
From:
Sent: 28 November 2022 21:33
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : HPK/2022/0473 Site Address: Land at Longclough Drive Longclough Drive Simmondley
Glossop Derbyshire Comments by: Kate Raine
From:

Longclough Drive
Simmondley
Glossop

Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: I strongly object to this variation of condition 1 of HPK/2021/0081.

It is very disappointing that a variation to the layout and plots has been submitted so soon after the approval of reserved matters (HPK/2021/0081).

The indicative plan that was put forward for outline planning (HPK/2016/0416 - 1218 indicative landscaping) contained a substantial amount of public open space.

This was refused by the Council for the following reasons which still hold true:

“1. The proposal would clearly result in a significant erosion of visually important open space and lead to an urban intrusion outside of the existing well defined residential estate to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. The qualitative benefits of the scheme offered are not considered to overcome the evidential quantitative loss of visual open space at the application site. The proposal is therefore contrary to Adopted Local Plan Policies S1, S1a, CF4, EQ6 and EQ9 and the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.” (HPK/2016/0416 decision)

The Planning Inspectorate allowed the outline planning at appeal (APP/H1033/W/17/3177730) as a S106/legal obligation was agreed at appeal to provide public accessible open space (POS). The Planning Inspectorate themselves made clear that the POS is the mitigation for the harmful development.

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 POS has already been significantly reduced from the indicative plan at appeal and can no longer be considered of equal or greater value to the visual amenity that has been lost. (I also made this comment before the planning committee meeting in July 2022. Please see my comments HPK/2021/0081 4/7/22).

Number of Houses

The developer has proposed this variation ¿To improve the site layout and house type plans and elevations¿ (HPK/2022/0473 ¿ application form). It is clear this variation has been applied for with the intention of making space for more houses. (please see two invalid applications HPK/2022/0470 & HPK/2022/0471; DOC/2022/0051 9405-WML-00-XX-DR-C-1007-P01 - EXTERNAL WORKS (which has the current plot 6 divided into two houses plot 7 & 8); DOC/2022/0051 1300_A_DR_150---Proposed Site Plan - Discharge of Planning Conditon (which has an area of land marked out next to plot 4 which on a plan on the developer¿s website shows another house).

The outline planning agreed at appeal (APP/H1033/W/17/3177730) was for a maximum of 6 houses only. This was for good reason. The site cannot take any more houses without becoming too dense and overbearing and causing substantial problems to the current residents. It will also reduce the POS to unacceptable levels.

If the developer wishes to build more than 6 houses on this site a whole new application should be submitted.

Reasons this application should be refused

This variation to HPK/2021/0081 condition 1 (which is only being submitted to allow the developer to build more properties) should be refused for the following reasons:

1. Proximity of plot 1 to nos 2-12 Longclough Drive. From comparison between the approved and proposed site plans (HPK/2021/0081 9405-WML-00-XX-DR-C-1004 P11a - Site Layout Drawing and HPK/2022/0473 1300_A_DR_035 ProposedSitePlan_App1_S73_Rev-) it would appear that plots 1-4 have moved even closer to nos 2-12 Longclough Drive. There is a new sewer diversion (as the buildings are now too close to the sewer) and they now cover the trunk of the ash tree that was felled (supposedly due to ash die back disease and not for the sake of the development). This is completely unacceptable. Plot 1 was already too close as the distance window to window between plot 1 and nos 8 and 10 Longclough Drive was 14m when the minimum window-to-window guideline figure

is 21m in the Residential Design Guide SPD (this was the reason for condition 2 of the decision notice HPK/2021/0081).

This is even more unacceptable when the aim is purely to make space for another house next to plot 4. An improvement would be the houses moving further away from nos 2-12 Longclough Drive.

