
From:
Sent: 06 December 2022 22:00
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : HPK/2022/0456 Site Address: Land At Dinting Vale Dinting Glossop Derbyshire
Comments by: Deanne Day

From:
25
Dinting Vale
Dinting
Glossop
Derbyshire
SK13 6NY

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: I object to the proposed development on the following points

The transport plan does not address or acknowledge the potential impact the proposed access will have on Dinting Vale primary school or the adjoining church, be it pupils put at risk due to additional traffic movements at a point not 22m from the school access and adding to pollutants to that of frequently standing traffic at a well known choke point.

I may add that the local plan identifies 130 houses to be delivered from this site, the data is based on 100 homes which has not taken into account a potential 30% increase.

I take issue with a number of statements within the traffic assessment survey, extracts follow and are shown in speech marks, my comments are underneath in response.

2.19 "Less than three accidents over a five year period is not considered to be an unusual frequency for these types of junction, the evidence presented above suggests the existing accident record on the roads immediately surrounding the site do not represent material concern."

Para.2.17 contradicts the above stating there have been nine accidents over a five year period, one serious injury recorded. The impression is given that the number is acceptable surely the aspiration should be a target of zero. The proposed access will influence traffic dynamics.

3.5 "The bus stop is proposed to be located circa 15m South East of its existing position which does not impact on the junction visibility splays."

"Transport Assessment plan pge 40 appendix B states, visibility splay 2.4 x 45m offset 0.5m? into highway"

"Derbyshire highways response January 2020. The proposed junction will need to be laid out in accordance with current design criteria and provided with exit visibility sightlines of 2.4m x 54 m"

The bus stop may not impact on visibility but the regular stoppage of buses during passenger set down or pick up will impede/reduce sightlines, particularly if a car is attempting a right turn from the site. The set down area will straddle the vehicular access for the Dinting girl guides group and that of the adjacent off road residential parking slot, (not identified on Transport plan diagrams)

3.10 "The proposed development provides a level of parking broadly in accordance with councils parking standards detailed above (ref Local Plan)"

(Broadly) in my book means it does not meet the parking needs as detailed in the local plan, no provision for visitor parking.

National Policy Framework (NPPF)

4.2 "Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of Transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve and air quality and Public health."

The site is basically an island, it's only vehicular access is via the A57, it's proximity to retail stores, shops, leaves no other option but to travel by car in order to conduct the weekly shop, adding to the strain on parking facilities within the town. The majority of daily commutes will be to workplaces outside of Glossop. The plan does not encourage cycle use, the A57 is a well known route for bringing cyclists into conflict with other traffic. Travel by train involves a walk up a steep incline not conducive to those with impaired mobility, then travel on and add to an overcrowded. system The above points and the proposed access, at a point facing a primary school, add to the already congested infrastructure and does nothing to improve air quality and Public health. there is not a choice of Transport modes, it is limited not convenient, which is why commuters choose is to sit in traffic in the car rather than on the bus.

4.6 "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe."

There is an impact on road safety, the access is at a point 22m from the school access, cumulative impacts on the network will add to the current traffic congestion, particularly with cars leaving the access wishing to travel East, this manoeuvre will ultimately lead to residents on leaving the estate, opting to travel down the unadopted highway which carries PROW.50 to the detriment of pedestrians and exiting at the junction to Simmondley lane at a point with insufficient visibility splays

"Derbyshire highways response January 2020. There is an existing PROW crossing the site along the route of the existing unadopted track serving Adderley place. Whilst it may be possible to incorporate the route of the PROW within the proposed estate street design, the existing track is not suitable for use by a significant additional development traffic, therefore permanent measures to prevent vehicular use need to be out in place"

"WH response 29/11/2022 in respect of restricting vehicular use of the unadopted track from the new development."

of barrier as we do not think it necessary

4.7 "create places that are safe, secure and attractive which minimise the scope for conflict between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter and respond to local character and design standards."

The scope for pedestrians to be brought into conflict will be increased, be it residents using PROW50 as a rat run in an effort to avoid accessing at the A57, or conflict with schoolchildren and accompanying parents to and from school Dinting school. The proposed access being across from The school access
Street clutter will be increased by the access which will be bordered to the West by an off street parking access and disabled bay and bordered to the East by the Girl guides access and adjoining off road residential Parking which will be straddled by the set down area of the bus stop situated 15m from the access, the safety zig zag lines to the pelican crossing not acknowledged in the transport plan and if yellow lines are incorporated on the A57 this will lead to people parking on the access road during school runs or due to the fact people can no longer park outside their homes or attending school and church public functions.

4.8 "Planning policies should Support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within large scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys, for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities."

There are no means of public transport within the large scale site, the number and length of journeys will not be minimised in fact increased, as most new builds are populated by residents who have moved from outside the borough, but their place of work remains outside the borough. No one will want to carry the weekly shop from Tesco's, education will incorporate school runs despite Dinting school being nearby, it is currently oversubscribed, a situation that can only be exacerbated as more developments are at the approval stage in line with the local plan proposals.

Public Open Space

There are no detailed/ designated POS areas in addition the undeveloped area to the north of the development should not be considered as such. The site plan provides no element of linking up to The transpenine trail or other amenity and just underpins the argument that The site in its current state is isolated.

Biodiversity

DWT advised that the site, due to its uniqueness had the potential to support rare species of Flora and Fauna (ref. Local Plan 2016) .The wild life surveys confirm that this is currently the case, despite all surveys not at completion stage or having been conducted at times of the year that are not optimum to encapsulating most species.

Invertebrate report Pge. 9 - 4.4.2 recorded a rare species of Garden bumble bee and Summary pge 1 & 1.2.1 stated the site to be that of at least District importance.

Policy & EQ5,EQ6 EQ9

Tetra Tech Report - Biodiversity Impact Assessment

Under the current proposals, the site fails to achieve no net loss or a 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 the access road. The proposed plans do demonstrate that areas of woodland will be retained, and new scrub and grassland planting will be created to mitigate for the necessary vegetation removal. There are no works proposed or losses to the wet ditches (river habitats) and as such no change in units has occurred. (note this statement does not take into consideration the final surface water drainage scheme not available at the time of this report)

5.0 CONCLUSION Based on the current proposals and outlined assumptions, the proposed development is predicted to result in an overall net loss of approximately -65.21% or -23.34 habitat units, +834.71% or 4.96 hedgerow units and no change in river units. Therefore, the proposed development, currently fails to meet the local policy EQ5 requirement of no net loss and also the NPPF requirement to achieve a net gain. As the BNG target is not currently achieved, a review of the recommendations set out in Section 4 will be required.

Where avoidance and mitigation cannot redress the losses, there are two further options to consider through use of compensation:

a) Offsite compensation of habitats which will require off-site land. This land will not be developed for 30 years and will be used to off-set the biodiversity losses of the development in terms of units. In addition, a 30-year plan to manage and maintain the habitats will also be required.

(there is limited off site land available within the borough)

b) Biodiversity unit offsetting scheme such as S106 payment to LPA or other similar mechanism to a land bank. The LPA should be consulted for the cost per each biodiversity unit. Typically, it can vary between £20,000 - £25,000 per biodiversity unit (Townsend Chartered Surveyors, 2022) required to reach the target BNG score (i.e., 24.34 biodiversity units).

$£22,500.00 \times 24.34 = £547,650.00$ in potential S106 payment.

In the event the LPA are minded to approve the application, we would seek to have the above S106 applied as a condition to the consent.

In consideration of all the above, non-compliance with NPPF, 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>
