties on the new development on the land in question. If the Council employs this option to deal with rainwater runoff from SHLAA225 it will be necessary for sewer sizes to be increased in order meet the regulations for rainwater drainage. This is not a problem solely for the developer, despite the Plan noting contributions to the local infrastructure as a “benefit”. It is unlikely that such contribution of the scale necessary to address the problems outlined will be limited to just the developer, indeed mitigation of the flooding problems outlined will be costly to the residents of Matlock as a whole, not just in financial terms at a time of austerity, but in indirect terms such as disruption. It is inevitable that the flooding implications will incur further costs to the Council and more importantly to the taxpayers of Matlock but with no real benefit, this at a time of austerity and cuts to budgets in real terms.

Further, H3 clearly states that “where areas are paved: methods of drainage other than connection to a public sewer are encouraged” It is unreasonable to suppose that any new properties would not involve the creation of a paved areas of considerable size, adding further run off related difficulties to the existing householders in Gritstone Road and Bentley Close.

The relevant details of H3 can be found in the Appendix to this Objection

**The Local Plan**

The Sustainability Report states that all development must consider sustainable water management and that increased surface run off must be mitigated where necessary. However it fails to address the problems which are inherent in the micro-environment of SHLAA225 which is plagued by problems associated by water run-off. The development of the land can do nothing but exacerbate the existing problems. Mitigation can be achieved by avoiding the development of the land in question now and for the future, thereby providing
certainty and comfort for existing residents with regard to the potential costs of water related
damage to their properties.

This report supports the objections made by others. It is interesting to note that there
is now clear and recent (4th March 2016) evidence that property values in Gritstone
Road have already been affected by the publication of the Plan. This having led
directly to a reduction I value of 13.8%

It is however appropriate that two further comments be made.
The Plan is heavily biased towards the supply side of the property market with little
quantitative analysis of the demand side. The section Strategic Employment Development
addresses this in three short paragraphs (4.35 to 4.37 pages 39-40). There is no real
assessment of where the purchasers of new houses will work. Indeed the Plan
acknowledges the need for commercial and business development but does not state how
this is to be achieved. The Plan appears to be predicated on the sales of properties to
commuters when acknowledging in paragraph 4.39

The evidence from the Derbyshire Dales Retail Study Update (September 2015) indicates
that Matlock town centre is attractive and well maintained and has a reasonable environment
which is only reduced by the level of traffic travelling through.
The Plan as a whole can only serve to exacerbate problems on already overcrowded roads.

The study referred to is dated September 2015, that is prior to the announcement by the
Council of its intention to reduce its workforce in the town by approximately one third.
Paragraph 4.40 of the Plan states:
The Study considers Matlock town centre to be a healthy centre which acts as
a focal point for the wider surrounding area and as such provides a range of national retail
operators

This section appears to be biased as it fails to recognise the loss of small retail traders over
the past five years balanced only by the exponential growth of charity shops in the town. The
proportion of charity to “for profit” retail must make the conclusions drawn questionable,
therefore also question the sustainability of the degree of growth which is proposed. The
only conclusion being that the proposed new home will provide “dormitories” bringing little to
Matlock in terms of economic growth whilst having the detrimental effect of significant
increase in road use, making acknowledged problems worse.

Conclusion
Should the proposed development of SHLAA225 be approved by the Council the risks of
flood and water damage to the existing residents in the adjoining properties is considerable.

These risks are predicated upon the geological micro-environment of the precise block of
land which has been identified. As the risks are geological in nature they will not go away.
The key problem is the structure of the land which lies atop the various layers of which
Gritstone is comprised. This makes drainage through the underlying rock impossible and
leads to lateral and “down slope” water dispersal at a minimal rate thereby forming a surface
level water table. This in turn is creates flooding under the properties in Gritstone Road and
Bentley Close.

Current Planning Regulations require that rainwater be drained into a soak away for each
new property and advises against drainage into sewers. There is a practical example of the
negative results of the application of this requirement to two properties in Gritstone Road.
This takes the form of under-house flooding; run off into the street and damage to property
arising from the retention of water in the clay. Water disperses slowly down the Eastern slope SHLAA225. However, the addition of soakaways, collecting and concentrating rainfall from 64 new properties will focus the drainage down the Eastern slope, under and through the properties in Gritstone Road and Bentley Close. To this is added the effects of paving over much of the existing land. The implications form a terrifying prospect for the existing residents which include increased costs or even lack of insurance cover for their properties.

