

Cranbrook Plan

I have three objections to new material presented by EDDC in the Supplementary evidence paper (PSD 27) dated July 2020.

1. The argument relating to speedy implementation (Section 6.7). “Speedy gypsy and traveller site delivery ...is important in terms of giving clarity to future potential investors in housing over where new site provision is to be located. Early delivery of gypsy and traveller sites will ensure that anyone investing in, building, buying or renting a home at Cranbrook will do so in the knowledge of the existence of gypsy and traveller sites.”
 - a. Why is this deemed important? Clearly, existing home owners in Cranbrook phase 1 (overlooking the proposed Treasbeare site) did not have this opportunity.
 - b. Do EDDC feel that the location of such sites is likely to put off potential home buyers and therefore have a negative impact on some Cranbrook property values?
2. Their reasons for the 100% oversize land allocations for animal grazing and landscaping are not justifiable.
 - a. Covenants restrict residents of Cranbrook from keeping farm animals (poultry, pigs, etc) on land associated with their properties (or on rented allotments). Why is an exception being made for Gypsies? This is discrimination against non-Gypsies living in Cranbrook.
 - b. If the Cobdens site makes allowance for grazing animals (see Key Considerations ‘e’), then it is likely that Gypsies on the nearby Treasbeare site may also want to graze animals. However, as no allocation is being made for this purpose, then I suggest that undue temptation will be placed on them to use the adjacent country park land.
 - c. The excessive landscaping at the Treasbeare site (accounting for half the land allocation) will cause significant damage to the unspoilt environment of the nature reserve and wildlife habitat of the adjacent country park. Unless very effective drainage is installed, there is also a real risk of pollutant run off into the stream running just below this site.
3. Statement of common ground between EDDC and EDNCp (see Section 3.7 and Appendix 1) is now void as it was not acted upon in the timescale specified.
 - a. Sites were not made available within 5 years of 17 June 2015. The outlook for Cranbrook has changed significantly since that statement was drawn up. There is, for example, no sign of the promised town centre.
 - b. A new statement of common ground should be generated that now includes all stakeholders: EDDC, EDNCp, the Community of Cranbrook, and Gypsy representatives). I refer you to my bullet point 1 above, as further justification for this.

Peter Healey.