

From: Steven Gunn-Russell <Stevengr@whitepeakplanning.co.uk>

Sent: 15 December 2022 16:43

To: Niall Mellan <Niall.Mellan@houriganplanning.com>

Cc: Emily Wentworth <EmilyW@whitepeakplanning.co.uk>

Subject: HPK/2022/0456 Land at Dinting Vale

Dear Niall,

Thank you for our meeting on Monday. Apologies again for the poor acoustics, this has now been resolved. Further to our meeting I attach below some of the key information we require with regard to consultation responses received. Please note the below is not exclusive and any response should also take into account informal feedback provided at the pre-response meeting along with further consultation responses uploaded onto the council's planning application webpage.

Procedural issues

Description of development - The description does not mention the proposed new highway junction. Are you happy that the reference to 'associated works' covers this?

Layout/ Plans

Plans submitted do not accurately show the updated outline of adjacent properties at Shallow Fold/ Curley Way, or Alderley Place including Avenue Cottage, and Woodside View. A number of these properties have recent extensions and this information is required to assess aspect distances between existing and proposed dwellings, particularly around the west/ north west parts of the site. Further to this it would be helpful if you can provide a plan showing aspect distances annotated on the plan.

The cross sections provided are inadequate as they do not fully show the relationship between the proposed development and surrounding buildings. The cross sections should be extended to include the nearest buildings on Dinting Vale (the main road), Avenue Cottage, and Shallow Fold. Sections 1-3 should be clearly marked on Locator 1:2. Also, it is unclear what the dashed line represents. Additionally, a curved cross section should be provided to show the gradient of the proposed highway access from Dinting Vale (the main road) and where this transcends the PROW.

I also note that numerous plots appear to have narrow aspect distances between them, particularly on corner sections.

Planning Policy

May I refer you to the consultation response from HPBC Development Services received on 24/11/2022.

Wildlife

May I refer you to the consultation response from Derbyshire Wildlife Trust received on 01/12/2022.

In particular Derbyshire Wildlife Trust has requested the following key information:

- Updated habitat survey information
- Biodiversity metric

- Net Gain Plan

The Countryside Service has concerns on the interaction between the development and the woodland boundary. There is insufficient detail in the development proposal to determine the risk of damage to trees on the woodland edge or how the development plans to mitigate any damage. A further report adhering to BS5837 is required to enable the development to be considered in respect of the woodland. The report should include a survey of all trees which are likely to be impacted upon by the proposed development, with details and categorisation results provided in an appropriate schedule (please see detailed comments from Place – Countryside Services as provided on 28/11/2022).

It is essential that the habitats on site are accurately classified as this will impact the figures in the BNG calculations. Justification for the habitat classifications in the BNG Assessment is requested, including full species lists and a figure showing the locations of quadrats and plot references referred to in the condition assessments.

Currently the proposed drainage strategy is comprised entirely of below ground measures, with no attenuation basins, swales, ponds etc. We strongly recommend that drainage solutions should create above ground features, which can provide the dual benefits for both drainage and biodiversity. These should be designed in appropriate locations and integrated within green infrastructure to provide access for wildlife.

With regards to the Boundary Details - Drawing No. HDVBTD01 – there appears to be no provision of gaps to allow for the movement of small wild animals, supported by wildlife policies.

Trees/ Arboricultural

May I refer you to the consultation response from HPBC Arboricultural Tree Officer Craig McCrindle received on 24/11/2022 and 28/11/2022.

In particular amendments are required to avoid affecting high quality trees, and submit new tree plan showing clear identification of numbered trees, tree grade, and which trees will be removed or maintained.

Much of this tree removal comes from the necessity to create the access road into the site and the need to clear space for that. Has the applicant considered that the access road could come off the existing access to Adderley Place. This solution would greatly reduce the impact on the number of trees needing to be removed and reduces the number of junctions on Dinting Vale. Current proposals show that 106 trees will be planted with additional shrubs and hedgerows. This proposal falls exceptionally well short of the required figure, whilst the replacements will also fail dramatically in their ability to recreate the lost habitats, benefits and niches provided by the current woodlands.

Additionally, the exclusion of street trees contradicts current best practice and government guidance, which can be partly mitigated by incorporating the existing relatively linear stretch of trees across the centre of the site to be retained within the proposed streetscene. Furthermore, there needs to be a buffer included in the scheme between the rear gardens of the proposed properties and the start of the woodlands. This should be 10 metres. This would allow for a mature branch spread and only small overhangs to the gardens.

