

## **Tracy McFadden representation:**

### **Allocation of interest: North of Borrowash**

#### **Traffic Congestion**

Traffic congestion will always pose a problem when the infrastructure is not accommodating for expanded living. Roads need to be updated to enable a safe, secure driving experience both for the existing community and the expanding community that this site will provide.

#### **Road Safety**

Road safety for the existing community and expanded community is of paramount importance, not convinced the existing infrastructure and potential infrastructure will accommodate the expansion of vehicles on the roads.

#### **Air Quality**

Air quality is most important as the development is situated right next to the A52 dual carriageway which is always incredibly busy. How will the council accommodate good, proper air quality? Air quality we should all have access to, we all have to breathe it! What with the government confirming that geo-engineering is now backed by government policy (net zero) and tax payers' monies (we all have seen the after effects of GE by the debris on our vehicles) Loss of wildlife, Loss of sunshine etc, Loss of plant life etc, How can the council calculate the quality of the air that we, the community breathe?

#### **Wildlife / Biodiversity**

Net Zero is a myth, climate change is a myth. Plant more trees

#### **School capacity**

It is evident in many councils up and down the country that many services are overflowing and cannot accommodate the existing communities, never mind expanding communities, this needs to be acted upon with great importance to secure better learning facilities/sports facilities for the children of the community. If the private sector can do it, then why can the state schools not do it.

#### **Healthcare facilities**

It's a forgone conclusion that trying to get health services in the community is utterly broken in Borrowash/Ockbrook. The two surgeries are simply overwhelmed currently, trying to get an appt is near on impossible. Services have changed beyond comprehension and have failed the current community. All services need investment by government. The current system is not working and it will get worse with more people registering for health services.

#### **Green Belt**

Greenbelt is always controversial. I believe in the Greenbelt and what it means to many, however, there are anomalies that require investigation/consideration by the inspector to ensure that all changes to the Greenbelt boundaries are done so legitimately in line with compliance and legislation at the time of GB boundary changes whether past or present. The council states that this site provides little to accommodate the 5 purposes of the Greenbelt as confirmed in its Strategic Policy at 1.11. I can see no background documentation that the council has provided to arrive at such a decision. Such decisions should always have an audit available to the public to ensure all standards/compliance is met in line with legislation at the time to avoid future complications and unnecessary stress/anxieties/financials to the general homeowner/landowner caused by decisions of councils to not diligently, professionally, lawfully document decisions in line with the law of the land (NPPG/NPPF/Hansard). For example: Site 210: Land to the rear of 244 Victoria Avenue (contained in SHLAA 2022 Site Assessment). The council refers to this particular site's existing use as being domestic garden (which it is a cultivated garden with outbuildings

which have been there for over 100 years or so) however, it also states that the garden is also a paddock. It has never been a paddock. Evidence needs to be provided as to how the council made the decision that this garden was a paddock? The garden has old trees that would not allow a paddock, also outbuildings, a large pond and a very dilapidated (unused for years) swimming pool. It also states that the land is "Greenfield". It is not "greenfield" (the council needs to explain this and provide documentation of why it was changed), please refer to Crowley Associates Timeline report: 14.05.12: 01.06.12 Ms McFadden was advised in writing that (having submitted her land at 244 Victoria Avenue for promotion under the SHLAA framework) that her site would not be included in the 0-5,6-10 or 10-15 tranches of suitable and available housing sites. The local authority cited the Green Belt as an issue and made reference to her site being Greenfield without any proper justification or explanation.

The SHLAA 2022 Site Assessment confirms that the cultivated garden is now Greenfield. The SHLAA then further confirms under the "constraints" heading that the garden is now "Greenbelt". The SHLAA also confirms that prior to any consideration of residential development, the site would need to be released from the Greenbelt (not greenfield), to make housing compliant with local and national policies. This would require site assessment through a Greenbelt review. Would the council please confirm whether they have decided that my cultivated garden and outbuildings is greenfield/greenbelt and/or a paddock and provide evidence of the changes. The Greenbelt at this site is controversial and the council is fully aware of this.

The Greenbelt/Greenfield/Paddock allocation (whatever the council decides is appropriate-undocumented) at this site is unlawful. Evidence collected over very many years has proved that the council did not adhere to planning policies at the time, past and present (in this case NPPG, later NPPF, also Hansard) documents state unequivocally "alteration to GB boundaries to be fully evidenced and justified" The council has never demonstrated this at site 210. Furthermore, paragraph 69 of the NPPF states that small and medium sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out relatively quickly. The inspector asks the council for clarification sought on this matter. As far as aware no Greenbelt review has been applied to this site. Although given that the council will no longer communicate with the landowner due to controversy and not contacting the landowner concerning a "call for sites" therefore forcing the landowner against their will to utilise the offer a "pro bono" arrangement via a planning agent. This was a call for sites only arrangement. Why did the council not contact the landowner directly? The council's letter to the inspector states all work streams in EBC15 notably "additional steps to Workstream 8 (Greenbelt review), i.e undertaking a systematic evaluation of the Erewash Green Belt, this has not happened at site 210. Site 210 was put into the Greenbelt under suspicious circumstances, although the council dismisses this assertion. Evidence proves differently. The council now has the opportunity to set right the wrong decisions of the past. However, current evidence shows that the council are not willing to do this, why?

The above exemplifies how decisions can go horribly if not properly documented/audited legislatively in accordance with planning policy guidance (seemingly loopholes exist and is open to abuse). Hence why all additions/deletions from Greenbelt MUST BE fully evidenced. Sadly this has not been the case, and the council even now cannot fully evidence a thorough Greenbelt review and consider those sites that do not perform at all to the purposes of land being in the Greenbelt in the first place. Care and due diligences, honest and integrity is required by the council to ensure all decisions are legally binding rather than making decisions "willy-nilly" without the support of evidence/documents.