

Comments received (19/7/22 to 14/7/22)

As residents of Oker we do not want to move out of South Darley Parish Council.

We would prefer that the Parish boundaries are re-drawn so that Oker and Snitterton remain within South Darley parish, and the new housing developments in the former quarries are located in Matlock Town parish.

This is because Oker is a rural development with strong links to the church, school, village hall and pub in South Darley – all of which are within walking distance. We do not have the same links to Matlock which is an urban community and not within easy walking distance.

We do not wish to become part of Matlock Town Council, as we do not have any links to Matlock.

We are very happy with the present arrangement of three wards in South Darley Parish Council. This is because all areas are slightly different in make-up e.g. more houses and parking problems in Wensley, congestion with lorries over Darley Bridge in South Darley, and rural issues in Oker and Snitterton.

We believe that the current number of 8 parish councillors for South Darley is appropriate. This number allows for a Parish Councillor from each ward to be absent from the Parish Council meeting and still have that ward represented

We are very happy with the actions of the Parish Council.

The current arrangements are working fine and as most of South Darley is very rural it would seem nonsensical to align it with an urban conurbation

As there has to the best of my knowledge never been any issue with the number of councillors it seems strange to wish to change it .Clearly what works should be left alone.

The demonstrable logic for selecting the second option above [To move new housing development to Matlock] is:

1. The Parish of South Darley is a predominantly rural and ‘population-stable’ constituency consisting of the discreet communities of Darley Bridge, Oker, Snitterton and Wensley. The built environment of the constituent parts is substantially ‘traditional’ and it certainly contains relatively few examples of what might be termed ‘modern housing’. Its cultural homogeneity must be maintained and would very likely be fractured if any of the wards were to be geographically reassigned, to be combined with a modern development of more than 400 newly built dwellings.

2. The cultural, historical and geographical needs of Snitterton and Oker are far more closely aligned with those of Darley Bridge and Wensley than of the new housing development in the former quarries which lie closer to Matlock and are also accessed from Matlock.

3. The suburban nature of the new housing development is more likely to resemble and relate to that of Matlock Town.

4. The creation of the new community known as Matlock Spa, a community of more than 400 densely built and formally-sited suburban properties will assimilate far more harmoniously into the suburban Ward known as Matlock West whose parish councillor(s) would not need to be bound or concerned by the needs of perhaps conflicting demands of adjacent rural communities.

5. The incoming population of the new housing development are unlikely to want their needs to be expressed against a back-drop of historical constraints.

The current [warding] arrangements operate effectively and conveniently.

The reason I have responded **YES** [number of councillors] is because the present system works well and has done so in my experience as a resident for the twenty years we have lived here. The number of Councillors elected to South Darley Parish Council should therefore remain at it is.

I feel that Oker and Snitterton will be swallowed up into Matlock and will totally lose their identity. It is also removing a local hamlet from a rural environment into an urban environment.

The amount of officers seems to be quite adequate for our needs.

The new Cawdor quarry developments will look towards the urban settlement of Matlock and form part of that community.

Oker and Snitterton are small rural hamlets which lie mostly in the Peak District National Park (none of the Peak District in in Matlock Town parish) and have a longstanding and on-going relationship with the villages of Wensley (all of which is in the Peak District) and Darley Bridge i.e. the rural parish of South Darley.

The parish boundary should be redrawn to reflect the above.

The existing three-ward system works well.

2 [councillors] for Oker and Snitterton; 2 for Wensley and 4 for Darley Bridge seems about the right and proportionate number to me.

It is illogical for Oker and Snitterton to be taken out of South Darley parish as the children from these hamlets attend the South Darley School as their nearest school and St Mary's church is the local church for residents. Residents of Oker and Snitterton belong fully to the parish of South Darley and participate in all the parish activities. However residents of the new developments in the quarries are much nearer to the facilities of Matlock town and therefore should belong to that parish.

[warding] Why change an arrangement which works perfectly well for local residents, there would be no additional positive benefits.

Surely it would be fairer to have 2 councillors per ward with regard to representation for voting etc., i.e. 6 in total.

I agree that residents in new housing developments in the Oker and Snitterton Ward of the parish of South Darley will indeed consider themselves to live in Matlock but at the same time the residents of Oker and Snitterton clearly consider themselves to live in and identify with the rural parish of South Darley.

There are many substantive, cultural, logistic and democratic reasons why it does not make sense to locate the two small rural hamlets in with urban Matlock, against community wishes.

