

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 29 November 2022 14:33:02

Application Reference No. : HPK/2022/0456
Site Address: Land At Dinting Vale Dinting Glossop Derbyshire
Comments by: Sarah BottTintwistle Primary Assessment

From:

Adderley Place
Glossop
Glossop
Glossop
Derbyshire
SK13 6PA

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: 5 Adderley Place

Glossop

Objection points

HPBC have discussed/agreed that the council owned land (former tip) will be developed and linked to the development of 100 houses. I was told by HPBC when they came to test the land on the tip that this would be the case. Has the transport plan been based on 100? Or 130? Therefore the traffic plans that have been produced on the application 100 houses are ot appropriate.

¿ Withheld or missing documents

POS (Public Open Space?) WHDVPP01 - Revision A

Linkages Plan Drwg No. WHDVCSL01

Flood Risk ¿ no informed comment given until further information provided by the applicant

¿Public Open Space ¿ The application shows no public open space and buffer zoning and undeveloped areas of the applicants site cannot be classified as such. The Trans Pennine Trail Consultation Response also refers to this ¿ the application shows no consideration of linkage with the TPT and obstructs the access rights of PROW 50. Undeveloped areas of the northern site area (in front of my house) show proposals for a significant utilisation of a civil engineered cut and fill process. The application is lacking in technical detail and in this respect may propose significant structural risk and compromise to the existing dwellings at Adderley Place.

Wildlife/Habitat Policy -EQ6 EQ9

The site is home to many forms of wildlife ¿ deer family, owls ¿ including barn owls, foxes, birds various invertebrates, insects (including a rare species of bumblebee) and an abundance of flora. In terms of mitigation, I do not understand the logic of removing an already established habitat only to promise to ¿make¿ it somewhere else. This would be subject to land availability to which there is none available within the ¿built up¿ boundary.

¿Arboricultural Impact Assessment

4.2 ¿ the table shows there is an adverse effect on all three categories ¿ tree cover, tree condition and deciduous woodland, with no mitigation proposed for any of the categories.

4.7 - states the removal of woodland and trees around the site perimeter and a LARGER area from the north would cause harm to ¿Habitats of Principle Importance¿ and a permanent degradation in the quantity and functionality of the treescape within the site. It would not be possible to mitigate or offset this harm within the site.¿ An established habitat such as Adderley Fields could not be recreated as an alternative as suggested as an off-site provision.

There are 4 species of birds on the BoCC RED list and the 7 on the BoCC AMBER list (See Breeding Birds Survey -3 species from these lists and other lists, were confirmed to be breeding) will they be kindly asked to use this new ¿off-site provision?¿

Note - Breeding Birds Survey Report -only 4 out of the recommended 6 were completed and only 3 of those conducted between the mid June to mid July time frame ¿ survey 2 started late, 3hrs 16mins AFTER sunrise and survey 4 had poor visibility!

The entire site was registered with the Barn Owl Trust on 13/10/22 Adderley Place Simmondley, Glossop, Derbyshire ¿ registration number ¿ SK0190994189 Roost and Nest Site.

4.22 ¿ states that the development cannot meet the policy requirement of 2:1 replacement to reinstate the lost canopy cover and associated habitat and environmental functions. A mitigation for this is ¿off-site¿ planting. There is no point removing existing, functional planting and putting it elsewhere¿ leave it where it is already established. The building process will drive much of the wildlife away, despite any mitigation of ¿new planting.¿ The damning report by Tetra Tech Biodiversity Impact Assessment states ¿that under the current proposals the site fails to achieve no net loss or positive score for area based habitats. This is mainly due to the necessary removal of LBAP grassland and LBAP woodland, required to facilitate the proposed development and access road.¿

¿ Invertebrate Survey Report (118) Baker Consultants

This is a further example of a study which was not carried out as per recommendations

4.1.4 ¿The date of commissioning of the invertebrate surveys limited the surveys to the end of the invertebrate season¿ As a result, the spring and summer species of invertebrate are likely to have been missed and thus the site¿s invertebrates value is likely to be underestimated. ¿

¿Encroachment of development onto private land (Platts Wood) Adopted Plan Mapping, Designated H2 and a Conveyance Report dating back to 1923 shows that the development is encroaching onto this land which does not belong to the current owners of the site. The applicant has failed to issue certificate B to the landowner. This is contrary to planning statute.

¿Access Road ¿ Appendix B p.40 Viability Assessment SCP 210087SK01 ¿ the plan shows that the access road is outside of the development plan. The land is not included for access, it is OUTSIDE of the allocated site as shown on the official local plan mapping doc. Further encroachment is identified ¿

¿The red line plan submitted by the applicant varies from the allocation boundary in the Local Plan in three places. The north western boundary (at Adderley Road) differs slightly from the LP allocation in two places. It goes off at a point incorporating an extra piece of land at the north and follows a different boundary at the south, again incorporating a small extra piece of land. Additional land has been included at the proposed access point and along the eastern boundary. Accordingly, the proposed development would contravene the 2016 adopted plan and would be unlawful development.

