

Kay, Hayley

From: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: FW: Comments on application HPK/2021/0081

From: Kate Raine
Sent: 06 April 2021 12:42
To: Planning Comments (HPBC) <PlanningCommentsHPBC@highpeak.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments on application HPK/2021/0081

Application Number: HPK/2021/0081

Site Location: Land Off Longclough Drive Longclough Drive Simmondley Glossop Derbyshire

Name: Kate Raine

Address: 10 Longclough Drive, Glossop, SK13 8HN

Submission: Objection

Comments:

We object to this planning application in the strongest possible terms on several different and extremely important points.

The value of this green space as a visual amenity to the community cannot be overstated. The green space and the structural trees provide a pleasing visual element that merges into the view of the hills beyond. The space acts as a buffer from the busy main road (Primrose Lane) and prevents Longclough Drive from appearing too heavily urbanised. It adds enormously to the unique character and appearance of Longclough Drive.

Policy CF4 of the local plan is intended to "seek to protect, maintain and where possible enhance existing open spaces, sport and recreational buildings and land including playing fields in order to ensure their continued contribution to the health and wellbeing of local communities".

We do not believe that the proposed development meets these requirements in any way.

This development will destroy any benefit the street currently enjoys from this green space.

The proposed area of publicly accessible open space on the site does not adequately enhance or compensate for the loss of the visual amenity the space currently provides.

ACCESSIBLE OPEN SPACE

The proposal (HPK/2021/0081 3424.01B - landscape proposals plan) is to build an unlit, unfenced footpath, immediately next to the water that provides unobserved access to the rear of the new houses and unnecessary access to the front of houses 2-12. The proposed footpath serves no useful purpose.

We note comments on the previous application HPK/2016/0416 from Derbyshire Constabulary expressing concerns about security and on the current application from HPBC Service Commissioning about antisocial behaviour, ongoing maintenance, and the fact the path serves no purpose.

It is inevitable in our opinion that such a badly planned path will attract antisocial behaviour and criminality whilst providing absolutely no benefit to the community. There have been previous incidents of antisocial behaviour and acquisitive crime on the street (Derbyshire Constabulary incident number 20*225477 refers amongst others) and these incidents appear to be on the rise in the area.

The proposed footpath at the rear of the new houses links up to the current footpath that only serves as access to houses 2-12. We object to this in the strongest possible manner. Our path was never intended to be a public

thoroughfare and was only ever meant as access for the occupiers. We are concerned about the impact of the general public being routed directly past the front of our houses for no good reason.

In the agreed planning obligation, the developers must provide publicly accessible space. This path is presumably the attempt to meet this obligation. Due to the topography of the land, we have concerns that if it was built, this path would not be particularly accessible, especially from the main frontage on Longclough Drive. The land drops off very steeply from the level of the road. No details have been provided of the construction and land modelling necessary to make this path accessible. (HPK/2021/0081 3424.01B - landscape proposals plan)

We are concerned that even more trees are going to be removed than in the original application, tree T5 in particular. This further reduces the pleasant visual amenity of the area in order to allow the building of a completely unnecessary footpath.

There do not appear to be any details or provision for the long term/ongoing management and maintenance of the open space. Is there any mechanism in the planning obligation for long term sustainable management of the site especially as there are invasive species such as Japanese Knotweed and Himalayan Balsam across the site?

The path and landscaping proposals appear to be a complete afterthought by the developers, using the leftover part of the site that is unsuitable for residential development to do the absolute bare minimum to provide a public accessible space under the agreed planning obligation. This very minimal attempt to provide accessible public space appears to be a mere tick box exercise tacked on to the design afterwards rather than part of a cohesive plan. The majority of the landscaping will not even be visible from the street frontage. It is behind the new houses and below street level. It will be of little to no use to the residents of the street.

APPEARANCE

From looking at the proposed site plan (HPK/2021/0081 – proposed site layout plan) the houses are going to be built on two small areas at opposite ends of the site. This creates two areas of dense development.

The developers claim in their planning statement that the street has “a wide range of house types and layouts”. This is simply not true. The majority of houses on Longclough Drive are built from identical brick in only two different layouts. We have no details of what material will be used or any images of what the final buildings will look like within the street. We are concerned they will stick out unpleasantly from the rest of the street.

