

**From:** [planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk](mailto:planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk)  
**To:** [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comment Received from Public Access  
**Date:** 06 December 2022 20:51:46

---

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

From:

6  
ROWSLEY GREEN  
GAMESLEY  
GLOSSOP  
DERBYSHIRE  
SK136ET

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: I object to this planning application and feel that this development will ruin the whole area of the of Simmondley and the infrastructure of Glossop will not support any more houses as it is struggling with traffic, doctors , dentists etc. Also I would like to address the following points

¿ Is this a development of 100 houses or 130?

HPBC have obviously 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. What has the transport plan been based on 100? Or 130? Traffic plans have been produced on the application 100 houses - what happens when further houses are built on the HPBC land which has been soft market tested and obviously earmarked for development.

¿ Withheld or missing documents POS (Public Open Space?) WHDVPP01 - Revision A and Linkages Plan Drwg No. WHDVCSL01

¿ Public Open Space ¿ where is it? There doesn't seem to be any stated in the planning docs. If the public open space is deemed as the land in front of our house -how it will be used? Also where will the spoil go from the road building process? Will it end up in the land at the front of our houses in preparation for a later application of more houses to be built there?

Wildlife/Habitat

The site is home to many forms of wildlife ¿ deer family, owls ¿ including barn owls, foxes, badgers, birds various invertebrates, insects (including a rare species of bumblebee) and an abundance of flora.

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.¿ Explain how can an established habitat be recreated as an alternative as suggested as an off-site provision.

Will the 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) be asked to kindly 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!

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. Please explain where this will be and what the point is of 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.¿

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 te site.

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.

Affordable housing ¿ Adopted plan states that 30% should be provided. Wainhomes have said it is not viable to put in affordable housing. They have offered to make contributions to offset, known as S106 money ¿ towards things like infrastructure ¿ schools, libraries etc. However there is a shortfall and there is not enough to compensate.

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 and 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?

Roman Road - see Consultation Response DCC Archaeologist

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.

What consideration has been given to this with regards to the Wainhomes development?

Highways Transport assessment SCP/210067/8K01 bus stop 15m to the east on the A57 - the set down zone is not shown for the bus. It will be opposite the school entrance causing traffic congestion and cars passing through the keep clear zone. Unsafe for the school on both sides of the road.

Consultation Response DCC Highways referred for further comments? No report showing

Adderley Place Specifically

As residents how can we base an objection on the use of the lane when there are no documents or relevant information to show us 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 we are to access our properties 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 our 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 own all of the lane and along with other constraints would not be able to put those measures in place.

Internal Memo 24th Nov 22 ( published on the planning site) states-

p.3 Paragraph 2 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. However, as these areas of land are still within the Glossop Development Boundary this does not raise a particular issue in principle.

I disagree that this does not raise an issue in principle as it implies that this land has been given to Wainhomes in order for them to gain their access point, when, actually without this land it may not be viable. Please give a further explanation to clarify this very important point.

If you would like to speak to me regarding any of the matters above , please feel free to contact myself on number enclosed above.

many thanks

---

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>

---