In addition, it should be noted that about half of the rural 'Oker and Snitterton' ward of South Darley Parish lies within the Peak District National Park and is thus subject to Peak Park planning rules. From a planning perspective, I believe that it would make sense to keep this together with the rest of South Darley Parish (around two-thirds of which lies in the Peak Park) rather than to move it to an essentially urban parish which has no Peak Park territory.

Given that the community governance review invites any representations on the 'alteration of existing Parish Boundaries', I believe that the Matlock and South Darley parish boundaries should be re-drawn so that Oker & Snitterton remain within South Darley parish but also that the new housing developments in the former quarries be located in Matlock parish.

Yes, the existing ward patterns works well and gives clearly identifiable local ward councillors for the three settlement areas.

It [the current warding arrangements] results in 2 councillors for each of the two smaller wards (Oker & Snitterton; Wensley) and 4 to cover Darley Bridge and Cross Green

I think the current South Darley Ward should remain the same but it would make sense that new builds in Matlock should come under any Matlock boundary.

I see no reason for any change to the current warding arrangements as they seem quite logical from a map perspective.

I see no reason for any change to the current system.

Seems the most logical in terms of connecting communities that identify with each other. In addition Oker and Snitterton are more rural in character relating more to the rural nature of Winster and south darley.

See comment on first page re new development at matlock spa which does feel more linked to matlock for those residents – although I think the views of those residents should be weighted as they are the ones affected.

Councillors are all volunteers and as long as they have the interests of the community at heart I don't mind how many there are.

Oker and Snitterton have always been part of the South Darley community, the children attend South Darley School and the church in South Darley. They are impacted and involved with local issues which wouldn't be of concern to residents in the Matlock area. It would be like putting a small community at the bottom of the list of priorities, whereas our small communities are currently united in supporting each other as a whole.

As previously outlined

There is only one parish councillor I know of, who is very active in emailing residents of ongoing situations and seems to get information to a decent area, and that is Colin Swindell. No idea who the other parish councillors are. So not sure why we have 4 in Darley Bridge? What do they do? Who are they?

Oker & Snitterton are rural and a collection of detached houses with some terraces. The new housing developments are being marketed as 'benefits of urban living with countryside views', and are multi tenanted units plus terraces. These are fundamentally different settings.

Not a strong view, but these are four rural communities with similar issues: access to shops/doctors, public transport?, isolation. Stronger together.

We need a team of councillors that can get things done. Eight seems a good number to represent four communities, allocate tasks/get things done and have a reasonable debate about priorities/options. I wouldn't have a problem if there were ten: more than ten would I think be overkill.

The Oker and Snitterton communities are focused on South Darley. All the social functions/activities that make up the community are in South Darley and not in Matlock. Although relatively near to Matlock this is essentially a rural community and to link it in with Matlock would I fear result in many of the issues here being 'swept under the proverbial carpet'. Thus, to split the existing community would disenfranchise and

alienate the community. The development in the quarries feels closer to Matlock and those people living there would benefit from being part of Matlock. However I am open to either of options two and three.

Yes [to existing warding] because these are all separate communities

I don't think there is a strong need for more councillors

The Oker and Snitterton settlements are long established integral parts of South Darley parish, sharing a common identity, culture, history and landscape setting with their companion rural communities of Wensley and Darley Bridge.

Any proposal that would hive off Oker and Snitterton and be enveloped within a ward of Matlock town, with its own distinct urban identity and interests, would have harmful cultural, logistical, democratic and administrative effects on these smaller rural communities, substantial portions of which lie within the Peak District National Park, as does the sister ward of Wensley.

For these reasons, I consider it important for the cohesive integrity of the existing and established components of South Darley to remain undisturbed and for Oker and Snitterton to be contained within the redrawn boundary described in the second option above, and with the whole of the residential development on the former Cawdor Quarry to be made part of new Matlock West urban ward.

The current warding arrangements operate effectively and conveniently, and should remain

It has been demonstrated that the current arrangements and number of councillors are appropriate

The parish of South Darley is primarily a rural area, the residents of which have largely rural interests. The proposed changes of the parish boundary would push Oker and Snitterton into Matlock which is an urban area. In addition our children go to school in the opposite direction to Matlock hence their friendships are formed in that area, not Matlock. The church, a centre of the community activity of a large number of the residents is in South Darley - another reason to remain as one parish

There are no reasons to alter a system which delivers for the needs of the community.

The division seems to represent the communities

I feel strongly that the parish boundary of the South Darley should be redrawn to exclude the entirety of the quarry and thus the new housing development would become part of Matlock. It is likely that the inhabitants of the new houses will be drawn to the facilities in Matlock town for education and their social lives whereas those of

us who live in Oker, Snitterton and South Darley gravitate to the South Darley area of our social events, education etc. It is much easier for us to walk to South Darley to use the parish hall and the church than Matlock. The residents of Oker, Snitterton and South Darley are much more of a rural based community with rural interests as opposed to Matlock which is an urban community.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my feelings and concerns.