¿Policy H3/ H4 Affordable housing ¿The 2016 Adopted plan states that 30% should be provided Wainhomes have said it is not commercially viable to supply any affordable housing. They have offered to make contributions to offset, known as S106 money ¿ towards schools, libraries only to the sum of £104,025.00 in the applicant¿s viability assessment. Alternative documents obtained identify an education finance shortfall alone of £1,197,490.17 accordingly the applicants S106 offer of £96,203.00 towards education is considered derisory.

¿Education reports are conflicting. Education Impact statement (carried out by Alfredson York on behalf of WH) It is stated that there are 604 surplus primary places. I have spoken to Dinting Head ¿ they do not have the 45 surplus places as stated in that document. Nowhere near. They do not have room to build and the only way they could accommodate is to take away the hall. As mentioned above there is a shortfall in S106 money so it is unlikely they would get any to build.

HOWEVER an email from Rachael Simpkin ¿ to Claire Campbell at WH 2020

Education APPENDIX AYA04 ¿ states

¿Dinting CE Voluntary Aided Primary School has a current net capacity of 119 pupils and has 137 pupils on roll currently. The latest projections show the number of pupils on roll to be 147 during the next 5 years. There are a number of recently approved planning applications within the normal area totalling 108 dwellings amounting to an additional 26 primary pupils. The analysis of the combined current and future projected number of pupils on roll, together with impact of any approved planning applications, shows that the normal area primary schools would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 25 primary pupils arising from the proposed development.

Analysis of the current and future projected number of pupils on roll, together with the impact of approved planning applications shows that the normal area secondary school would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 21 secondary and 8 post16 pupils from the proposed development.

¿2016 ¿Local Plan states ¿ Adderley Fields has very little commercial value to offer Glossop. How will this development benefit our town? There is very little benefit, in fact the opposite especially when taking into consideration the 122 BNG FINAL V2 Report which states that -

¿The results demonstrate that the current development proposals result in a net loss score for area habitats. The trading rules have not been met under the current development proposals as habitats of medium distinctiveness

¿ they have been lost and not replaced within the proposals.¿ Therefore, the proposed development currently fails to meet the local policy EQ5 requirement of ¿no net loss and also the NPFF requirement to achieve a net gain. In the event that the LPA approve the application, we would seek to have the S106 applied as a condition to the consent (as detailed in the report)

¿Roman Road - see Consultation Response DCC Archaeologist for the Zion Methodist Church Planning Application HPK/2022/0353

¿The proposal site is just to the north of the postulated line of the Melandra to Brough Roman road as suggested by Peter Wroe (Derbyshire Archaeological Journal 1982). The line shown on Derbyshire HER (MDR11569) is indicative and the line suggested by Wroe is more properly on the line of the lane to Adderley Place which lies just south of the proposal site and can be seen to be embanked as it runs further west. Wroe has recently reviewed his work however and is of the opinion that the true line may lay slightly to the north, and that there may be two alignments ¿ one earlier and one later ¿ either of which could potentially run across the current proposal site¿

¿No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological work has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing, and until any pre-start element of the approved scheme has been completed to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority. ¿

In consideration of the above report, alignment and potential dissection of the applicant¿s development site with a Roman Road leading to Melandra is highly probable. Accordingly, if the LPA award planning consent, in advance of any other works, the consent should be conditioned to accord with the DCC officers recommendations.

¿Consultation Response DCC Highways referred for further comments? The applicant has failed in every respect to provide detailed civil engineering schematics with technical notation on which to base informed comment by any party consulted.

Adderley Place Specifically

As a resident how can I base an objection on the use of the lane when there are no documents or relevant technical civil engineering information to show how the lane will be affected? There are no technical drawings to show how residents will safely access their properties. The access road to the estate is to cross the lane ¿ the plans in submitted form show no signage, traffic lights or line marking at the junction. Please explain how I am to access my property safely with significant new traffic crossing the lane in both directions. The driveway from my neighbour¿s house opposite the crossroads is also omitted from the drawing.

As there is only one access point to the estate, can Wainhomes explain how they will stop people accessing the new properties from Simmondley Lane via the lane to the new dwellings ¿ creating a rat run and an unsafe footpath (PROW50)? There is no support/evidence/drawings to show how we as residents will be protected. We have within our deeds prescriptive rights of use for the lane in order to access our properties. Visibility splays out of the end of the lane would not accommodate the extra traffic. The Linkages Document is missing as previously stated.

Highways Report 2020 states that ¿The existing track is not suitable for use by a significant level of additional development traffic, therefore, permanent measures to prevent extra vehicular use will need to be put in place.¿

This would be impossible as the current owners do not own all of the lane and along with other constraints would not be able to put those measures in place.

Wainhomes need to demonstrate how they will stop the new residents and or their visitors parking on Adderley Road where current residents park and have parked for many years. The sit GA plan in its submitted form shows a considerable shortfall in parking provision within the development site for parking, in direct contravention of appendix 1 of the adopted plan 2016, which has been submitted by Wainhomes in supporting application documents. The entire site only has provision for 5 visitor parking spaces plan ref ; WH/DV/PSL/01 which conflicts with the plan reference CLPD 006 P01 in terms of location and layout.

In consideration of all of the above, non-compliance with NPFF, adopted development plan 2016 and policies contained therein, the application should be REFUSED

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>
