

Statement read out by Martin Slater at the Stansfield Annual Parish Meeting on 24th May 2021. **This statement is neither made by nor endorsed by Stansfield Parish Council**

Having reviewed the proposed “Master Plan” put forward by H.E. Dennis & Son and which included the Heritage Impact Assessment by John Selby both dated December 2020, I have the following comments:

1. There seems to be a heavy linkage between the so-called “decline” of the village and the lack of new housing and that this decline could be corrected by initiating a housing plan involving nine or more new housing for unknown speculative purchasers. There has been no effort to define what decline implies in this document. Does it mean a decrease in the number of houses within the village or the increase in the number of sub-standard houses? Or does it mean that the wealth of the population has declined – a simple proxy for wealth might be taken as the number of cars in the village which I am sure that everyone can agree on that this has increased inexorably over the years. Perhaps “decline” might assumed to be linked to the decline in parochial employment opportunities which has certainly occurred almost entirely because farming (the dominant sector employer up until about the 1950s) has so much more efficient in labour productivity. So it would be helpful if the proposed Master Plan would offer its definition of “decline” in the community, so that parishioners might better understand the grounds put forward for the supposed needed housing in the proposed “Master Plan”.
2. It has been well proven in the past 50 years or so that there is no link whatsoever between an increase in available housing and the maintenance of amenities commonly thought to represent a suitably structured community. A case in point is Clare, which despite a very considerable increase in the number of houses since WW2 yet many amenities have continued to decline, such as groceries, hardware and clothing shops and hotels. The decline in these amenities is a nation-wide phenomenon occurring because of changes in economic development and nothing to do with a lack of housing or other related housing issues.
3. The Heritage Impact Assessment statement does not support the SHEELA sites WS 166 and WS 164 for various reasons, but the same report is silent about SHEELA WS 162 and WS 163 sites. What are the Consultant’s comments on these two sites?
4. In my opinion the WS 166, WS 164 as well as WS 162 and WS 163 SHEELA sites should be erased from consideration for the duration of the current county housing planning exercise, which I believe is for at least two decades into the future.