
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 16 March 2023 20:39
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : HPK/2023/0025 Site Address: Land South of Hollin Cross Lane Glossop Derbyshire SK13 8JH Glossop Comments by: Mary Moss

From:

8
Slatelands Road
Howard Town
Glossop

SK13 6LH

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: We write to object to the above re-submitted planning application.

Our previous objection centred upon the lack of affordable housing in the application. We note that this has been addressed by the provision of two one-bed-roomed apartments, one of which will be rental. However, of 24 units, 15 will be three or four-bedroomed properties. This does not seem to us to be proportionate, and not what this area of Glossop needs.

We also disagree with the conclusion that the removal of so many trees is acceptable and that the proposed plans for re-planting will sufficiently compensate.

We are seriously concerned about the Japanese Knotweed in the area, specifically that the proposed development will facilitate the spread of Knotweed, causing damage to existing properties and lowering the value of property.

There does not seem to have been any serious attention given to the issue of traffic on surrounding streets, in particular the junction of Slatelands Road with Hollin Cross Lane where it is often difficult to make a safe exit, and the lack of a pavement on the Slatelands Road bend which makes the proposed new access road unsafe for the many pedestrians, including many young children, and cyclists who use the road.

I repeat below the content of our previous objection:

¿The site is described as 'brownfield'. We understand this term is used to describe land which has previously been developed, and possibly used for industrial purposes that has left it potentially contaminated. The vast majority of

the site has not been built on previously and we would consider it to be woodland, with trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders. It is clearly not a 'brownfield' site. We raised this question when we responded to the consultation, but received no reply. The documents from the developers also refer to the site as woodland, and any picture of the site will show you how small a space the current buildings occupy compared with the new proposals.

The development would greatly increase traffic on and around Slatelands Road. We understand that 17 new dwellings are proposed to be accessed from Slatelands Road, and more than 30 parking spaces are provided to serve these dwellings. We believe that the calculation in the application of only 8 or 9 two way vehicle trips is far too low. There are likely to be many more peak time journeys than this and a substantial increase in traffic throughout the day. Exiting onto Hollin Cross Lane and from the top of Slatelands Road will cause significant additional traffic issues as the area is busy at all times, but especially at school opening and closing times, at least four times a day, when many additional cars are parked on Pikes Lane and surrounding streets, and a large number of people walk their small children along these busy streets. The same problem arises when the church is in use. Cars are always parked on corners which mean exiting blind onto Hollin Cross/Pikes Lane and from Hollin Cross onto Victoria Street/Charlestown Road. The developer's observations regarding low levels of traffic were certainly not made at school run time. They also seem to assume that people only drive to and from their houses very rarely. DCC are aware that the exit from Slatelands Road onto Hollin Cross Lane is sub-standard. We believe it would be dangerous for yet more traffic to have to use this junction.

We are advised that government guidance on street design, contained in the Manual for Streets, advises that street networks should be 'connected and permeable'. Cul de sacs should be planned for with caution as they 'may concentrate traffic impact on a small number of dwellings'. (MfS 4.5.7). Slatelands Road and Slatelands Avenue already constitute a cul de sac since the barrier at the Turnlee Road end was erected. The new development would greatly increase the total length of the cul de sac and proportionately, greatly increase the number of houses within it. It appears to have no turning area, which should be provided (MfS 6.8.3). Refuse vehicles and other large vehicles will have to reverse far longer distances than at present, where reversing distances already exceed recommended safe distances (BS 5906:2005). We have lived in two houses on Slatelands Road at either end, over more than 20 years, and can testify to many occasions when rubbish has not been collected because the trucks were unable to get up and down the road. Similarly, the road is not gritted in icy or snowy conditions, and the steep hill and sharp bend where the access road is located, are dangerous to navigate. In winter, the new development will create additional hazards on that difficult corner.

The consultation undertaken by Indigo on behalf of Eden Land/Glossop Eden Ltd was cursory and unsatisfactory. We received no response to our email. I think many local residents understand the need to redevelop the Redcourt site, but that does not need to mean cutting down woodland and making the streets more dangerous. We raised the question of the ongoing management of the public spaces in the new development, and are still concerned about how that might be managed in the future.

We understand that the National Planning Policy Framework guides the decisions of the Planning Committee. We do not feel that this application meets the objectives, in particular failing to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being. We do not believe this proposal is well-designed, or safe.

We are not satisfied that the current proposal adequately addresses the requirements of the Conservation area and will do harm to the area.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Moss and Peter Allen

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>