The effect of the proposed development is to place residents of Gritstone Road and Bentley Close at considerable risk of major water damage to their properties of the type which has already been experienced by numbers 30 and 32 Gritstone Road. This is likely to include actual structural damage to buildings which will be costly to repair. It has been noted that the risks set out in this paper have not been identified or addressed in any of the documents which accompany the Plan. Indeed, in places these risks have been determined as “not relevant”.

There is a possibility that the Council might consider the installation of a considerably larger sewer system which meets the standards required to accommodate the rain water run off resulting from the new buildings and paving of the land. Such a rainwater sewer system would incur the Council in considerable costs for no real benefit to the citizens of Matlock.

We have taken the step of informing Councillors of the risks and problems which are likely to arise from the release for development of the block of land SHLAA225. We have taken legal advice regarding this matter. We understand that as Councillors have been advised of the risks of flood and rain water runoff related damage to existing property prior to the decision to approve the Plan then claims for compensation are likely to be successful should such damage described occur following approval of the Plan and/or current or future planning applications. Claims could be made by the owners of properties in Gritstone Road and those in Bentley Close. We understand that claims for compensation could be made as a result of damage arising from the approval of block SHLAA225 for development or planning approval. Any such claims could be made from the current land owner, the Council and any future developer. Of course, we would prefer to avoid this possibility.

This written objection requests that the block of land identified as SHLAA225 in the Assessment and Policy HC2(v) and DS4 Housing Land Allocations Site allocation at Land off Gritstone Road / Pinewood Road, Matlock be removed from the Draft Plan and further protected from development at any time in the future.

Janet Roberts FRSA, CIPS Affiliate, CIPD Affiliate, MSA
12th March 2016

Photographs
1) Layered Gritstone showing a capping of basalt (black) which is impervious to water interleaved with layers of permeable sandstone (tan coloured). Collected from SHLAA225
2) An example of quartz overgrowth (white crystalline) on basalt (black) with feldspar crystals not yet weathered to clay. Collected from SHLAA225
3) Sandstone layered between two layers of quartz crystals. Collected from SHLAA225
4) Surface level water table appearing to the north of the properties 26 to 30 Gritstone road and extending into land by 10m
5) Water table above the land surface in the form of a lake on abutting properties to the South west of MPA2 East This lake has been observed for several days every in every month of the year for the past 25 years.
6) Bog grass has established itself demonstrating the slow drainage capacity of the clay layer across MAT 2 East.
7) Site of soak away in the garden of number 30 Gritstone Road. Note that the surface has sunk as the clay liquefies on a regular basis.
8) The soak aways at the rear of numbers 30 and 32 drain under and through the properties reappearing as drainage across the pavement into the road. The installation of the soak aways in the new development is a requirement of Planning Regulation H3. There is no other outcome than increased water drainage through and under the properties on the north side of Gritstone Road. As water for the soak aways cannot disperse down into the underlying rock, but must disperse laterally and down the slope replicating and increasing the problems demonstrated at numbers 30 and 32 along the entire length of Gritstone Road

Appendix
The Planning Portal
A larger roof area will increase the amount of surface water. It is preferable to keep the extra volume on site, in order to avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere. Rainwater can be kept on site by using a soakaway or some other way of allowing it to soak into the ground (referred to as infiltration) Approved Document H gives advice on where to site soakaways, how large they should be and how they should be built. Where it is impractical to use infiltration (eg. because of nearby foundations, impermeable or contaminated ground, or high groundwater), it is preferable to discharge it to a watercourse or, failing this, to a surface water sewer or, as a last resort, to a combined sewer. Surface water must not be discharged into a foul drain or sewer.

Approved Document H – Drainage and Waste Disposal

H3 RAINWATER DRAINAGE
This Approved Document, which took effect on 1 April 2002, deals with the following requirement which is contained in the Building Regulations 2010.
Requirement
Limits on application Rainwater drainage

H.3
(1) Adequate provision shall be made for rainwater to be carried from the roof of the building.
(2) Paved areas around the building shall be so constructed as to be adequately drained.
(3) Rainwater from a system provided pursuant to sub-paragraphs (1) or (2) shall discharge to one of the following listed in order of priority:
(a) An adequate soakaway or some other adequate infiltration system; or, where that is not reasonably practicable,
(b) A watercourse; or, where that is not reasonably practicable,
(c) A sewer.

