

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF RIPLEY TOWN COUNCIL**  
**Held September 5th 2011**

**Present:** Councillor S Daley, (in the Chair)

Councillors: R Ashton, A Bridge, Ms L D Cox, C Cutting, S D Freeborn, M B Gent, M J Godfrey, Mrs J H Gregory, T Holmes, M G Jones, Mrs A S Ward, D Ward, D A Williams, M Wilson.

In attendance: 39 member of the public, Police, press and the Clerk

**PART I – NON CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS**

**AGENDA**

Members signed the attendance sheet for the meeting and completed the declarations of interest sheet (if appropriate).

**PART I – NON CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS**

**5194. To receive apologies for absence** Cllrs K Buzzard, D Bowley, S Joynes, M Missett, RAP Phillips-Forsyth, Mrs C Worth

**5195. Variation of Order of Business**

**RESOLVED** to suspend standing orders for 30 minutes to allow members of the public to speak and bring forward item 7 Planning Matters to be discussed by the Council after returning back into standing orders.

**5196. Declaration of Members Interests** None

**5197. Public Speaking – (30 Minutes)**

**“Codgroves Application”**

Mr Stamp spoke of serious objections to the “Codgroves” application AVA/2011/0528 which are: intolerable traffic congestion and the traffic assessment information does not stack up and asks Cllrs to read PG13 of the Local Plan. Lives will be put at risk through increased response time of emergency vehicles attending Waingroves and other immediate communities. Quality of life for people in the immediate vicinity will be significantly reduced through experiencing road safety hazards, long journey times, increased traffic noise and fumes and public transport, commercial and agricultural vehicles will have increased difficulty travelling through Waingroves, Peasehill and Steam Mill Lane. There is a school within 30 metres of this development and parents and children will be crossing the road and walking on the footpath. The application is contrary to the comments made in January 2006 at a full council meeting of Amber Valley Borough Council following an attempt to have this land included as green belt which did not get approved but following the debate Cllrs A Cox and S Hayes said “I can promise today that no houses will be built on that land, We will continue to fight to save it” Concerns are also that there is insufficient capacity at local schools to support the development. The Ripley Gateway proposal has an implication for a further 100 dwellings (another 635 traffic movements) together with a supermarket (100’s more traffic movements) totalling over 1200 additional traffic movements. Church Street Waingroves becomes a “rat run” and Peasehill, Nottingham Road and Steam Mill Lane will be grid locked and this is not acceptable. Finally he urged Ripley Town Council to fully support the residents of Waingroves, Steam Mill Lane, Nottingham Road and the Western edge of Codnor by not supporting this application.

Mr Muggeridge spoke as a resident of Waingroves and echoed the sentiments of Mr Stamp and many residents. Mr Muggeridge takes his child to school and is aware of the problems now and will become much worse. Why free up more land when there are major building sites not being built on? Marehay Garage 200 – 300 houses not being built as not selling so why need more land when the ones already approved are not fulfilled? Does any Cllr know how long these developments can sit and stand not used can any Cllr put a date to this?

Cllr Mrs L D Cox stated that the comments she would have made are as Mr Stamp has stated and noted his objections and would not want to support this application. There is a known flood risk and though there are proposed pond levels this is a concern. The additional traffic and safety is also a major problem.

Cllr R P Ashton spoke of the application would have been discussed but is now to be discussed at the September 19<sup>th</sup> 2011 planning meeting and all are welcome to attend.

Back into Standing Orders:

**RESOLVED** Object to the application as the comments made.

Suspend Standing Orders:

Nottingham Road proposed development

Cllr S Freeborn ask the Conservative members if they were in favour of the applications and Cllr R P Ashton stated that he could not comment as he is a member of Amber Valley Borough Council Planning Board.

Member of the public stated that if a supermarket comes down Nottingham Road there will be no-one coming into Ripley.

Member of the public stated that regeneration needs to have a healthy environment and if not sure take a look at Heanor.

Member of the public stated that the Government are pushing to build gateways, residents need space here and many use this land every day. Pushing a shop local plan and then proposing to allow a super store next to another makes no sense.

Member of the public stated that if they want to regenerate Ripley they should stop parking charges as supermarkets are free parking.

