

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION  
COUNCIL HELD ON 04 April 2024**

**Item 8 – Proposal of a Notice of Motion (Rule of Procedure 16)**

**STATEMENT from Ms Debra Stone, Bakewell Local Resident**

“To whom it may concern

I would like to express my support for the provision of a banking hub in Bakewell now that we have very little banking provision.

I urge the council to work with other local partnerships to help make this excellent and progressive idea become a much-needed reality in Bakewell.

I would be interested to hear of any developments on this subject.

Yours sincerely  
Debra Stone, Bakewell resident”

**STATEMENT from Mr Peter Stone, Local Resident**

“Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to express my support for the creation of a Banking Hub for Bakewell. I would urge the Council to engage with this vital venture as a matter of urgency and to ensure that this becomes a reality as quickly as possible.

I would also be grateful if I could be kept informed of developments.

Kind regards  
Peter Stone”

**STATEMENT from Mr John Odmann, Eyam Local Resident**

“I very much welcome this initiative as I see a Banking Hub (or a bank) as an integral and necessary part of the local economy - both for private and business customers.

John Odmann  
Eyam”

**STATEMENT from Ms Sara Price, Tideswell Local Resident**

“Dear Committee,

I understand there is a desire for cross-party working to establish a banking hub in Bakewell to service our area.

As a business & personal banking customer of NatWest there is definitely a need for banking service in our area particularly given the closure of so many local post offices in the villages. I feel the criteria for banking facilities must be broadened as our local area serves an older population as well as the needs of tourists and day trippers who often use cash over card.

I would welcome any effort to get this established.

Kind regards,  
Sara Price”

**STATEMENT from Ms Georgina Blair, Little Longstone Local Resident**

“Hi,

I would like to support the proposal for a banking hub in Bakewell. I mainly bank online but am treasurer for an organisation that still receives cheques which I need to pay in somewhere. My elderly mother does not use online banking at all, and is being severely inconvenienced by the lack of a bank in Bakewell.

Given the poor state of our public transport, it is not acceptable to expect people to travel to Chesterfield or Buxton to do their banking.

Please do everything you can to get a banking hub for Bakewell, which will help residents and visitors alike.

Thank you,  
Georgina Blair”

**STATEMENT from Ms Julia Morgans, Great Longstone Local Resident**

“Hi there,

I fully support Councillor Bob Butcher's proposal to bring a banking hub to Bakewell. This seems the most sensible approach that offers us local facilities that isn't dependent on travelling to Chesterfield or Sheffield.

With best wishes  
Julia Morgans”

**STATEMENT from Ms Josephine Pinder, Local Resident**

“I am in full agreement that we need a banking hub in Bakewell. I fully support councillor Bob Butcher in his proposal. The closure of Nat West the last bank in Bakewell has left us up the creek without a paddle. It is disgraceful that this has been allowed to happen.”

## **STATEMENT from Ms Zoe Wareham, Local Resident**

“I'm emailing because I think Bakewell do need a bank hub. I am 54 and live in Baslow, work in two shops in Bakewell including the co-op, and my mum lives in Bakewell.

I have been away 26 Feb -22 March, but I noticed even before I was away that the removal of the two Natwest cash point machines started to have an effect, which predictably has become worse over easter bank holiday weekend. Even I have found myself short of cash, and I can drive to Baslow.

Bakewell has a high percentage of retired people in its residential population most of whom I expect would use a bank hub, my mother and me included.

We are lucky that Bakewell has a range of shops, keeping the high street and town centre thriving. We do need a bank.hub too.”

## **Item 11 – Delegation of decision making in respect of Gypsy and Travellers**

### **STATEMENT from Ms Mary Chaplin, Local Resident**

“Report on Gypsy and Travellers:

I understand that Cllr Sue Hobson emailed Derbyshire Dales District Council on Thursday 28 March asking when the report in relation to Gypsy & Travellers was being published, she then notified them that she wished to ask the Leader of DDDC, Councillor Steve Flitter direct questions in the meeting, but was told that she had missed the 12.00 noon deadline that day for submission of questions – 8 days before the meeting.