The Requirement
Guidance
Performance
In the Secretary of State’s view the requirements of H3 will be met if:
a. rainwater from roofs and paved areas is carried away from the surface either by a drainage system or by other means;
b. a rainwater drainage system:
i. carries the flow of rainwater from the roof to an outfall (a soakaway, a watercourse, a surface water or a combined sewer) rainwater soaking into the ground is distributed sufficiently so that it does not damage the foundations of the proposed building or any adjacent structure.

**Section 2**
Drainage and waste disposal

2.2
Surface gradients should direct water draining from a paved area away from buildings. Where the levels would otherwise cause water to concentrate along the wall of a building, a reverse gradient should be created, for at least 500mm from the wall of the building, to divert the water away from the wall.

b. In ground where the water table reaches the bottom of the device at any time of the year;

c. sufficiently far from any drainage fields, drainage mounds or other soakaways so that the overall soakage capacity of the ground is not exceeded and the effectiveness of any drainage field is not impaired
Layered Gritstone, showing interleaved layers of black Basalt (impervious to water) and tan coloured Sandstone.

An example of Quartz overgrowth (white crystalline) on black Basalt, with feldspar crystals not yet weathered to clay.

Layered Sandstone between two layers of Quartz crystals.

All specimens collected from MAT2 East

Water table above the land surface in the form of a lake abutting properties to the south west of MAT2 East. This lake has been observed for several days every month for 25 years.

Surface level water table appearing to the north of the properties 20 to 30 Gritstone Road and extending into the land by 10 metres.

Bog grass has established itself demonstrating the slow drainage capacity of the clay layer across MAT2 East.

Site of soak away in the garden of number 30 Gritstone Road. Note that the surface has sunk as the clay liquefies on a regular basis.

The soak aways at the rear of numbers 30 and 32 drain under and through the properties, reappearing as drainage across the pavement into the road.

The installation of soak aways in a new development is a requirement of Planning Regulation H3(3). There is no other outcome than increased water drainage through and under the properties on the north side of Gritstone Road. If water from the soak aways cannot disperse down into the underlying rock it must disperse laterally and down the slope, replicating and increasing the problems demonstrated at numbers 30 and 32 along the entire length of Gritstone Road.
REPRESENTATION FROM DAVID & KAREN JENKINSON

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Planning Objection to the sites SHLAA224 and 225.

Please record our strong objections to the proposed planning designation relating to the above sites on the following grounds:

If there are going to be up to 500 houses on these sites then there will be at least 500 extra cars using the surrounding roads, which are not suitable for this amount of traffic as they are not wide enough, with a lot of the roads having parked cars on them. Cavendish Road and its junction with Wellington Street has restricted visibility for emerging traffic. The Chesterfield Road junction with Wellington Street is very busy with traffic coming and going to Chesterfield/Matlock causing emerging right-turners to block the junction for many minutes at a time; additional traffic will exacerbate the problem.

There is a large school off Chesterfield Road. If the exit and entrance to the new proposed site is to be Gritstone Road and then onto Chesterfield Road there will be significant extra congestion and ad hoc illegal parking at peak times, putting children in danger.

Access for emergency service vehicles is going to be seriously compromised, which will result in people’s lives being put at risk through no fault of their own. There is already grid-lock at peak times, such as Saturday mornings when the Cavendish Fields football pitches are in use. It is a miracle that no-one has lost their life if an ambulance or fire engine was needed at these times.

Construction traffic. The existing roads are not wide enough or robust enough to take large and heavy construction vehicles - extra money will be needed for DCC to improve roads.

Flooding and water run off: The fields above Cavendish Park are very wet and Cavendish Playing Field has had to put expensive land drainage channels in to keep it useable all year round. If more houses are put on the local fields then run off water will seriously affect the properties that are already in the area. The fields soak up a lot of rainfall, preventing localised flooding; creating a large expanse of hard-surfaced housing estate will significantly increase the flood risk to all properties downhill of the proposed development.

Loss of a greenfield site: last and by no means least, the fields are a haven for wildlife and nature. Please do not cover them with tarmac and concrete.

Please acknowledge receipt of these objections.
Yours very sincerely, David & Karen JENKINSON
Dear Sirs,

I write in regard to the application SHLAA 224 and would like to put in this written objection.

The impact on what is possibly already the biggest Cul de Sac in Britain if not Europe is of grave concern. I would invite Councillors to attend a site visit on a Saturday morning when Children’s football matches are on. The Cavendish traffic and jam of football traffic, is already at such a level, that I am afraid it is only a matter of time before there is a tragic incident. Be it a fire in a house, a heart attack to a resident or a serious injury to a football player and the emergency services will not be able to attend in time due to the traffic congestion.