Cllr S Freeborn spoke of other land with planning approval already not developed, and why is more land needed. When a small amount of work is done at the developments then the approval stays live. The Nottingham Road / Pit Top development the first thing any Council should be rooted in procedure and currently there is a Local Plan which is made every ten years and the Local Plan policy ER3 is breached as commercial use, LC3 breached twice tearing up planning law of open spaces and leisure. Another breach is of TP13 transport etc, and as there is a TP13 set up already this shows that Nottingham Road is very stressed now and needs a by pass and not more traffic.

TC5 Planning Permission (for out of town shopping) asks: 1) prove a need 2) determine there is no harm to existing town centres 3) can be accessed by public transport. Yes the site can be accessed but who thinks we need another supermarket?. AVBC have spent good money on a Ripley Master Plan, but it's being ignored as well. The Gateway along Nottingham Road - with the cricket and football now - is attractive to see.

Member of the public asked "How can Amber Valley Borough Council make decisions on land they are selling for £5 million as they have an interest?"

Cllr S Freeborn spoke of CISWO own three acres of the eleven acre site and the Charity Trust has appointed local trustees, nominated by the Conservative led borough council - and no-one else can select them. There has been a meeting, the first in nine years, and now lawyers etc are involved. The site is well used every day and CISWO documents say that the land can only be sold if not required.

Cllr T Holmes stated that he would like to back up Cllr S Freeborn's comments, Ripley is almost a bustling Town and another supermarket would be the death of the Town.

Cllr M B Gent Some trades are struggling to make a living now and another supermarket would destroy the Town. Amber Valley Borough Council enhanced the recreation area and people felt this made the recreational area safe and with the tremendous Cricket Ground. With the new development the new Cricket Ground would need to settle for three years as would the football ground.. I care about people and as more and more houses are built then there will be more anti-social behaviour and I don't think this land should be used for building purposes, all this is about is building a supermarket and houses.

Cllr D Williams echoed that regarding the store proposal anyone with any common sense would know that without market research and sales forecasts we have to assume there is no need for a supermarket.

Cllr J Gregory stated that it has not been made easy to put in any objections to the planners as anyone without email find it hard to object and it appears many emails have been lost.

Member of the public spoke of if people object and the plan is refused the appeal could cost the Council a lot of money, and the by-pass has been ongoing for years.

Cllr R P Ashton stated that regeneration will not begin until a developer comes, and four years ago there were many retail shops wanting to come into the Town but the shops are not large enough. Regarding Nottingham Road has anyone seen the plans as there are various play areas. Regarding the properties proposed there is planning permission already granted and they could build now but Amber Valley Borough Council asked if they would hold back until there is something in place for a by-pass. The by-pass has been on the cards for over forty years but no consultation by the Council, certain legislation has to be abided by but there is permission in place.

Cllr A Bridge spoke of several youngsters here today who enjoy the recreation area and we don't want them hidden away.

Cllr M G Jones regarding the Gateway to Ripley, what better than the Cricket, Football and walking the dogs; Amber Valley Borough Council are custodians and the Gateway should be kept. There should be no development as a loss of green space where everyone lives is important space.

Member of the public stated that in the Amber Valley Borough Council statement they do not have to replace the recreation ground and if they run out of money the developer does not replace it there will be nothing left.

Back into Standing Orders:

**RESOLVED** Object to the application as the comments made

**5198. To determine which items if any from Part 1 of the Agenda should be taken with the public excluded.** None

**5199. Ripley Town Hall** the petition regarding the Town Council taking over the Town Hall with 1567 has been handed in to Mr Grady at Amber Valley Borough Council and receipt acknowledged.

**5160. Planning Matters - "Codgroves" development and Nottingham Road / Pit Top development** as in the public speaking

**5161. Christmas Lights**

**RESOLVED** to add coloured lights to the white lights, have a real Christmas tree on the Market Place and repair the electric feed, have new lights on the tree at the church, all at an additional cost of £4000.00.

**5162. Revised budget 2011/2012**

**RESOLVED** to accept the proposed budget changes

**5163. Date for next Meeting: Monthly Town Council Meeting September 20<sup>th</sup> 2011 at 7.00pm**  
**Prior to the meeting at 6.45pm Garden and Allotment winners' presentations**