

Description of the Proposal: Planning Application for part of the Shepley Green Mill site George Street, Glossop.

Submitted by Stephen M Rimmer of 33 George Street, Glossop.

Description of the Proposal.

1. Engineering works to derelict land (category Z).
2. Specified tree works (including create a mixed species copse and 'eco-niche' in the 'V' adjacent to the Central Methodist car park and planting mixed species hedges).
3. Boundary Treatment (including rebuild grit stone wall along George Street to match existing and fence a section adjacent to the Old Glove Works car park).

Reasoning.

1. The site is the former location of Shepley Green Mill yard and mill pond. Its location can be seen in Site Detail/ Photographs. The spoil heap (14, 17) was created when the remains of the mill were pushed into the pond when the mill was demolished for salvage in 1962. The owners then abandoned the site. In articles published in the Glossop Chronicle (20th Jan 2011 and 27th Jan 2011) the then Mayor, Councillor Graham Oakley suggested the land was 'abandoned.....scrubland' and could be converted to a car park. This was a use supported by Councillor George Wharmby, the then leader of DCC, in a radio interview 3rd October, 2011.

The site cannot be regenerated without this. Regeneration of this site was part of the Glossop Vision Strategy of 2004, and the regeneration of the George Street thoroughway is current strategy as set out in the 'Glossop Design & Place Making Strategy Supplementary Planning Document to the High Peak Local Plan December 2011'. The document states that High Peak Borough Council is committed to deliver a sustainable future for Glossop town centre and it sets out a vision for the town centre that whilst recognising its heritage, looks forward to ensure its long term and viable future. It also states that the quality of the public realm in the town centre (streets, squares and parks) generally does not reflect the quality of the architectural heritage of the town. My proposed development needs to take place over time to ensure continuity of habitat, but it will improve the street scene and access to the town centre from Harehills. The HPBC recommended ecologist, Dr Elizabeth Barrett surveyed the site and concluded it had no special ecological value but this could be greatly enhanced by sympathetic development. This is my intention.

My preferred use of a disabled friendly campsite for motorhomes sits well with HPBCs employment and tourism objectives, but even were the site to be used for housing this is far preferable to developments on green field sites with the destruction of mature woodland as suggested in the Local Development Plan.

Derelict land is classified as 'land so damaged by previous industrial or other development that it is incapable of beneficial use without treatment. Treatment includes any of the following: demolition, clearing of fixed structures or foundations and levelling'. This land needs to be cleared and levelled or it will remain the dangerous eyesore it is for many years. Whatever the final use, it needs to be remembered that approximately 70% of all new developments utilises previously developed land.

In many articles in the Glossop Chronicle I have made no secret of the fact that my preferred scheme for the overall regeneration of the land would be a super-green, campsite for motorhomes with a holiday let aimed at the less able tourist. I am happy to work with HPBC and the Holland family (the Old Glove Works) on a development that could include a riverside terrace, a performance area and a shared use car park for the Old Glove Works and PCT.

Whatever the future use of this land, the spoil heap is not only unsightly, it is also dangerous. The majority of the site will remain at its current level as shown in photographs

2. If my proposed development were compared to the PCT (HPK/2008/0613) it is clear that a precedent has been set. All the trees were cleared from that site to facilitate building. I do not propose the complete removal of all trees.

As far as the trees go, had this not been a Conservation Area I could have cleared all the trees without reference to HPBC. There may be a TPO, but there is not a single specimen of equal value to the ones removed for the construction of the PCT.

I can appreciate that even though the trees are 'category C' that they may have some visual amenity in that they provide screening. I would propose to leave tree 28 and landscape around it. Coupled with the other large ash tree on George Street, tree 3 and the trees in the Old Glove Works car park there should be adequate screening.

Photograph 23 shows the view from George Street looking at the Central Methodist Church. Since this was taken the bush has been removed. I would suggest that my proposed 'eco-niche' would greatly enhance the view by screening the 1960's 'pre-fab' from the road.

3. I do not believe planning permission is actually required for this as the walls will be less than 1.2metres in height and are only replacing or rebuilding collapsed walls. I would build using grit stone as per photographs. I would build with it in mind that a dry stone wall can be a habitat, shelter or nesting location. The wall in the Methodist car park would be an extension to, and match the current grit stone wall and would retain the levelled ground. This too would be built with it in mind that a stone wall can be a habitat, shelter or nesting location.

Originally I intended to install a wooden fence for security, but my current fencing has been the focus of repeated criminal damage so I have opted for a more robust option which I feel is suitable because it is not adjacent to a highway and there will be a hedge planted to grow through it.

I will plant a minimum of 60 metres of mixed native species hedging as detailed on the maps. This will provide screening, improve the street scene and provide habitat.

Reading the 'Glossop Design & Place Making Strategy Supplementary Planning Document to the High Peak Local Plan December 2011' I believe my ideas match perfectly.

Background Information.

The site is part of the former Shepley Green Mill complex. It is identified in attached photographs. The 1967 photograph of the Central Methodist Church is not good perspective for the boundaries, but gives a clear picture of the brown field nature of the area.

In June 2011, with support from local Labour councillors, a group calling itself 'Friends of George Street Wood' was established. A prominent supporter of this group is Councillor Godfrey Claff; I am surprised that an Executive Member of HPBC who, as well as having responsibility for the Local Plan, has a portfolio which includes:

- Regeneration Strategy
- Economic Development
- Tourism
- Town centre regeneration
- Local Development Framework
- Planning Policy
- Conservation
- Design
- Development Control
- Building Control
- Planning Enforcement
- Peak Park matters
- Car Parking

feels that there is no conflict of interest in his open support and membership of FOGSW. He has, in his own words, 'encouraged in order to protect George Street Wood from threatened development'.