I trust you will take my current concerns into your deliberations.

Kind regards Justin Hird
Objection to sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225 Land off Pinewood Road/Gritstone Road being included in the DDDC Draft Local Plan

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 them 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.

Kevin J Knight
Dear sir,

I am writing this letter to object about the proposal to build houses at the back of Sandy Lane and Grinstone Road, and linking up with the Wolfs estate. These proposals are madness. Over the years, various builders have put forward plans to do the same thing, and permission was turned down because common sense prevailed. There are numerous problems with this site, including access, followed by the problems
of massive amounts of spring and ground water and boggy land, all this water has to go somewhere. All the infrastructure would be put under increased strain including water, gas, sewage etc. all of which are at their limits and could not possibly accommodate more housing. All of the surface water that would be collected on drives, roads, hard standings etc. would have to go into the river eventually, and this is at a time when local authorities around the country are trying to find ways of stopping this happening in times of flood. To use this land is totally unwise, it's a desperate way of appeasing the government's housing plans and I and my wife object against these proposals.
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

To whom it may concern

Planning Application in Matlock by William Davis Homes - Reference SHLAA 224

My wife and I have given much thought and concern about the above planning application and proposal for housing development up until 2033. We both wish to object to any proposals for building any more property particularly for this area because of the following concerns and objections which we wish to put forward:

- Road safety - The huge increase in traffic and parking which is already a huge problem on these narrow streets. Residents, especially children and the elderly are already affected on these roads.

- There is no clear, direct access to the development site. To create access will mean extensive, costly and disruptive highways improvements that will impact all roads in the vicinity of the sites.

- There will be an increase in problems with flooding, run off water and sewerage for all houses within a wide radius of the sites. Properties already have serious problems with flooding from standing and run-off water from the permanently boggy, waterlogged sites.

- Sewerage Piping - Infrastructure will need reinforcing or enlarging which will be costly and will cause lots of disruption.

- Devaluation of existing properties - and it is well known that this is already causing difficulties for people trying to sell houses in the neighbouring areas.

Yours faithfully,

Les and Vera Turner
REPRESENTATION FROM MICK CONBOY

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Dear Councillors

I am writing to express my concern at suggestions for developing these sites might be added to the Local Plan.

There are many reasons why I object to the proposal but the most pressing I feel are:

1. The proposed 500 homes, with a potential 1000-2000 new residents, is completely out of proportion to the current size of Matlock. I do not understand where new residents could expect to find jobs or school places. It can already take 2 weeks to get an appointment at the doctor’s or dentist’s (we found it difficult even to register when we moved here 6 years ago), and the huge number of new residents would only make this situation worse.

2. Driving in Cavendish Park is already challenging. When cars are parked on the road outside their owners’ homes, Cavendish Road is effectively reduced to a single track road with no official passing places. Anyone who has attempted to enter/exit Cavendish Road by car when the sports field is in use can testify to the resulting frustrations and aggressive driving. I am also concerned that school pupils and elderly residents would find it difficult to cope with a potential 500+ more cars in the immediate local area. We are forced to drive, as Bank Road is too steep for us to carry our shopping back home. The M1 bus service is precious but is gradually being eroded (no bus at 1 or 4 p.m.; ends at 6 p.m.; no service on Sunday). I believe it is also under threat due to lack of public funding.

3. Loss of greenfield site and natural habitat would be catastrophic, as this is one of Matlock’s greatest assets. Tourist potential for the area would surely be threatened by new housing on this scale; we are already challenged by the painfully slow development of Bakewell Road, loss of the tourist information office, and the preponderance of charity and junk shops in town. It would be encouraging to see the Council taking steps to improve quality of life in this community, rather than the opposite.

Please consider this a strong objection to the planning proposals.

Yours sincerely

Mick Conboy
Dear Derbyshire Dales Councillor,

Below are our objections to the local plan relating to sites SHLAA224 (land of Pinewood Road) and SHLAA225 (land off Gritstone Road).

**Effect on traffic or parking**

The large proposal of housing will inevitably lead to an increase in road traffic along all access routes. From personal experience Cavendish Road is already heavily congested with parked vehicles and vehicle movements. This is exasperated at peak times and at the weekends when there are large volumes of cars attending football matches at Cavendish Fields. Current daily volumes already hinder progression of larger vehicles, e.g. the emergency services, public transport and refuse collection.

