

Name of Petition: **Proposed redevelopment of Pit Top, Ripley**

Additional Information:

Petition To Amber Valley Borough Council from Residents of Greenhill Avenue, Ripley

Clowes Westerman's proposals to Amber Valley Borough Council in their 'gateway' scheme are that they wish to apply for planning permission, for amongst other things, to redevelop Pit Top.

Access to the football pitches, club house, covered spectators area and 150+ space car park would be through Greenhill Avenue. The land at Pit Top is NOT a suitable area for the creation of a football ground with car parking for 150 cars. It is a public open space which is extremely well used by the community.

We, the undersigned residents, do not want the extra traffic, noise and disruption that will arise if this scheme is given the go-ahead by Amber Valley Council. We wish to maintain both Pit Top and Greenhill Avenue as they presently are.

Name of Petition Organiser:

D Williams

Number of Signatures:

33

Outcome:

The petition was submitted to Full Council on 28 September 2011.

It was resolved as follows:

“That consideration of the petitions be deferred until the next Full Council meeting so that they can be considered alongside the officers’ reports that are expected for that meeting.”

At the meeting of Full Council held on 2 November 2011, it was:

RESOLVED

That the Leader’s response is considered and noted (as follows):-

“We have listened to the representations, considered the petitions, and personally spoken to residents at the public consultation events. We have also talked to those with direct interests in the sports use including Ripley Town Football Club, Butterley United Cricket Club and Ripley Rhinos Rugby Club.

We want to help those clubs find more permanent homes that will allow them to grow as sport leaders in the community. We believe that this development will assist this process. However, we will only look to the Pit Top site if we cannot find suitable homes elsewhere for all these clubs.

We will exclude the Trust land, or what is described by some as the 'CISWO' land, (about three and a half acres) from this development, which means, for example, that the skateboarders can stay where they are, if that is what they want.

We will consult widely on enhancing this land to 'Green Flag' standard, and converting the land immediately to the south, mostly fronting Nottingham Road (about eight acres), into recreation use, in advance of the development.

We will so consult on the proposed new facilities and on the proposed name "Greenwich Park".

This means that there will be much better recreation provision than at present, irrespective of whether the development goes ahead.

The development still proposes to provide much needed housing, in place of the industrial planning permission, but the access would be from Nottingham Road.

Officers will be reporting to Council tonight on firm proposals to progress the construction of the first phase of the A610 link road to Alfreton Road in Codnor, (between 1500 to 1800 metres (or about a mile) depending on the final route) if this development goes ahead.

If this first phase progresses, it will release unkempt land at the front of the industrial estate that the County Council has retained for the previous line of the link road. This will allow the land to be put to better use, so improving the 'Gateway' to Ripley when approached from Codnor.

In respect of the proposed superstore we have restricted the footprint of the development, hence the exclusion of the Trust ('CISWO') land.

We have also obtained improvements to reduce the height, scale and setting of the proposed superstore, with the retention of the existing tree line at the northern end of the site, fronting

the highway. This will be supplemented by further planting.

We understand the concerns about the impact on the Town Centre, and we will be bringing forward tonight proposed improvements under the Ripley Master Plan.

However, given the improvements that could be delivered, not least the short and long term employment and economic benefits, we believe that we should not turn our back on the consideration of this development, which, if approved by Members tonight (under confidential agenda item no 19(b)), will be further tested by the planning process which will, of course, include further public consultations. “

Councillor L D Cox proposed the following amendment to the resolution which was seconded by Councillor C Emma-Williams:-

“If the development goes ahead, that any capital receipts received from the sale of the land are ringfenced to Ripley.”

Pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 16.4, upon the demand of one third of the members present, the voting on the amendment above was recorded as follows:-

The following 21 members voted AGAINST the amendment: Councillors J Anderson, P J Arnold, R P Ashton, S J Bradford, J W Brown MBE, C N Bull, A G Cox, J A Cox, G B Gee, J E A Gemmell, S B Joynes, P Makin, J Nelson, J Orton, M E Robertson, C J M Short, A G Stevenson, D H Taylor, T S Thorpe, M Tomlinson and A S Ward.

The following 15 members voted FOR the amendment: Councillors B R Aistrop, M Bennett MBE, L D Cox, C Emma-Williams, M B Gent, E Hamilton, P Jones, A Longdon, B J Lyttle, J McCabe, J R Moon, G H Parkes, C R D Roper, P J Smith and J A Walker.

Accordingly, the Mayor declared the amendment LOST.”