Please will you explain why you circulated the report at the start of the Easter break, so residents and businesses have no time to comment. You had plenty of time to be aware of the Easter weekend and should have given extra time. Maybe taking out the whole weekend of 4 days in your 'notice' period would seem to be reasonable. Circulating it four days previously say on 25 March would seem to me to be best practice. Please do not argue about statutory guidelines- you could always have sent any urgent papers on 28th March separately. It is imperative that this matter is dealt with by a full Council as the findings from it will impact on the lives of the residents in the areas concerned.”

### **STATEMENT from Sarah Porter, Baslow & Bubnell Parish Council Clerk**

“I am writing to express my concern over the preparation of the above report. This item was added to your website after the end of the working day on Thursday for consideration at Council on Thursday. This only allows 4 working days before the meeting for me to circulate this to my councillors for them to comment and return those comments to you.

This is an important issue which the District Council seems to be trying to make decisions in a closed way.

I understand our District Councillor has asked to speak to this item which was declined as after the noon deadline but at noon the report was not published.

It is a concern.”

**STATEMENT from Victoria Friend, Chair – Rowsley Parish Council**

“I am commenting on Agenda Item 11 - DELEGATION OF DECISION MAKING IN RESPECT OF GYPSY AND TRAVELLERS.

I am extremely concerned that this decision making is being delegated back to the Community and Environment Committee, when it was only moved to full council a couple of years ago. As the provision of both temporary and permanent Gypsy and Traveller sites did not make any progress under the Community and Environment Committee previously, I fail to see how moving the decision making back to this committee will lead to any progress in the future. Surely the reasons for giving the full council the responsibility for this issue in the first place still stand?

The council has been going round in circles over meeting their legal obligations to the Gypsy and Traveller community for many years and this is yet another sign that they do not know how to move forward. Surely, as a legal obligation the requirement to find the Gypsy and Traveller community somewhere to live is outside of party politics and therefore ALL decisions on this subject should be taken by the entire Council, not by any delegated sub-committee?”

**STATEMENT from Mr Will Watkin, TW Auto Engineers Ltd**

“We are the owners of TW Auto Engineers Ltd and have operated from premises in Station Yard, Rowsley since 2003.

We strongly object to the proposal to grant permission for a Traveller site on the car park at Old Station Close, Rowsley.

Our objection is based, not only on the anticipated impact on our business, our employees, our customers and the surrounding area, but also on real experience and proven outcomes following the previous occupation of this car park, by Travellers, for over a year.

The grounds for our objections are as follows;

**Security of Premises and Vehicles**

“Our premises are situated in a hollow between the A6 and the car park. The building and any vehicles parked on our premises cannot be easily seen from the road or the footpath alongside the car park.

In the event of permission being granted for the Traveller site we would need to invest in additional security for the premises in order to satisfy our customers that their vehicles are safe whilst in our care.

During the period that the Travellers were living on the car park we caught them trying car doors on a number of occasions and also found children in the back of an unlocked van.

The children of the Travellers would also use the steep ramp into the Station Close as a cycle racing track causing health and safety issues to themselves, our customers and our employees.

We would seek to recoup the cost of the additional security from the Council.

### **Anti-Social Behaviour**

The previous occupation of the site by Travellers confirmed and reinforced the anticipated anti-social behaviour and its impact on the local community, businesses and visitors to the area.

The Council had provided toilet facilities for the Travellers, but these were thrown down the bank. The Travellers proceeded to defecate and urinate on the footpaths surrounding the area. This was often done in full view of our customers, local residents and visitors including children who would then tread in the mess which, on occasions, had been covered with foliage.

The demeanour of the Travellers was often threatening. Shouting and excessive swearing was common. The Travellers also had a number of dogs which were constantly barking and intimidating passers-by.