**Danger to pedestrians, children and the elderly**

As outlined above the increase in traffic will increase the risk to pedestrians and other public highway users (e.g. cyclists) on already tight and limited vision junctions combined with the narrow footpaths. Many local residents use the footpaths for commuting, attending school and for leisure. On numerous occasions we have seen vehicles mount the footpath to pass other vehicles as the roads are not wide enough. More traffic will only worsen this issue.

**Drainage and flooding issues**

The local area already has a high moisture content in the ground and additional housing and infrastructure will only make matters worse, leading to the potential of localised flooding due to less water retention in the ground and thus increased run-off. The area's roads and drainage are already stressed to capacity during severe weather, with manhole covers being lifted by the volume of water in the system.

**Impact on the local environment & whether the proposed use is appropriate**

The population increase from such a development will put a strain on the already stretched services of the locality (e.g. doctor, dentist and school places). Greenfield sites are obviously appealing from a developer's perspective and there is indeed pressure to build more and more housing, but shouldn't more appropriate locations be targeted and used first? The Cawdor Quarry site was earmarked for a significant development but does not appear to have progressed - brownfield sites should be targeted first and given priority, otherwise they are left as unsightly, unused spaces.

Yours sincerely,

Mr and Mrs Hughes
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Dear Councillors

I am writing to object to the development proposals for these sites off Pinewood and Gritstone Road.

I am very concerned with the issues of road safety and access with the significant increase in the volume of traffic on adjacent roads if the development goes ahead, in combination with the current obstructions that already occur.

As a resident of Rockside View, I can report it is seldom that one can progress along Cavendish Road without waiting.

With the parking that is invariably present on the North side of Cavendish Road, this road is already one way.

There are certain times of the week that this gets much worse.

On Wednesday mornings, whenever there is a refuse collection, one can be held up for up to 10 minutes waiting for the 2 vans to move along Cavendish Road.

On Saturdays and Sundays, just before and just after the hour, there is a constant stream of traffic moving both ways along Cavendish Road going to and from Cavendish Fields to football. This is much worse on tournament days. Invariably non resident and in a rush, one can wait for a whole team or two of cars to pass.

When congestion is at such a level, one is concerned for how quickly emergency access could be achieved in the event of a resident falling ill, a fire occurring or a player being injured.

With any increased volume of traffic, there will be difficulty accessing Wellington Street and Chesterfield Road. These junctions are currently difficult to navigate, again at particular times.

When the council traffic arrives or departs, there are long delays already getting onto Wellington Street and onto Chesterfield Road. There would need to be significant alteration of traffic flow for Cavendish Road to not be totally gridlocked by the parking, a queue of traffic waiting to turn on to Wellington Street and, say a bus, trying to go against this stream towards Wolds Rise,

Things are already dreadful at certain times and current access does not safely sustain traffic movements of local residents, this being without the forthcoming plans being implemented.

I have been fortunate enough to have not been affected by flooding, but I know of other properties on the sides of the estate on Moorfield that have been subject to flooding/mudsides off the fields and I am concerned that concreting the fields behind will increase this risk.
Along with the risks of increasing traffic near Highfields School, reducing green field sites and natural habitat, the increase in pollution from increased dwellers vehicles and the lack of current increase in local resources for health and schooling for the already increased population before any considered increase in dwellings, I write to ask you to consider these objections when making decisions about the above sites.

Many thanks

Yours sincerely

Dr Neil Fray
Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

I strongly object to the proposal of building on SHLAA224 and SHLAA225 for the following reasons.

Access and safety.

Accessing the site through either Gritstone Rd or Cavendish Rd firstly is a non starter, the junction at Wolds Rd/Chesterfield rd will be unsafe and will not meet highways regulations due to visibility and will also be unsafe for pedestrians especially at peak times and when Highfields schools starts/finishes.

Access through Cavendish Rd again is a non starter, the bottle necks part way along will bring traffic to stand offs which already happens constantly. There is no room at these points to widen the road due to physical features already there. This will also cause GREAT concerns over emergency services access which could and WILL cost LIVES are the developers and council prepared to be liable for this.

Both Access points will put extra traffic to an already extremely busy Chesterfield Rd (A632) and create peak hour madness, delays and inevitably more accidents no matter what the speed limit is.

Access through both sites will put local residents at a heightened safety risk from traffic whether it is calmed or not as the proposal for approx 500 home will put a minimum of 1000 traffic movements a day ,and that is just stating the obvious, this will likely be greater with most homes having two cars and using them for commuting and social use especially at his elevated position where owing a vehicle will be essential. All this through 1 or two access points.....