2. Sewer diversions. I note there was one sewer diversion on the final approved site plan (HPK/2021/0081 9405-WML-00-XX-DR-C-1004 P11a - Site Layout Drawing) near plot 4. In this application (HPK/2022/0473 1300_A_DR_035 ProposedSitePlan_App1_S73_Rev-) there are 7 new manholes covers/junctions including 4 junctions over an area of less than 30m by the side of plot 1. This is for the mains foul sewer. I am not an engineer, but this seems a recipe for disaster. The current drain, by former tree T9, regularly needs to be cleared by tanker. In their consultation response (HPK/2021/0081) United Utilities requested that any sewer diversions had to be discussed at the earliest stages to see if they were feasible. I note they have not been consulted over any of these new sewer diversions. This sewer diversion is such a dramatic change it should again require a whole new application.

3. Reduction of proposed POS as a visual amenity. The POS is the compensation to local residents for the destruction of our visual amenity by this harmful development. This has already been significantly reduced to unacceptable levels from the indicative plan approved at appeal HPK/2016/0416 - 1218 indicative landscaping. There are also still issues about how accessible this space will be (please see my comments DOC/2022/0051 17/10/22).

On the current approved plan (HPK/2022/0081 9405-WML-00-XX-DR-C-1004 P11a - Site Layout Drawing) the landscaping behind plots 1-4 will be visible from some of the footpath in the POS. If this variation is approved (and later a house built next to plot 4 which is clearly the intention) this will severely reduce the amount of POS, but also the visual amenity the POS will provide. There will be more urban intrusion on the frontage of Longclough Drive. Also, the landscaping behind plots 1-4 will be barely visible from the POS making it worthless and leaving it at risk to becoming forgotten about and left unkempt (there are invasive species here including Himalayan Balsam).

Continuing Issues

The approval of HPK/2021/0081 has led to the wholesale destruction of the visual amenity that benefitted the local community and has caused much distress and harm to the wellbeing of local residents. This is a very great loss and saddening to see.

I am still concerned about the outstanding issues with the site and development. I feel these could have been more adequately addressed at reserved matters stage. These include:

1. Sewer Diversions – It is unclear whether United Utilities approved the sewer diversion in HPK/2021/0081 9405-WML-00-XX-DR-C-1004 P11a - Site Layout Drawing. There are now significant new sewer diversions being made in this application. If these are not feasible, what does this mean for the development?

2. I note from the consultation response from the Environment Agency (HPK/2022/0473) that a permit and permission is needed for the construction of plot 6 and the public footpath by the river bank. If these are not granted, what does this mean for the development?

3. The footpath in the POS – I have commented several times on this issue and the fact that without significant land modelling the POS will be inaccessible. This has not been properly addressed. We are at the point where the area of POS has been significantly reduced, the public footpath is inaccessible to many and can only be made accessible by reinstating the part that was removed by the Council at reserved matters stage (please see my comments DOC/2022/0051 17/10/2022). Now in addition the construction of the most significant part of the remaining footpath may not be granted by the Environment Agency. I feel this issue in particular is so important to the application that it should have been resolved at a much earlier stage and especially before reserved matters (HPK/2021/0081) approval.

4. I note on the plan that the telegraph poles are to be relocated. I acknowledge that this has been dismissed as –not a planning issue–, but again has permission been sought for this? What disruption will be caused to residents, especially those whose livelihoods depend on an internet connection?

Construction Management Plan

I yet again repeat my comments about the construction management plan. No details have yet been provided by the developer about how construction will happen on this very sensitive site without blocking access and causing major issues to local residents.

The site has now been fenced off with access gates near nos 2-12 Longclough Drive. It is clear that vehicles will not be able to access the site. It is also clear that if they can't be accommodated on site, vehicles belonging to construction workers, delivery and works vehicles will block the road to local residents for prolonged periods of time, which is completely unacceptable.

The contractors of this developer that have cleared the site and installed the fencing have already been using the public pavement to drive machinery between the two ends of the site and blocking footpaths to local residents (photographs and videos can be supplied). The construction management plan needs to be very robust to prevent further suffering.

Summary

In summary this application should be refused.

It is unclear what improvements to the layout and benefits this application is making. It is clear it has not addressed any outstanding issues and has created new problems (sewer diversions, building closer to nos 2-12 Longclough Drive, reduction of POS and issues with the public footpath).

This application should be rejected and any variation in the number of houses should be submitted as a completely new application. After 6 years of this applications process, it is very clear that no more than six houses should ever be built on this site.

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>