The car park and surrounding area became an eyesore with rubbish everywhere which the council had to remove.

TC Harrison Ltd who own land in the area have security footage of some of the behaviour described.

If permission is granted for the Traveller site, then we are very concerned that we will be subject to the same anti-social behaviour that we experience previously and that had such an impact on ourselves, our business and the wider community.

### **Loss of Car Parking**

This is the only public car park in Little Rowsley. It is used by visitors to the area, our employees and our customers. We employ 6 members of staff who all need to use this car park. Our customers also park there prior to us being ready to start work on their vehicles.

The car park is fully utilised on most occasions. It is at the start of the footpath following the old Rowsley to Matlock railway line which is a popular tourist attraction in the area.

It is also the designated car park for the Level Centre in the Station Yard. I understand that this parking facility was a consideration in granting planning

permission for the Level Centre as they only have parking available on site for disabled drivers.

### **Loss of Business and Local Employment**

The previous occupation of the site by Travellers led to a downturn in our business and we had no option but to let one member of staff go. We also had to shelve plans to take on an apprentice. We were then hit by the impact of Covid and had to work very hard to build up the business again. This has now begun to pay off and we have been able to employ 2 more staff.

There is a shortage of qualified motor mechanics and we need to be recognised as a preferred place to work in order to attract and retain the best staff. Lack of parking and the impact of the anti-social behaviour demonstrated above would have a negative effect on this. We were considering employing a further mechanic and/or apprentice but this has had been put on hold until we know the outcome of this proposal.

We are very concerned that all our efforts will now be undermined if this proposal goes ahead as it will once again bring about in a loss of business as a result of;

- Customer confidence in security of their vehicles
- Customer reluctance to be in that area
- Loss of experience staff to other employers with resulting impact of loss of skill and cost of re-training
- Additional cost of security
- Lack of parking facilities

If permission is given for this Traveller site, then we would vigorously pursue a financial claim for any loss of business resulting from this decision.”

### **STATEMENT from Kerry Andrew, Executive & Artistic Director, Level Centre**

“I am writing to request greater transparency on Agenda item 11: CLARIFYING DECISION MAKING ARRANGEMENTS IN RESPECT OF GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS.

I would like to raise a concern with the proposal for decisions going forward to be made by a smaller committee and not the full body of Councillors in relation to agenda item 11. At LEVEL Centre we feel that these conversations should be discussed by the full council. In addition, it has not been easy to locate the documents related to this agenda item and this meeting or the report referred to in the recommendations that is happening on Thursday 4 April 2024.

The timeline in issuing this information related to this meeting has created this query on the process and transparency related to this agenda item.

Please can this email be circulated to all Councillors and Councillor Steve Flitter.”

### **STATEMENT from Councillor Alasdair Sutton, Bakewell Division**

“I write in regard to agenda item 11 and my concerns about decisions being by a subcommittee rather than by full council regarding the gypsy and travellers report. As we are all aware finding suitable temporary tolerated sites and a full-time site has been ongoing for many years. For these decisions to be taken away from full council would be irresponsible for both the gypsy and travellers and the District Council.

I would therefore ask you to rethink or remove item 11 at the present and do what is best for the gypsy and travellers and the residents of the Derbyshire Dales.”

**STATEMENT from Councillor Christopher Harrison, Ashford in the Water Parish Council**

“I am a Councillor for Ashford in the Water Parish Council and wish for the full council to make a decision on Item 11 - Gypsy and Traveller sites rather than a select few given this being such a delicate matter and affecting our wider community as a whole.”

**STATEMENT from Ines Hankinson, Environment, Health & Safety (Darley Dale Operations), Forged Solutions Group**

“Dear Sirs,

I am writing to you in relation to your recent report which will be covered in the meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup> April. I find the delayed authorisation (Monitoring Officer Helen Mitchell - authorised date 28/03/2024) somewhat staggering consider the Easter weekend in between as this is not giving sufficient notice.

