

Burnett, James

From: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

-----Original Message-----

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk [mailto:planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk]
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2017 5:00 PM
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HPK/2017/0171
Site Address: Land at Dinting Road Glossop Derbyshire
Comments by: Dan & Jennie Hart
From:

Ferncliffe
Lower Dinting
Dinting
Glossop
Derbyshire
SK13 7DU

Submission: Objection

Comments: We wish to object to planning application HPK/2016/0171. I have also submitted these comments by email, copying Councillor Wharmby, as I have discussed my objections with her this morning, and she suggested that I copy her into my comments.

1. General Comments

This proposal is entirely different to the layout which was previously proposed and in relation to which outline planning permission was obtained. There is much less open space, the housing is denser and the proposed layout is now such that the residents of Lower Dinting are significantly disadvantaged. The previous layout had two properties on the boundary with Ferncliffe and Fingle Cottage. We now have nine, most of which are now incredibly close to the boundary! This is a significant change and should cause the entire application to be looked at again.

Where is into taken into consideration that this is not one development in isolation? There are ongoing plans for dozens of houses in the Dinting / North Road / The Shaw area, which will cumulatively add huge pressure to the Dinting Road area. Further, as a resident of Lower Dinting, it is proposed that our property is 'sandwiched' between this development and another application immediately on the other side of our house (ref: HPK/2016/0224). The design of that application has also recently changed, so that instead of the originally proposed 3 houses backing onto Lower Dinting, they are now proposing to have 5. This cumulative effect significantly impacts on our residential amenity.

2. Documentation provided

We make a number of comments on the documents provided as follows:

(a) Revised Design & Access Statement

We dispute several comments made in this document:

¿ Care has been taken not to overwhelm the character of Birchside Avenue by the massing or nature of the proposals which also seek to compliment (sic) existing properties¿:

- The revised proposal now very much does overwhelm the character of Lower Dinting ¿ we are now faced with 9 properties right on the Ferncliffe/Fingle Cottage boundary (plus 5 on the other side of our property). Why do the revised proposals look to address Birchside residents¿ concerns but at the expense of Lower Dinting, which is now significantly disadvantaged?

- The drawings of the proposed housing look cheap and ugly and not at all in character with Lower Dinting

¿ A pre-application consultation event was¿ well attended¿.¿:

- This is a misrepresentation of the facts. We received a letter some weeks prior to this meeting to say that builders had been appointed and they wished to proceed on the basis of the original plans. We then heard nothing further.

- The event at St Luke¿s was not well publicised. We understand that some residents received notice of the event, but those on Lower Dinting (who are more affected than anybody else) were not made aware. When we did hear about it, on the day of the event, we rescheduled plans in order to attend, but arrived to find the event finished earlier than the stated finish time.

- When the developers eventually responded to our requests to engage with us regarding our questions, they made no mention of the fact that the proposals had changed entirely and therefore provided totally misleading answers.

- Since nobody from Lower Dinting was invited to this event, the summary of the feedback in this document does not present a true picture of local residents¿ concerns. Conducting this whole application process in this way only increases residents¿ anger at these proposals.

¿ The proposed residential development¿ would make a positive contribution to the community; would enhance the immediate environment¿¿

- Disagree. How does having so many properties backing on to Lower Dinting (especially when coupled with those being built to the other side of Lower Dinting (application reference HPK/2016/0224)) ¿ enhance the immediate environment¿? It causes significant detriment to the residents of Lower Dinting in terms of privacy, noise and loss of amenity. The collection of affordable homes, if needed, could be bunched together elsewhere in the site (e.g. the northern or southern boundary) where they do not impact existing residents to the same extent.

(b) Planning Statement

¿ Paragraph 6.4.2: ¿The site is adjoined by residential properties on Birchside Avenue (sic) and Lower Dinting (Ferncliffe and Fingle Cottage). The layout has been carefully designed, having regard to orientation and siting, to ensure that there would be loss of residential amenity to those existing residential occupiers that adjoin the site.¿ Whilst we assume that there is a missing ¿no¿ in this paragraph, the wording as provided is absolutely correct ¿ there is a loss of residential amenity, in breach of Policy EQ6 of the Local Plan. There are now nine properties backed onto Lower Dinting, including eight which are right up to the border and will create additional noise, lack of privacy

and loss of amenity. The previous proposal was unpopular (over 200 objections), but this is significantly worse. Further, it is likely that the new houses will be able to see into the existing Ferncliffe and Fingle Cottage properties and gardens, given that they are two-storey buildings, and the existing homes will be faced with views of the new houses. At least the previous drawings had some gaps between buildings, so that the current views were not lost entirely, and the houses were side-on to Lower Dinting, so being overlooked was less of an issue.

Paragraph 6.8.1: this application also proposes to provide an area of Public Open Space, to be centrally located within the body of the site. The proposals therefore accord with the requirements of Policy CF4 of the Local Plan. True, but the open space is now much smaller than previously indicated. Once again, the initial drawing has been replaced with something which is worse.

(c) Design review panel

We agree with the panel. Whilst we were not happy with the previous proposal, that layout was significantly better than this one.

3. Precedent

An application for planning permission immediately adjoining the western boundary of the proposed site has previously been rejected (reference HPK/2010/0643). There were several reasons given for rejecting this application, including that the development, would have a detrimental affect on the residential amenity of adjacent dwellings by virtue of loss of privacy, overlooking, noise and other disturbances contrary to the provisions of policies H11 and GD5 of the High Peak Saved Local Plan 2008. This is exactly the same issue here (but with significantly more properties involved and so a much bigger problem), so the proposed development should not be allowed.

4. Conclusions

For the reasons stated above, we strongly object to both the application itself and the way in which it has been handled. The developers have obtained outline planning permission for an entirely different scheme to the one now proposed. It should be rejected on this basis.