

From:
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Cc: [Hannah Varley](#)
Subject: Comments on DOC/2023/0092
Date: 23 January 2024 14:00:14

I wish these comments to be added to DOC/2023/0092.

Application Reference No. : DOC/2023/0092

Site Address: **ALPORT HOUSE, Brookside, Simmondley, Glossop, Derbyshire, SK13 8HP**

Comments by: Kate Raine

From: Longclough Drive, Simmondley, Glossop

Submission: objection

Comments:

I am making these comments for the public record, as I know public comments are automatically dismissed for discharge of conditions applications.

You claim application HPK/2022/0471 is a new 'STAND ALONE APPLICATION' yet the documents that have been submitted for this discharge of conditions relate to the whole site as covered by approved applications - HPK/2021/0081 and APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 of HPK/2016/0416.

The site as marked out on the official plans for HPK/2022/0471 (plots 1 and 2) is that including and immediately surrounding plot 6 of HPK/2021/0081 and APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 of HPK/2016/0416. If this is NOT a variation under section 73 of the Town and County Planning Act, why do you continue to validate and consider documents that cover and use the whole site in approved applications - HPK/2021/0081 and APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 of HPK/2016/0416?

I still have very serious concerns about the construction management method statement and construction management plan both the original (CMS 001 REV A) and amended (CMS 001 REV B).

Construction Method Statement

This appears to be the standard construction management plan that this developer uses for all its sites.

I was informed by enforcement in Oct 2023 that the sentence '2. During the majority of the construction period the loading of plant and materials will be carried out as per the site plan that accompanies this statement', makes this statement unenforceable. I suggest this sentence gets amended to prevent this method statement from being completely worthless. I would suggest a change to '2. During the entire development period...' as this would seem fair for the developer to set up the site appropriately during the pre-development period and provide protection to local residents during the development period by allowing enforcement.

Construction Management Plans

CMS 001 REV A – This was unacceptable due to the fact the unloading area was marked over the top of the tree protection area in front of plots 1-4 (which technically should not even be included in this plan, as it is outside the site of HPK/2022/0471 and would represent a variation to the plan in HPK/2021/0081 and APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 of HPK/2016/0416, which is not being considered in this application).

CMS 001 REV B – I note this amended construction management plan has been submitted. Is this plan a total replacement of REV A? i.e. REV A is no longer valid?

This new amended plan is also flawed. The new hatched areas are marked as 'vehicle turning and contractor and visitor parking'. They have erased all unloading and storage areas. Where are they proposing to unload and store material? Does this mean you are going to officially allow them to unload in the street across the public footpath, like you have for the last year?

A year on and with 4 of the 6 (7) houses nearly complete and plots 5 and 6 (and 7/plots 1 and 2) started, there are still no usable access points on to any part of the site (applications HPK/2021/0081 and APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 of HPK/2016/0416 and HPK/2022/0471). It is still physically impossible for them to comply with the plan CMS 001 REV B.

I wish to note that this application was submitted after conditions 15 and 16 were refused on DOC/2023/0061. This was submitted under a different description. I suspect in an attempt to hide it. You also decided not to publish the documents, as legally required, and it was only after I requested their publication that they were published on the 9/1/2024.

It is shocking that you continue not to enforce the construction management plan for applications HPK/2021/0081 and APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 of HPK/2016/0416 (DOC/2023/0002) despite complaints to Planning Enforcement, DCC Highways and a formal complaint to yourselves. You will not even acknowledge the continued dangerous practice of unloading heavy goods in the street and over the public footpath.

It would be shameful if you were to use this 'stand alone application' to provide a variation to the whole site. The site to be considered in this application should only be that immediately surrounding plots 1 and 2 of HPK/2022/0471 (otherwise being called plots 6 and 7). As a 'stand alone application' the construction management plan and method statement should only involve this site. The plan should be workable, physically possible and enforceable.

You will be setting a very dangerous precedent for future problematic sites, if you knowingly allow these developers free license to do whatever they please for the sake of development.