We are particularly concerned about plots 1-4. These houses will destroy all benefits we currently gain from the green space as a visual amenity. We believe that this development will be visually intrusive and overbearing. For numbers 2-12 the current visual amenity will be lost and replaced with views of staggered three storey buildings and extensive retaining walls, in stark contrast to the existing street scene.

The removal and cutting back of trees (especially T3) and the construction of these houses brings the urban development right to our doorstep. Our front ground floor window provides a slightly elevated view over the green space and objects in that space appear to be extremely close to our front window. We are concerned that this trick of perspective will make any houses on the site appear to be immediately outside our front window.

CONDITIONS

We understand that the conditions 8 and 11 of the Appeal decision (APP/H1033/W/17/3177730) will be dealt with in a separate conditions discharge application but we wish to make comment on them here, as we believe there are several important points that need to be considered from the outset.

Condition 8 – Construction Management Plan

We are concerned that it will be next to impossible for the developers to meet this condition and that construction is likely to cause massive disruption to the residents of Longclough Drive.

Under this condition the developers are required to have areas for turning and parking facilities, loading, unloading and storage of plant and materials and wheel washing facilities. From looking at the plan of the site provided in the tree report (HPK/2021/0081 tree report, Appendix 3), we fail to see how all this can possibly be accommodated on the site.

The site is wooded and steeply sloping. There is absolutely no vehicle access on to the land at the moment. Until the site is sufficiently cleared to allow vehicle access, where are all the construction vehicles going to be parked? Large

vehicles completely block access in and out of the street to all residents, something we have ample evidence of every time the bins are collected.

Access to the site via Longclough Drive is likely to pose major problems. The road is a narrow cul-de-sac often heavily congested with parked vehicles. Anything larger than a light goods vehicle finds access exceptionally difficult. There is nowhere for them to turn and they are forced to reverse out of the street with great difficulty. There have been frequent instances of larger vehicles getting stuck on the street and the drivers having to ask residents to move their legally parked vehicles to assist them reversing back out of the street. There is also a height limitation due to overhanging telephone wires running across the street. The street cannot be closed under any circumstances as there is no other access for residents to get to their homes.

Telegraph Poles

We note from the proposed site layout (HPK/2021/0081 – proposed site layout plan) of plots 4 and 6 that the development is on top of the existing telegraph poles that service many of the houses on the street. Are these going to be moved? If not, the driveway of plot 4 becomes extremely difficult to park on and one of the spaces for plot 6 would be completely unusable. If these telegraph poles are to be moved, how would this be done? What disruption would this cause to the telephone and internet service for the street?

Condition 11

Policy S1 of the local plan states that sustainable drainage should be considered from the outset. We are concerned about what engineering works, especially in the TPO area, would be required to deal with the surface water drainage as proposed in the flood risk report (HPK/2021/0081 – flood risk assessment – Longclough Drive). The corner of Longclough Drive near to plots 5 and 6 has frequent flooding problems in wet weather despite the drains being regularly cleaned. The details of the surface water drainage for the site need to be considered at an early stage to avoid exacerbating the current problems.

SUMMARY

In summary, we object to this proposed development in the strongest possible terms on the following points:-

- The development does not provide any necessary mitigating or compensatory measures to address harmful implications – contrary to Policy S1 of the High Peak Local Plan.
- The benefits of the development are significantly outweighed by the adverse impacts - contrary to Policy S1a of the High Peak Local Plan.
- The proposed path is harmful and not fit for purpose. Without the path the rest of the landscaping will not be visible to the street and of no benefit - contrary to Policy CF4 of the High Peak Local Plan.
- The planning inspector states in point 17 of the appeal decision (APP/H1033/W/17/3177730) that the obligation to provide publicly accessible open space held great weight and was “necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms”. The badly designed foot path does not adequately meet this obligation.
- The development does not support community health, social and cultural well being – contrary to paragraph 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The development will be visually intrusive, overbearing and provide opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour - contrary to Policy EQ 6 of the High Peak Local Plan
- The development will have a detrimental effect on the amount of green space and will not replace it with green space of equal or greater value – contrary to Policy EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan.
- The benefits of the development do not outweigh the value of the trees that will be lost – contrary to Policy EQ9 of the High Peak Local Plan.

We urge you to refuse planning permission.