The system works well as it is.

The present division works.

Oker and Snitterton are rural areas. The issues and concerns here will be the same as in the rest of South Darley Parish. It's residents will therefore be much better represented alongside those of the existing parish. The new developments in the quarries are urban in character and so its residents interests and concerns are likely to align with those of Matlock town.

If Oker and Snitterton were bought in to Matlock town parish their concerns are likely to be subsumed by those of the much large population of Matlock. This is not a criticism of councillors, simply a recognition that they will have to spend their time on the large majority of the people they represent.

I do not have a strong view on this. Ideally both Snitterton and Oker should be represented by their own councillor but this is of far less concern to me than the boundaries of the parish

I suppose if there is a over-riding financial issue then the numbers could be reduced but this number seems reasonable to ensure a range of views are brought to the Council and that appropriate debate and discussion occurs.

1. Historic Boundary

2 Physically split from the new development by open Country

3 Parish Facilities ie School, Vilage Hall, Reading Room, Church, Pub would be split off from the village based community

[Warding} No reason to change fine as it is

Gives full representation to the 3 wards

It would be inappropriate for Oker to be part of Matlock Town Parish due to the significant distance between the new housing development and Oker/Snitterton. Also, no properly reasoned argument has been forwarded to explain the benefits of any Boundary changes.

I am unaware of any arguments or reasons why a change in the existing warding arrangements would benefit me as a local resident.

Assuming that the ratio of Councillors per ward is based on number of households/properties then I see no reason to change.

The people of Oker and Snitterton feel an affinity with South Darley parish as it is set up at the present, as well as its long historical context. It goes without saying that the site of the new quarry development as a feeling of being geographically linked to Matlock.

The present {warding} system appears to work perfectly adequately

[size] Basically the same answer as above.

The new housing development in the quarries near Matlock should not be part of Snitterton.

Because we have our own Parish Church, School and Village Hall. We do not want to be part of Matlock.

They [Councillors] just need to be better organised and find out from the residents what we want.

Cawdor Housing Development is not Part of Snitterton

Because we have our own Parish Church and School.

{Councillors} need to be better organised.

I and my family have lived in Oker for 43 years. Our children went to South Darley School. We have attended local events at South Darley Village Hall, attended meetings in Wensley Reading Room, attended our local church, St Helens on numerous occasions and sporting events at Darley Bridge cricket ground. As a Parish councillor in the 1980s I was acutely aware of the notion of a linked, living community within our present borders – and equally aware that our Parish boundary helped to give the population, which was diverse in its livelihoods a sense of unity. This is also something which, if the history is examined, of Snitterton, Oker, South Darley and Wensley – goes back to their development along the old coaching route to Buxton out of Matlock, and the hillside of lead mining and medieval ridge and farrow cultivation provides a unity that stretches back a long time. The character of the area is something worth preserving as a whole and the unity of its governance is a critical aspect of it.

I very much doubt that the new residents of the new developments in the quarries will look towards Oker and Snitterton for their community life. Their proximity to Matlock Town clearly indicates that their perception of community will be one of an

outlier of the town and that decisions as to schools, and community life will be as part of Matlock rather than towards the 'distant' countryside.

The parish boundary for South Darley should remain as it is...

Matlock slowly but surely works its way along the A⁶ and will eventually envelop Darley Dale and its environs. I think it is important that a local identity and a local voice on important matters is retained for the future. The slow and relentless morphing into one metropolitan "blob" will benefit nobody.

The parish boundary for South Darley should remain as it is...

I can see no reason for change. The inclusion of further people/properties could be advantageous in financial/ facilities terms in so far as we could get much needed school extension, perhaps one shop, a doctors, bus services etc. Instead of always having to travel (and not have to beg of Matlock/Darley Dale for money) would have continuing benefit of Peak Park Board to help us.

Warding – Can see no reason to change other than to perhaps trim over-heavy Darley Bridge element

Council size – Need mixed representation in view of various different hamlets/elements involved perhaps redistribute a little as above.

Other issues – I am secretary of local "South Darley" Charity which helps needy people in the Parish could possibly help more people if more in the parish

Oaker and Snitterton should remain as they are. Their removal will affect our church, village hall, our school, the community and a trust that has been in existence since 1721

Warding – It seems to work well as it is

Size – I cannot see a reason for changing it