Just saying developers can “mitigate” against this isn’t good enough, the council will be left to pick up the pieces when the developers have gone. Hard facts and figures along with a GUARANTEE from developers and the council needs to be given to say local resident WILL NOT be adversely effected.

Flood risk.

Flooding on both sites is already and issue as the local run off combined with natural springs cause damage and disruption to existing residents, gardens and properties already get flooded along with subsidence to others. It is shown on the NRA website that particularly on SHALA225 there is risk of flooding, why hasn’t this been considered without just saying developers can “mitigate” against it.

The natural water course for this area hits bedrock 2 meters below the surface so the runoff will have to go somewhere and I don’t believe connection to the already at capacity drainage network is possible so where will it go..... to existing properties AND roads causing further flooding and damage eventually ending up in Matlock town centre. Does this meet the challenge of flooding as stated in National Planning Policy Framework – No!

Inappropriate location.

Why would you build 500+ housed/ large community at approx 250 meters above sea level in an area that is regularly under snow in winter, exposed to violent and strong winds which causes damage to existing properties (mine on Gritstone rd had severe roof damage in 2014), heavy rain...
storms and continuous days of thick fog. Who is going to grit and clear the roads this puts extra load on the council's capacity. An aging community at this site is a problem in itself.

There is no local amenities within almost a mile of the area (Smedley street cannot be considered as you can't get basic products and any shops there closes after 5pm!) as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework. Any facility/amenity that is needed is at the closest in Matlock town center which will have to be accessed via either bank road or chesterfield road by powered vehicle for a majority of people especially an ageing community. Both of these roads especially Bank road is VERY steep and long, so steep its used annually as a Cycling Hill climb course and this year is a course of the UK national championship, not something most people will walk/cycle and certainly with shopping or the elderly!! This doesn't promote a healthy community as stated in National Planning Policy Framework.

Sites have to be close to public transport, most of the proposed new development will be a considerable walk to the closest public transport or is there proposal for extra network to be added, again this should be set in place BEFORE any decision is made as this wouldn't promote sustainable transport as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Where are the extra 500+ homes worth of people (1000+) going to work, go to school and receive medical services all these are already a capacity? It will not create business in the area, resident will be long distance commuters needing a car adding to traffic, Shoping in chesterfield as its easier access, I say this from experience as that's what I do! Schooling is already at a limit likewise are the local GP surgeries getting an appointment is already a near impossibility therefore pushing more people to use A&E! This doesn't comply with ensuring vitality of the town center or support a rural economy as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework

**Loss of Tranquility.**

Building on these sites will lead to a loss of tranquility to existing residents and a traditional high visual impact Derbyshire landscape close to the peak park will be lost and is one of the last remaining green field sites bordering the Matlock settlement boundary. It will also reduce habitat for local wildlife including many birds on the RSPB red list, also foxes and badgers will be pushed further into urban areas. This doesn’t conserve the natural and historic environment or protect GREEN BELT land as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework

Existing residents will also lose privacy and light and will turn border town properties into suburban town houses which will also devalue the area. When will the development stop, when we meet the next county Chesterfield!

**Devaluation, damage, and compensation.**

Devaluation to existing properties is going to occur which will have a financial impact for local residents trying to sell the properties.

Damage to existing residents properties from building and further flooding may occur.

Will the developers have a fund to provide compensation for existing residents to claim from if latent damage or disruption happens years in the future?

**Disruption to the environment**
Adding approx 500 more houses will have a huge impact on the local environments. Light pollution will transform a dark sky, edge of town location into suburban lit night sky. Noise during any construction will have a huge effect on local residents quality of life and after construction will turn edge of town tranquillity into suburban estate style living of which locals chose not to live in. Air pollution is going to be a major concern to all locals but some more than others, add thousands of car movements a day will seriously affect the standard of life for local residents with respiratory problems such as COPD or Asthma and could even COST LIVES, are the developers and council prepared to accent liability for this!?

BUILD ON BROWNFIELD FIRST!

Due to the past local industry in Matlock area there are many deserted Brownfield sites closer to the town centre that will easily absorb the supposed need housing for the area, pass these and MAKE developers see that its these sites or NOTHING before any Greenfield is even considered. These would ensure the vitality of town centre, support a rural community, promote sustainable transport, promote a healthy community, protect greenbelt land conserve a natural and historic environment and meet the challenge of flooding as all stated in the National Planning Policy Framework

Sustainability

Overall from the points listed above the sustainability that is mentioned in the National Planning Policy Framework can’t be achieved, therefore the sites SHLAA224 and SHLAA225 should be removed from the Local plan proposal and NOT developed any further.

