

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 26 February 2023 18:03:08

Application Reference No. : HPK/2023/0025

Site Address: Land South of Hollin Cross Lane Glossop Derbyshire SK13 8JH Glossop

Comments by: Dr Helen Dalton

From:

41

Hollin Cross Lane

Glossop

Glossop

Derbyshire

SK13 8JQ

Submission: Objection

Comments: Part 1

Please note my vehement objection to the resubmitted application for development of the former Redcourt site. Despite the clear-cut rejection of these plans by both High Peak Borough Council in summer 2022 and by the Planning Inspectorate in November 2022, the company responsible have demonstrated their sheer disdain for the wishes of the local community in tendering yet another proposal for the site a mere 7 weeks after the most recent denial of their scheme. The purportedly new application merely rehashes what was proposed a year earlier and, in a startling gesture symptomatic of the arrogance of Glossop Eden Ltd, in fact adds a further property to now comprise 24 homes. The many points of objection of the High Peak Borough Council Planning Department have not been answered and there has been little in the way of progress from the initial submission. Many of the documents offered in support of the application remain thoroughly outdated, containing data gleaned from assessments carried out during the first lockdown in 2020 (and, of course, these will not be updated as the results will no longer be so advantageous to the developers). Indeed, the short turnaround between the Planning Inspectorate's ruling and the further application is such that it would simply be impossible for any entity to properly digest and respond to the comments and criticisms levelled against their plans. Glossop Eden Ltd. instead intends to wear down both planners and other regulatory bodies through a campaign of attrition, resubmitting the same proposals over and over again in the hope that those assessing the application will surrender out of sheer weariness.

Yet the local community has spoken. This incongruous development motivated entirely by greed and gain is out of keeping with the conservation area and rides roughshod over the supposed Tree Preservation Order in place to maintain the ancient woodland occupying the site. Permitting these plans to proceed would substantially increase the traffic of this already heavily congested area and lead to dangerous conditions on neighbouring roads, not to mention overloading the Slatelands cul-de-sac. The proposed programme of construction has been summarily and unanimously rejected by the local community. In turn, High Peak Borough Council (HPBC) has refused the application, with local councillors from all parties and Robert Langan, the Conservative Member of Parliament for the High Peak, publicly and keenly supporting this dismissal. Hundreds of objections were appended to the planning application. There is no scenario in which this development should be allowed to proceed and I hope that HPBC will again do the right thing in opposing the scheme. I attach my comments regarding the rejected application in 2022 which continue to bear relevance in light of the absence of any substantive changes to the plans advanced by the so-called 'Glossop Eden Ltd.'

I am writing to express my significant concerns in regard to the proposed construction of 24 houses on the former Red Court site in the St. James's Conservation Area. I am one of the owner-occupiers of 41 Hollin Cross Lane and, as such, reside on land situated directly on the boundary of the planned development. Imagine my surprise then when I first consulted the original plans to discover that our property was not even included on the drawings submitted by Glossop Eden Ltd. Despite some attempted corrections to this effect, much of the supposed supporting evidence offered by this company is predicated upon drawings and maps that continue to ignore the construction of our property in 2019. Our residence at No. 41 does not even feature on a number of

the revised plans! I fail to see how the development can possibly proceed when current documents do not accurately reflect the architecture and infrastructure of the area, nor indeed the substantial impact upon our own dwelling which is, for the purposes of these developers and this proposal, seemingly invisible.

This configuration of available plans notwithstanding, our garden immediately borders the unoccupied building earmarked for demolition. As a result, the intended construction work will not only severely affect our quality of life, it will destroy it. We will be unable to make use of the garden in any way for the life of the project. What measures do the developers plan to instate to prevent harm or injury to us and surrounding properties when we are centimetres from the building to be dismantled? There will be plumes of dust and dirt thrown over the gardens and houses around number 41, not to mention significant risk from the demolition process itself. We also have concerns as regards the potential contamination of a building of this era with harmful substances such as asbestos. Furthermore, what do the developers propose to put in place to ensure that our property and our neighbours do not suffer from any resulting structural damage? In the event that debris and vegetation are cast onto our land or harm is carried out to structures within our garden, will the developers provide financial compensation? How are we to live and work merely metres away from a full-blown construction and demolition site? We will be subject to significant noise exposure levels on a daily basis, with piledrivers and heavy machinery in operation approximately ten-fifteen metres from our back door. Clearly, our quality of life will notably depreciate and we will be subjected to unsafe conditions. We have received nothing from the developers pertaining to these issues. The council bears responsibility under Protocol 1, Article 1 of the Human Rights Act 1998 to protect the entitlement to, peaceful enjoyment of possessions, including one's home and garden. If the development is permitted, we will be deprived of the ability to spend time in and benefit from both our garden and residence, not to mention the ensuing loss of privacy from construction workers established in the immediate vicinity, i.e. metres from our back door. Furthermore, such activities will also undermine our right to Quiet Enjoyment in impinging upon unimpaired use of our property. Will the developers address these issues and allay our concerns in this regard?