With the impact of Gypsy & Travellers on local businesses and tourism as pointed out by other local businesses, I am struggling to understand why a proposal would be made for a relatively small committee (Council’s Community and Environment Committee) to be the principal decision maker in respect of temporary as well as prospective permanent stopping places within the District. I feel that this does not enable due democratic representation from all the stakeholders.

As previously pointed out pages 23-28 do not appear to be traceable to the reports attached? The report attached only has 5 pages. This was raised previously and to date NO response has been received.

I would like to express some concerns in relation to the recommendations outlined within the report:

Recommendation:	Note to the committee
1. That the report is agreed.	I sincerely hope that this will not be agreed as I fear this would not guarantee a fair and democratic representation of all stakeholders. In the background there are clear references made that decisions tend not be unanimous to date on this subject matter.

<p>2. That the Gypsy and Traveller Working Group provides reports on all its activities to a mutually agreeable timescale to the Community and Environment Committee.</p>	<p>Where else would this be published so that this is “easily” retrievable for other interested parties?</p> <p>Current publications on the subject have a record of being released last minute presumably to deter / put off potential objections. In the background provided there is reference to secrecy surrounding this which is not helpful when securing buy in should be a priority to ensure a positive long term resolution.</p>
<p>3. That decisions relating to temporary tolerated / negotiated stopping places in the District are taken by Community and Environment Committee.</p>	<p>This is a bit of a concern as decision should not be taken by the committee only but open to public consultation which will enable businesses as well as local residents to voice their concerns over such decisions or at least the full council should be voting.</p>
<p>4. That Council notes permanent sites will be sought for allocation within the Local Plan process overseen by the Local Plan Sub Committee and endorsed, ultimately, by Council.</p>	<p>As with the point above, sites can be sought however decision should be open to public consultation to ensure fair representation.</p>
<p>5. That decisions relating to permanent sites sourced outside of the Local Plan process are taken by the Community and Environment Committee.</p>	<p>As per point 3 and 4 above and even a bigger red flag to suggest that permanent sites can be sourced outside of the local plan.</p>
<p>6. That Council delegates authority to the Council’s Monitoring Officer to make such amendments to the Constitution.</p>	<p>The council should not delegate their authority.</p> <p>It would be good to understand if it is the council wishing to delegate their authority or if the sub committee is seeking it.</p> <p>I do not think this is in the interest of other local stakeholders.</p>

As previously outlined in the reports there was lack of support from the council to continue having officers under delegated authority to move travelling families around tolerated stopping places and also that there are yet to be any permanent provisions to be adopted into local plans.



I am concerned that potential endorsing of temporary / tolerated / negotiated stopping places temporary or permanent were identified outside of local planning processes and that such decisions would be made without public consultation.

The element of secrecy surrounding this subject matter sadly seems to continue especially given the poor notice and lack of transparency.

Whilst there is note that the council will retain its role in adopting the local plan and permanent sites, there is no mention of requiring approval for temporary arrangements especially around a subject matter causing such friction and concern for the general public.

This subject should not be included in the discussion tomorrow – Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> April due to breach of due diligence from Derbyshire Dale side.

As Derbyshire Dales has failed to release all information within the required timeline – I expect above concerns to be included tomorrow in the discussion tomorrow (4<sup>th</sup> April) should the subject being included despite this.

Please note that the this has been discussed with neighbouring businesses.

Kind Regards,

Ines Hankinson, Environment, Health & Safety (Darley Dale Operations), Forged Solutions Group”

**STATEMENT from Mark Sealey, Peak Rail PLC, General Manager**

“Dear Sirs

I have read through the email from Ines and fully agree with everything that has been said.

As a major player in the tourism sector in our area, Peak Rail want to make sure that our business views are represented and safe and secure. .

Kindest Regards

Mark

Mark Sealey, Peak Rail PLC, General Manager”