

Dear Ms Wilson,

Thank you for the opportunity to pass further comment on the Cranbrook DPD.

I write to you with concern over the recently submitted "PSD27 Supplementary evidence paper including Sustainability Appraisal update in respect of policy and allocations for gypsies and travellers".

I appreciate you requesting that EDDC further evidence their selection of sites. Reading the document, I have found a number of discrepancies and biases that expose this document as a justification of the pre-selected site at Treasbeare rather than the impartial sustainability appraisal you asked for.

I have studied the site appraisals which have been barely updated since the previous Cranbrook Plan SAs. With no more than a couple of sentences in some cases, I feel there needs to be far more justification.

Additionally, negatives have been ignored or downplayed to suit the pre-selected sites. For example, the access road (Station Road) in sites W and V is described as unsuitably narrow, whereas Parsons Lane in B3 is noted as wide. Knowing both routes very well, Station Road has room for two vehicles and features road markings down the centre, whereas Parsons Lane is a typical single track country lane for the majority of its length, including the part that would be required as access from the Treasbeare pitches to London Road. There is an inconsistency for site R where Parsons Lane is described as "narrow along central and eastern sections", despite these sections being a similar width to the northern stretch (stretch that will see most traffic as a result of proposed Treasbeare pitches) and also only allowing one vehicle at a time.

Furthermore, section 6.6 of the report states that Parsons Lane would not require widening. I disagree with this statement. I feel Parson lane is far from suitable due to its narrow stretch from the junction with London Road, as well as the fact it has ditches either side, which could cause a hazard when vehicles are inevitably forced to reverse. It also floods in sections and is already very busy with traffic, as well as being popular with walkers, runners and cyclists due to its country character. A pitch location with direct access to London Road is required.

Given the topography of the South West Corner of T, a steep sloping section of field in the direction of Cranbrook, I feel it will have a big impact on the environment and character of the area. I disagree with the statement in 6.5 of the SA that the single storey nature of the dwellings will be less visible, given the fact that caravans tend to be white in colour, reflecting more light. My belief is that this would be more intrusive than typical housing. I also have a concern that a lot of effort is going into protecting the country character of Rockbeare (rightly so), yet there is no concern for the character of Cranbrook. Cranbrook currently benefits from a green outlook and the current green wedge is a beautiful natural feature of the landscape. By siting the pitches in such a prominent position, they will be in view of huge areas of Cranbrook. A location with a less prominent position should be sought.

Referencing 6.4 in relation to noise pollution, I think it is very important to raise concern here, especially given the reduced amount of insulation in single skin caravans. I would argue that given the proximity to the airport in Treasbeare, the 5 pitches would be better located at the site in Cobden. This would bring the site to 15 pitches, still within the recommended size. The site in Cobden seems far more suited due to its direct access onto London Road, as well as its less prominent position.

Finally, I feel the comment in 6.7 truly reflects the insensitivity of EDDC and their lack of empathy with the residents whose properties look over the South West corner of T. It is stated that “speedy gypsy and traveller site delivery... is important in terms of giving clarity to future potential investors in housing”. Current residents thought they had ‘clarity’ in purchasing a property overlooking a section of protected green wedge granted by the same planning authority who are now wishing to remove this status. I must admit this statement makes me feel incredibly angry and let down by EDDC!

I appreciate you taking the time to read my letter.

Yours sincerely,

Ed Smiddy

Cranbrook Resident