
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 04 July 2022 11:09
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HPK/2021/0081 Site Address: Land Off Longclough Drive Longclough Drive Simmondley Glossop Derbyshire Comments by: Kate

From:
10
Longclough Drive
Simmondley
Glossop

SK13 8HN

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Neither

Comments: I wish to make further comment on planning application HPK/2021/0081 due to the 16 new documents that appeared on planning application on 1/7/2022 and the recommendation report by the planning officer.

Public Open Space and Planning Obligation

The public open space (POS) and planning obligation were the only things that made this harmful development acceptable at the appeal.

Appeal Decision APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 17. “The proposed development would undoubtedly reduce the amount of open space present at the appeal site. However, I am mindful of the agreed planning obligation in this respect, which, through securing the use of the site as outlined in the description of development would clearly be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.”

Appeal Decision APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 21. In reference to the previously refused appeals on the site “In both cases the amount of space left open would have been less than the amount secured in the agreed planning obligation in this instance.”

The area of POS has been significantly reduced from the indicative scheme presented to the Planning Inspector at the appeal. With the suggestion that the proposed footpath being removed from the side of plot 5, we are left with a very small semi-circular path at the front of the site on Longclough Drive. This is less than a third of that proposed at appeal. This is the compensation for the harmful development, but is definitely not equal or greater to that which is being lost.

Appeal Decision APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 18. ¿As the submitted planning obligation introduces a legally enforceable mechanism to secure these measures, I give considerable weight to this aspect of the appeal scheme in my consideration of its merits.¿

After 4 years the applicant has still provided no details about the future management of the site (the planning obligation). It is unacceptable that we are less than a week away from a decision without the most important details of this application. Derbyshire Wildlife Trust recommends the management plan to last at least 10 years. Anything less than 10 years with management by the landowner or a suitable management company, should mean the application is refused.

Trees

Appeal Decision APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 23. ¿Ample open space and mature vegetation would remain, along the appeal site¿s frontages, and within, which would ensure that the wider appeal site continued to contribute to the character and appearance of its surroundings in terms of the visual relief it offered.¿

With an additional 4 trees now being proposing to be removed, including some pivotal trees on the street frontage (eg T1) this is no longer the case. The site has been decimated of mature vegetation with 12 of the 14 trees covered by TPOs being removed alongside others. T1 would have provided a significant amount of visual relief to the residents of 2-12. With its removal and the replacement trees being placed elsewhere on the site, we are left with a very stark, harmful, visually intrusive view of the side elevation of plot 1, retaining features and a row of parked cars. Some more landscaping is needed in this area to soften and provide some relief.

I question the statement made by the planning officer at 6.69 that the distance window to window between plot 1 and nos 8 and 10 Longclough Drive is 14m when in 6.65 it says separation distances have a minimum window-to-window guideline figure of 21m in the Residential Design Guide SPD. I note the condition for opaqued windows, but what is to stop the new owners replacing the glazing. A reduction of the guideline figure by a third and being less than 8m from our boundary seems unacceptably close.

I also question the black UPVC windows. Most of the windows down the street are white UPVC or dark wood.

I note the proposed new sewer diversion on the site plan included in the officer¿s report. Has this been agreed with United Utilities as requested in their comments? If not, what does a refusal by United Utilities mean for this planning application, if the committee approve it?

I would like to reiterate two of my comments that have been omitted or heavily edited in the summary in the officer¿s report.

My questions about telegraph poles ¿ The telegraph poles that are functional items of street furniture provided vital services for the street. On the current plans the telegraph poles sited IN (not in front of) plots 4 and 6 make at least one of the parking spaces on both those plots UNUSABLE. If unusable parking spaces are ¿outside the scope of a planning determination¿, then who is responsible?

Construction Management Plan ¿ I reiterate how problematic construction down this street will be. Anything more than a light goods vehicle struggles to access the street. It cannot be closed under ANY circumstances for any period of time, as it is our only access to our homes.

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