FOGSW have repeatedly said their aim is to prevent development of this site and as such have filed a village green application, VG126. To date this document has not been made public or received an initial review by DCC. The solicitor dealing with it says it could take ten years to reach a decision. I have had it reviewed by an independent expert who felt the evidence was sufficient to dismiss it as it stood. In an email from another local councillor it is clear that HPBC expect VG126 to be dismissed as he says ["I certainly agree with you that brown field sites should be developed before we build on green field sites and I'm not too confident the village green application will be successful"](#), which is why I believe a group of labour councillors are now trying to have this derelict land declared 'urban green space'. I expect strong opposition from these activists to my proposal, not because they have legitimate ecological reasons, merely because the 'Newspaper Articles' make their position clear.

Arboricultural analysis supports the fact that there is not a tree older than 35 years on the site and no trees in category A or B.

Much of the rest of the Shepley Green Mill site has already been built on or has planning permission to do so – the ambulance station, Central Methodist Church, 33 George Street and the proposed Lomas development of 37 flats.

Flood Risk Assessment.

The entirety of the proposed development site is above the 100 years + 20% level of the adjacent developments (144.1m AOD) on George Street. It has been agreed this is not needed.

Site Access.

This is from the un-adopted section of George Street. There is currently a drop kerb and gate giving access. This will be tidied up but the access point will not be changed at this point.

The access point will be used for 'plant access' during works but I do not anticipate any increase on current motor vehicle access which is minimal.

Photographs – Tree Identification

I am submitting this application electronically which allows the photographs to be viewed on the 'zoom' facility.

The tree identification numbers are highlighted on individual photographs and equate to those used on the Arboricultural Appraisal. Photographs are numbered 1 to 66 for reference.

Photographs – Site Detail

Photographs 1 to 7 show the site over the last 100 years.

Photograph 8 shows Mr Hancock's (The Stove Shop) car park which was constructed in July, 2009. It clearly indicates the area is being used as an impromptu tip.

Photograph 9 and 10 show the 'village green' application as a sham. The area is clearly used for fly tipping. Photographs 11, 12 and 13 show the same area before HPBC ordered me to stop work and imposed a TPO. Photographs 14, 16, 17 and 18 show the spoil heap I wish to level and the foreground would be the level I would work to.

Photograph 20 and 21 show the wall as it is and 22 is an indication of how it will look when rebuilt.

Photograph 23 shows the position of my proposed wall and the location for the copse.

Photograph 25 indicates the type of palisade fencing.

Site Detail

This folder contains maps originally supplied to me electronically by Planning and Arboriculture Officers. I have added my boundaries and the position of the proposed works.

The fence I propose will run along the northern boundary of The Old Glove Works car park, will be constructed as per photograph 25 and 26 and will be 1.8m high.

Hedges will be planted adjacent to the new fence and rebuilt wall.

The arboriculture statement gives a breakdown of my proposed tree works. No tree is in a higher category than C and all are on the periphery of what some now refer to as 'George Street Wood'.

It should be noted six of the trees are less than 75mm at 1.5m and no action is sought for two of them.

The Glossop Vision zoom map has been taken from the strategy report and shows the regeneration area hatched in brown.

Design Strategy

This folder contains policy documents relevant to the application.

Newspaper Articles and Associated Material

This folder Contains related newspaper articles that demonstrate I have made my intentions public. This document makes clear that I have put my plans into the public domain.

The Labour Rose leaflet, in my opinion, is evidence of a conflict of interest for the Executive Member, Godfrey Claff as is his admission of membership of FOGSW in 2013 article 30.

Ownership Certificate D

I would have preferred to submit Certificate A as I have acquired this land by Adverse Possession and regardless of what some think, their protests or subsequent attempts to claim the land for themselves are futile. I have dealt with HPBC since 2001 regarding land in my ownership acquired in the same way, as has Mr Hancock of FOGSW. I have always completed Certificate A (acting as an owner would).

The land has been subject to much front page publicity since January 2011. HPBC has repeatedly tried to find the owners and have failed to do so (and they acknowledge that I have made my intentions public). I have correspondence dating back to the early 90's between myself and HPBC, unable to locate the owner then.

I have correspondence between myself and several local solicitors dating back ten years and more. George Wharmby, the then head of DCC, has announced on radio that he had asked HPBC Officers to look into ownership and that they have been unsuccessful. FOGSW have tried to establish ownership, again unsuccessfully.

The company that owned the site in the 1960's has long since ceased trading; they did not sell the land so there is no record at the Land Registry. In legal terms the land has been abandoned, meaning the owner did not wish to be found.

Summary

I am aware there has been a very vocal campaign mounted against me and my plans, but the argument put forward by these people would be easily dismissed if DCC would perform an initial review of VG126. The photograph of the Central Methodist Church in 1967) gives the lie to what is often said, 'George Street Wood has been used by residents for over 70 years'. Forty three years ago there was not a tree on the site. FOGSW are a pressure group aiming to stop regeneration of a rundown piece of private land while at the same time 'claiming' it for themselves.

Regardless of what happens to the main body of the land this is a proposal that will not only dramatically improve the street scene along George Street, but also improve and guarantee continuity of habitat. I hope my ideas will eventually bring tourism and employment to Glossop, but prior to that this application will benefit many by enhancing this part of the town.

Stephen M Rimmer