
From:
Sent: 02 July 2023 10:35
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: Sarah Bott

From:
5 Adderley Place

GLOSSOP

SK13 6PA

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: We would like to object to the application HPK/2022/0456 based on the following points -

1. Access for Chinley Apartments - the redesign shows the apartments take access directly from PROW50 and NOT the new access road. The design shows no proposals for traffic management. There is no indication as to hierarchy usage for all lane users. The plan shows parking for 9 spaces. Although they are 1 bedroom apartments a couple living there could potentially have 2 vehicles, 12 spaces therefore could be required this is not inclusive of visitor parking.. There is no provision outlined for extra vehicles - including visitors. We are concerned that parking will over-spill onto the existing parking spaces for the residents of Adderley Place and will also cause congestion potentially blocking access to our property. As PROW is the only access to our property, a right which is written into our deeds, we are concerned about the increase in traffic on this part of the footpath. The footpath is used daily by walkers, children going to school etc. Extra traffic will further restrict the use of the footpath for all users.

2. Adderley Place - PROW50 - traffic management this is one of the major issues with the development which has not been addressed in the redesign. The proposal shows no consideration as to how the existing lane will be used by residents of the new housing estate or in fact anybody wanting to escape the regular long traffic queues on the A57. There is no traffic management to prevent any vehicle accessing the new estate or Simmondley via PROW50. Anybody in Glossop knows that the A57 is renowned for long traffic queues. Any vehicle sitting in traffic on the A57 will be able to exit the A57 via the new access road, travel along PROW50 onto Simmondley Lane and onward. The FOOTPATH is clearly not suitable and CANNOT be made suitable for this amount of traffic. PROW50 is not suitable for significant increase in vehicular traffic. The lane is currently maintained by the residents of Adderley Place. In August 2014 the High Peak Local Plan Submission stated 'it is understood that vehicular rights of access are only permitted in any case for the residents of Adderley Place and the scout hut.' This lack of consideration imposes significant risk for anyone using the lane (PROW50) not only residents of Adderley Place but also the many pedestrians that use the footpath.

3. Derbyshire Wildlife Trust - they have submitted further comments regarding the new proposal. They state after reviewing the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Version 4 (Tetra Tech, May 2023) they have multiple concerns about this assessment.

' Based on the original TEP report and the visit undertaken by DWT, it is

possible that areas of the site could be classed as 'lowland meadow', 'other acid

grassland' or even 'rush pasture'. Wainhomes have not provided sufficient data to suggest that this is not the case. They also state that the mitigation proposals by Wainhomes do not offset the loss of rare species and habitats.

' The site qualifies as a Local Wildlife Site based on one of the
bird criteria and is clearly valuable to local bird populations.'

'The site qualifies as a Local Wildlife Site based on three separate
invertebrate criteria (only one criteria needs to be met to qualify).'

The requirements of the NPPF 2021, states that local authorities
should apply the following principle (amongst others) when determining a planning application:
'a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through
locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last
resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused'.

4. Number of houses - whilst the number of houses has been reduced by a total of 8, the size of the houses has also been altered. 2 bedroom houses have been reduced and the 3 bed houses have increased significantly. If one bedroom = 1 occupant the overall occupancy is only reduced by 10 people, going from 268 to 258 people. If houses are occupied by couples with children and all bedroom spaces used this would equate to 350 people. This is a maximum, reports such as the NHS 'Response to Planning Application' 30/6/23 is requesting funding based on 230 extra patients, in reality this could in fact range from 230- 350 extra patients.

5. Arboricultural Response 30/6/23 - states

'...the applicant's own arboricultural consultant, who confirms the following in their Impact Assessment:'

¿The development would give rise to adverse effects that cannot be mitigated. It would not be possible to fully replace the trees and woodland that would be removed within the site in accordance with local policy, by total area, or in terms of the functions they currently provide. It would also cause fragmentation of Deciduous Woodland'

It is stated that the development does meet policies EQ1, EQ2, EQ5 and EQ9 of the Local Plan.

6. DCC Archaeological Response 22/6/23 states that they maintain an objection as per previous comments, because there is...

'still insufficient information to understand significance and impact in relation to potentially nationally important archaeological remains'

In conclusion, the redesign does not address our comments- in our previous objection, including the impact on wider infrastructure issues such as school places, services and additional traffic congestion. The number of agencies requesting additional information/data etc shows that this land and local area is not appropriate for this development. This development SHOULD NOT be looked at in isolation when considering infrastructure. There are other housing developments in locally which will also impact and compound these issues.

Dinting School DO NOT have places for extra children, regardless of what the developer states in their Final LPA document. As a deputy head of a local school I know that the schools outlined in the proposal as suitable schools do not have the places available as stated.

This proposal 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>