A concerned resident of Gritstone rd.

Neil Gibbs
Objection to the development of SHLAA 225 / 224

You must all be aware by now of the huge number of objections to the development of this greenfield site from residence and professional bodies, such as scientific, geological and environmental. The only justification of the "Developer" to develop the site is just because they want to.

Yet the Government has stated many times that "it is the responsibility of local Planning to exhaust the possibility of Brownfield development before any Greenfield site is considered."

The general consensus of opinion is that all elected officials fall into one of three groups.

First group are those who honestly believe they have been elected to represent the wishes and concerns of the residence, and do so at every opportunity.
Second group are full of their own importance, with an arrogant self serving interest and "what's in it for me" attitude.
Third group would like to be like the first group, but are week and easily bullied / intimidated by the second group to do their bidding.

On a vote of a show of hands groups one and two raise there hands immediately, but it has been observed that group three have a few seconds delay to see which way they have to vote.

So, which group do you belong to ? Do you vote for the Free, or do you vote for the FEE.

P. Thompson
22. Gritstone Road
Matlock, DE4 3GB
12th March, 2016

Cllr Lewis Rose OBE, Leader, Derbyshire Dales District Council
Cllr Sir Richard FitzHerbert, Chair, Derbyshire Dales District Council
Town Hall, Matlock, DE4 3NN

Dear Councillor Rose and Councillor FitzHerbert,

The Local Plan:
Objections to the development of sites SHLAA 224 (off Pinewood Road) & SHLAA 225 (off Gritstone Road)

Further to our letter of 27th February, we write to register our objections to the development of the above-mentioned sites on the following grounds:

1. The sites occupy an exposed position, where development would be a visually damaging intrusion into the landscape.
2. The location of the sites is poorly related to the settlement pattern, and accessibility to facilities would be inconvenient due to their comparative remoteness.
3. Visibility at the access/exit junctions (Wolds Road, Sandy Lane, Moorcroft etc) with Chesterfield Road is unsatisfactory (due to the fact that the visibility splays are inadequate). Therefore, in the interests of highway safety, these developments should not go ahead.
4. Furthermore, all the access roads (including the above) are generally narrow and totally inadequate for the purpose of serving the needs of hundreds of additional households.

Please note: A proposed smaller development on this joint site was refused in 1990/91; more or less on the grounds as outlined above. These grounds are even more relevant today, as far more houses (covering a much larger area) are proposed, and the traffic/road safety situation has become even more acute.

Other concerns arise from issues highlighted in the National Planning Policy Framework – Achieving Sustainable Development. It appears that the proposed development of the sites in question is contrary to guidelines in this document. For example, how do the wonderful ideological phrases such as 'empowering local people to shape their surroundings' (para. 17), and a 'creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives' (para. 17) together with a declared aim of 'protecting green belts' (para. 17) have any meaning at all against a background of plonking hundreds of additional houses in greenfield areas (of sensitive landscape significance) where there is considerable local opposition?

The high target number for houses to be built in the Derbyshire Dales - particularly in the Matlock area - suggests that Matlock is seen as a dormitory town for surrounding authorities (thus encouraging journeys by car), in which case the proposed development of these sites is at variance with the guidelines (outlined in the NPPF) which talk about the need to:
- support the transition to a low carbon economy (para. 17)
- minimise journey lengths for employment (para. 37)

In addition, Cawdor Quarry remains an eyesore, and Halldale Quarry remains unused whilst greenfield sites are allowed to be developed immediately. How do these situations stand against the declared aim to 'encourage effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (providing it is not of high environmental value)' (para. 17)?

As Matt Thompson (Head of Planning, Campaign to Protect Rural England) says, 'We all want to solve the housing crisis. But plonking down large housing estates in the countryside on the edge of towns and villages, with poor design, inadequate infrastructure and no real relationship to the places of which they are meant to be a part, is in no one’s long term interests'.

Yours sincerely,

Peter S Wild
pp Peter & Lavinia Wild

Copies to:
All councillors: Derbyshire Dales District Council, Town Hall, Matlock, DE4 3NN
All councillors: Matlock Town Council, Imperial Rooms, Imperial Road, Matlock, DE4 3NL
Dorcas Bunton, Chief Executive, Derbyshire Dales District Council, Town Hall, Matlock, DE4 3NN
Paul Wilson, Corporate Director, Derbyshire Dales District Council, Town Hall, Matlock, DE4 3NN
Mike Hase, Planning Policy Manager, Derbyshire Dales District Council, Town Hall, Matlock, DE4 3NN
Sue Smith, Town Clerk, Matlock Town Council, Imperial Rooms, Imperial Road, Matlock, DE4 3NL
REPRESENTATION FROM ROB EATHERDEN

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Having been a resident of Gritstone road for the last 17 years, I am writing with concerns to the proposed development (SHLAA 225) for 500 new homes.