In terms of the existing boundary with our property, we would appreciate some clarification as to how the developers propose to configure or preserve the prospective demarcation. We note the attached comments in the plans affirming that condition of existing boundary brick wall to be assessed + restored / cleaned [sic] where necessary. This is deliberately and unnecessarily evasive. Those of us adjacent to this aforementioned wall require a clear plan from the company as to their intentions towards the brick wall already in situ, as any amendments or modifications sanctioned on this periphery will interfere with, and encroach upon, our land. Having consulted the drawings, we also observe that plot number 13 backs immediately onto our property and, in fact, represents the assigned garden of this house impinging onto and over our red brick boundary with the self-proclaimed close boarded timber fencing, continuing beyond the site limits. Can the planners please ask the developers to elucidate why they intend to override prevailing demarcations and seemingly appropriate a section of our garden? This is a considerable source of concern for us and a revealing preview of the approach of Glossop Eden Ltd. towards the cultivation of relationships between the site itself and surrounding dwellings.

Lastly, we have considerable concern regarding a sycamore tree under a Tree Preservation Order on and around the boundary. Glossop Eden Ltd. has submitted a revised site plan which does not depict this tree, whilst displaying in detail the many trees elsewhere and their intentions towards them. In those few documents where the sycamore is confusingly included, the tree is positioned so as to be situated entirely across the Redcourt border and an occupant of our garden alone. Whilst the tree in question is predominantly on our land, part of the trunk extends into / against the Redcourt boundary, over which there remains some confusion in this area with a seemingly unclaimed sliver of land in between the boundary to our property and that of the site. This is not reflected on the plans submitted by the developers, which depict this boundary as congruent with the dilapidated chain link fence seen in the attached photograph. If this is in fact accurate, the demarcation provided by our panel fencing to the rear would need to be extended outwards against this chain link fence, bringing us even closer to the structure earmarked for demolition and, again, raising concerns as to which party will finance the renewal of the aforementioned chain link partition or its replacement.

More significantly, the extensive canopy of this ancient tree in places rests against the structure to be demolished. This sycamore is around 13 metres from our house and would cause devastating damage to property and/or lives if disturbed during demolition or construction. We feel that it is disingenuous of the developers not to make specific reference to this tree in the revised site plan and it is surely necessary that provisions are taken to protect the tree and its canopy and to ensure our safety. Indeed, this diagram seems to depict neighbouring trees as selected for removal, something which again will have implications for the remaining sycamore. It is clear that Tree Protection Fencing will need to be installed around this mature

sycamore, but should access to our land be required we will have to take legal advice regarding the applicability of a Party Wall Agreement and the developer's written assurances as to protection of our property.

Concerning the development of the site itself, I offer the following objections arranged under their specific headings:

Highways and Pollution

The proposed site access onto Hollin Cross Lane is simply not fit for purpose. This narrow thoroughfare is already very congested due to parked vehicles and general overcrowding in the area. Utilising the avenue as a site entrance, an entrance at the confluence with Hadfield Street, will greatly exacerbate pollution and likely lead to a sizeable build-up of traffic and inferior air quality, particularly at busy and popular times. On the vast majority of occasions, there are parked vehicles located along the street up to the proposed ingress. This will render turning very awkward and difficult and will potentially put pedestrians at risk. Indeed, the road is currently made use of by many parents and children going to and returning from the nearby primary school and an increase in heavy goods vehicles (and subsequently cars) will naturally result in a more overloaded and therefore dangerous highway, located on what is in essence a small residential lane. The second site access onto Slatelands Road presents its own unique set of problems in necessitating the reopening of a closed and no through road in order to connect the new site with the busy Primrose Lane. This will renew the throughflow of traffic into this very congested conservation area consisting predominantly of housing as vehicles seek other ways to travel into Glossop town centre (incidentally, one of the reasons why the road was sealed in the first place). Residents occupying houses on this lane will suffer from a significant escalation in pollution and traffic beyond what is reasonable. Might we remind the developers that there is an existing duty of care to maintain the integrity and quality of the conservation area. The built and historic environment is one of the plan area's greatest assets; insists the High Peak Local Plan (adopted 2016) under section 4.23, in an assessment including conservation areas as part of enhancements which make a particularly valuable contribution to local distinctiveness. Such individual character will be extraordinarily diminished by the conversion of Slatelands Road and Hollin Cross Lane into major thoroughfares.

We also gather that, according to the developer's own documents, the site will be furnished with parking spaces for around 58 cars! This staggering figure is of course likely to be an understatement (and certainly does not include visitors or those households with a large number of vehicles beyond the norm), and, at the very least, demonstrates complete contempt for the protection and enhancement of the conservation area, in addition to an unwillingness to accommodate High Peak Borough Council's own Local Plan under section 5.64 with regard to developing strategies for Green Infrastructure that mitigate the impacts of climate change and the control and prevention of pollution. This strategic document already notes the ongoing detrimental impact to Glossop from increased traffic under section 2.2, asserting that congestion on the infrastructure in and around Glossopdale is a major limiting factor in enabling growth and attracting investment to the area. Yet development is always permitted to continue.

Ecology and Sustainability

The developers falsely describe the area to be developed as a vacant brownfield site. This is simply untrue. Firstly, the land in question does not make an appearance on the Brownfield Land Register 2019 as maintained by High Peak Borough Council. Those sites which are named on this list are in the main areas of former industrial activity. The Red Court site in the former St. James' Conservation Area was absolutely not previously used for industrial and commercial purposes, but instead housed a residential care home. The grounds around the specific premises of Red Court itself were never subject to any previous development and have considerable longevity as mature woodlands. Indeed, the land in question comprises an array of veteran trees supposedly safeguarded by a preservation order and well-established biodiversity, serving as a site of ecological importance, including wildlife habitats for a wide variety of birdlife, bats and foxes and bees and insects, in addition to many other species. The term 'brownfield' is an inaccurate assessment of this site under protection in the St. James' Conservation Area and, as such, is an improper designation for this proposal and its objectives.

Upon perusing the attached documentation, I was also appalled to note the proposed destruction of tens of trees, despite the intended site occupying land within a conservation area and possessing Derbyshire County Council Tree Preservation Order No. 61. Many of these trees are classed as of high or moderate value in the

developers; own ;Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement.; This astounding decision surely contravenes the very principle of conservation. Removing a large number of veteran trees well-established within their own network over many years can only be described as the desecration of the local ecosystem and the desecration of the protections afforded to such areas in the High Peak Local Plan under Policy EQ 9 (;the Council will protect existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows, in particular, ancient woodland, veteran trees and ancient or species-rich hedgerows from loss or deterioration;) and Policy EQ 6 (;requiring that public and private spaces; provide for the retention of significant landscape features such as mature trees;). Permitting the paltry replanting of shrubs to replace mature woodlands under protection is simply an act of ecological vandalism for which the local council should be thoroughly ashamed. Furthermore, it is not possible for such replanting to be carried out on a like for like basis as regards veteran shrubs. Such a sacrifice seems rather senseless and baseless. How a company named after the most well-known of utopian gardens can call for the dismantling and removal of trees is an incomprehensible irony. Of particular concern to those of us resident in the immediate area involved in the violation of the preservation order is the unknown impact of such tree removal on the root stock of the trees. As noted above I am concerned that the harm caused by such mass eradication may impair the remaining trees bordering our own property which Glossop Eden Ltd. have so kindly deigned to retain. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Assessment even details ;direct disturbance to roots; in many instances. Long-term damage can simply not be adequately divined at this stage.

The above removal of trees is of such import that there will be an overwhelming change in the character of the area. Reshaping and transforming such a vital part of the locality;s environmental fabric will cause irreparable harm to settled animal life and their habitats. Such damage can never be undone. Offering a so-called ;woodland walkway; in mitigation of this destruction to an area specifically labelled for preservation is no more than a token gesture. Artificially thrusting properties into established woodland can never be considered as sensitive development prioritising local character.