My major concern being the lack of facilities for a development of this size in a town the size of Matlock. If 500 new homes are constructed, with no addition to the already stretched amenities that Matlock has to offer. Unless there are plans for some utilities are to be built on the new estate (shop, Doctors etc) and we understand this is not the case, 500 houses could mean possibly an extra 500 cars going up and down the already crowded streets that are going to be used as access routes (there are no shops easily accessible now). This extra flow of traffic would then give rise to safety issues, if the access to be used is to be Wolds Road, Highfields School being directly opposite, mornings and afternoon access may become very dangerous.

Also the proposed site is very boggy at the moment and houses on Gritstone Road are already suffering, underpinning etc, we have seen in recent years the consequences of mass building on such land when the water has nowhere to go.

regards Rob Eatherden
We live at 26 Wolds Rise, Cavendish Park, we are sending this email in strong objection towards the planning application to build 500 houses at the rear of our property and surrounding area. The main reasons for our objection firstly is the impact this will have on our property of constant flooding which is already a problem due to the proposed site being marsh ground this being a natural soak away for the existing hillside. Being an experienced builder in the local area for 30 years I know this will create a severe impact on our property and those around it. This will then proceed to affect our insurance and getting any, who therefore will be prepared to compensate us for all of this? Will it be yourselves or William Davis Homes? Secondly the huge impact of extra traffic on the surrounding roads that are already struggling to cope with existing traffic, at a time when most homes own at least two vehicles this would be adding at least an extra thousand more vehicles. The small roads already struggle with the amount of cars on them. This impact will then spread to further roads making Matlock a complete traffic nightmare which in future will impact on tourists avoiding the area and therefore having a negative effect on local businesses. This area isn't suitable for extra housing and building here will not only put our homes at risk but the safety of our children and elderly residents. We therefore urge you to rethink your plans and build extra housing in a safer more suitable area.

Yours sincerely Richard and Tracey Summers.
REPRESENTATION FROM VIVIENNE BIRD

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

OBJECTION TO DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS – SHLAA 224 & 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 which will devalue my property and deter any prospective buyers. I also have concerns with the amount of additional traffic that will be using the old and narrow roads leading from Wellington Road and Cavendish Road. Also 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 guide lines 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”.

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

“When 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
Properties will lose value and the area will be less attractive to prospective buyers looking for a quiet, beautiful area with immediate access to the Peak District and one of the best towns in Derbyshire.

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.
REPRESENTATION FROM WENDY LEE

Objections to allocation of sites SHLAA 224 and SHLAA 225.

Dear Councillors

I am writing to express my concern that the potential for developing these sites might be added to the Local Plan.

There are many reasons why I object to the proposal. These are the most important:

1. The proposed 500 homes, with a potential 1000-2000 new residents, is completely out of proportion to the current size of Matlock. I do not understand where they could expect to find jobs or school places. It can already take 2 weeks to get an appointment at the doctor’s or dentist’s (we found it difficult even to register when we moved here 6 years ago), and the huge number of new residents would only make this situation worse.

2. Driving in Cavendish Park is already challenging. When cars are parked on the road outside their owners’ homes, Cavendish Road is effectively reduced to a single track road with no official passing places. Anyone who has attempted to enter/exit Cavendish Road by car when the sports field is in use can testify to the frustration and aggressive driving this can cause. I am also concerned that school pupils and elderly residents would find it difficult to cope with a potential 500 more cars in the immediate local area. We are forced to drive, as Bank Road is too steep for us to carry our shopping back home. The M1 bus service is precious but is gradually being eroded (no bus at 1 or 4 p.m.; ends at 6 p.m.; no service on Sunday). I believe it is also under threat due to lack of public funding.

3. Loss of greenfield site and natural habitat would be catastrophic, as this is one of Matlock’s greatest assets. Tourist potential for the area would surely be threatened by new housing on this scale; we are already challenged by the painfully slow development of Bakewell Road, loss of the tourist information office, and the preponderance of charity and junk shops in town. It would be encouraging to see the Council taking steps to improve quality of life in this community, rather than the opposite.

Please consider this a strong objection to the planning proposals.

Yours sincerely

Wendy Lee