It is clear that such alterations fly in the face of sustainability and contravene the National Planning Policy Framework;s stipulations on the environmental role in developments, specifically providing assurance that a proposed development makes ;a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (185[c]); and respects ;the contribution made by the historic environment and character of a place (185[d.]), whilst making sure to ;protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity (174).; In addition, the intended development will also bring about the infringement of the High Peak Local Plan in its emphasis on the commitment ;to help create, protect, and enhance and manage networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure; under section 5.64. We are especially surprised that the developers propose to remove so many mature trees given the council;s own profession of protection for the arboreal environment, something again afforded great emphasis in the Local Plan under section 5.73 where it is acknowledged that ;mature and ancient woodlands are an essential part of the Borough;s natural capital and a significant source of biodiversity.; Approving the redevelopment of this site will undermine such assertions and dismantle beyond repair an established woodland site. As the Local Plan (5.73) itself makes plain, ;ancient and semi-natural woodland are not re-creatable within any practical time frame.; as such sites emerged ;over hundreds of years.; At what stage will we take responsibility for the impact of our actions on the environment?

In the developer;s sustainability assessment, they claim that their plans address ;the core principles of sustainability, national planning policy and the High Peak Local Plan Adopted in April 2016.; This claim is made despite the widespread and largescale removal of a significant number of trees and the complete destruction of the ecological character of the area. As such, we find this statement farcical. It should also be noted that the ;Ecological Management Plan; offered by the developers glibly glosses over the destruction of tens of trees in stating ;a small amount of the woodland will also be lost, [sic] this is considered to be a habitat of great ecological importance, only a small number of trees are proposed to be removed and the future management of the woodland proposed with the development will benefit the habitat.; We would not deem the casual removal of a huge number of veteran trees under a preservation order from mature woodlands in a conservation area ;a small amount; which will somehow ;benefit; the environment! Whilst there may be a need for some management within the current woodland, there is a vast difference between such pruning and the decimation of existing stock for the purpose of housing. The developer;s suggestion of some ;ornamental planting; composed of shrubs and trees; on site is nothing more than a weak attempt to disguise the harm that will be done by their activities and simply cannot replace ancient woodland.

In conclusion, the proposed development should be immediately rejected as contravening the National Planning Policy Framework;s regulations on Habitants and Diversity (175[c]):

Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.

Further support for rejection of the proposals can be discerned from Policy EQ 9 of the Local Plan which sets out the requirement that existing woodlands, healthy, mature trees and hedgerows are retained and integrated within a proposed development unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh their loss.

The Council also promises to adopt a strategy resisting development that would directly or indirectly damage existing ancient woodland, veteran trees and ancient or species-rich hedgerows. Their loss is poorly compensated for in the submitted plans and the development cannot be said to be of such unique importance that tree removal should be countenanced regardless.

The plans submitted by Glossop Eden Ltd. to construct 24 houses in exchange for the removal of protected trees is not covered by any such exceptional reasons; and any such measures put forward by this company for management of the environment will in no way redress the harm done to mature woodlands which have developed over a lengthy period in a conservation area bordering the Grade II listed St. James' Church (whose own outlook will be entirely transformed out of keeping with the distinctive heritage of the area).

Amenities and Facilities

The submission of this proposal continues a disturbing trend within Glossop of greenlighting planning applications whilst simultaneously neglecting to invest in or expand the necessary local infrastructure. We have already detailed the inevitable impact on highways and pollution, but it remains for us to point out the contribution of this site (in tandem with a multitude of other sites awarded planning permission for major developments) on already oversubscribed local amenities such as doctors, surgeries and primary and secondary schools. Consultation of the developers' plans makes it clear that the proposed houses may hold up to 85 people, a considerable number of new residents which will naturally place extra strain on the already overstretched services. For instance, the High Peak Local Plan identified a specific need for additional school places; a need noted even prior to the approval of other large housing sites within Glossop over the last few years such as North Road and Charlestown Road. This need was of course crystallised in 2019 when a shortage of secondary school placements received considerable media attention. Further developments like that proposed at Red Court will simply throw fuel on the fire in regard to such challenges.

We are aware that the developers do not intend to provide any affordable housing. The High Peak Local Plan sets out 30% as the appropriate provision of such residences on a site of this size in order to address housing deficiencies in the area. It seems clear that no such affordability criteria are to be considered and the project is instead an exercise in profit and contravene Policy H4 of the Local Plan. Such proposals go nowhere to satisfy the 'sustainable, decent and affordable' promise designated a 'key aim' in the Local Plan (5.137) as regards the Spatial Strategy and heavily emphasised in the National Planning policy.

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>