Drainage

We are awaiting a response from the consultee for this topic area.

Archaeology

May I refer you to the consultation response from the Archaeologist consultation response from Steve Baker received on 23/11/2022.

In particular the proposal site crosses a record on Derbyshire HER (MDR11569) for the Roman road and that there may be two alignments. The application therefore requires archaeological field evaluation to establish archaeological significance and impact across the site in line with NPPF para 194. An appropriate non-intrusive geophysical technique (perhaps GPR or earth resistance) should be carried out across the whole site insofar as it is accessible, but this will also need supplementing with trial trenching to establish hard and fast data on preservation and levels.

PROW

It is unclear how the existing PROW will be protected/ maintained as part of the development.

Housing Design & Landscaping

We are awaiting a response from the consultee for this topic area.

Highways

This will be looked at separately, and we are awaiting a further response from Highways.

Meanwhile, I can emphasise the following:

Access - The plans appear to show the 'hamlet' at Alderley Place would be cut off from the highway network in terms of vehicular access? Vehicular access should be maintained for these residents in addition to at least one pedestrian footpath alongside this section of the PROW.

Access - It is noted that there are three cul-de-sac heads close to the east boundary with the remainder of the housing allocation site. These should be designed to allow access to allow future housing expansion to the rest of the housing allocation site for example with no obstruction from the boundaries of private gardens, and positioned to prevent the necessity of removing trees.

Place / Sustainable Travel - Provision should be included for a route for non-motorized green travel of a continuous, pedestrian/cycle/horse riding route provided at a width of at least 3 metres and preferably segregated away from vehicular access within an overall 5 metre corridor. Similar cycle provision should also be provided, including a route to Dinting Vale separate from any vehicular access.

Transport - Rail

May I refer you to the consultation response from Network Rail received on 06/12/2022.

In particular the design and layout of proposals should take into consideration and mitigate against existing usage of the operational railway and any future increase in usage of the said existing operational railway.

Cycle access

a separate cycle access should be provided between Dining Vale (the main road) and the upper sections of the site so that cyclists are not dependent on using the relatively steep proposed highway access with its sharp bends, supported by NPPF principles.

Equestrian access

May I refer you to the consultation response from British Horse Society dated 23/11/2022, from Wendy Bannerman Access Field Officer East and West Midlands.

In particular the NPPF para 100 states: "Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails" therefore the potential route of the Pennine Bridleway is to the developer's advantage here.

The highlighted area in the copy of the Site Layout plan (attached) shows the route that would be most appropriate to help link the Pennine Bridleway, avoiding the increasingly busy roads.

Environmental Health

May I refer you to the consultation response from Environmental Health received on 23/11/2022.

In particular the submitted site layout plan (Proposed Site Layout, ref: WH/DV/PSL/01, dated 14 June 2022) needs to resubmitted, to make it absolutely clear where acoustic fencing is proposed (use of an alternate colour is suggested).

Place/ Strategic Infrastructure

May I refer you to the consultation response from DCC Place received on 08/11/2022 and 28/11/2022.

In particular, I can emphasise the following:

Education - In particular there is insufficient capacity at primary school to accommodate the increase in pupils forecast to be generated by this proposed development and if the development itself cannot enable the necessary provision, the County Council wishes to highlight that the proposed development may not provide for a sustainable form of development.

Waste - New developments should be provided with a convenient means of waste management, including access to a Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) offering suitable facilities for re-use, recycling and disposal.

Health/ Social Care - Some of the 1-bed provision should be delivered either as bungalows, to ensure users with less mobility or with visual impairments (typically older demographic households) can access level living. Provision of flats alone is considered to be insufficient given the lack of outdoor private amenity space and typical younger demographic.

Health

May I refer you to the consultation response from Derby & Derbyshire NHS Trust received on 25/11/2022.

Leisure & Recreation

May I refer you to the consultation response from Service Commissioning Leisure & Recreation received on 06/12/2022.

In particular I also note that the existing access from Swallow Fold is not shown on the Linkages Plan, which can provide pedestrian access to a potential play area on-site integrated for the additional benefit residential areas to the south.

May I refer you to the consultation response from Trans Pennine Trail and Sustrans received on 24/11/2022.

In particular the council is requesting on site play provision in the form of a LEAP, and expect to see the on-site play area integral to the design and layout, ideally located centrally with properties facing on to it, providing good casual supervision, It should have good walking access links from all parts of the development, potentially linked to adjacent existing housing via Swallow Fold. The development should address the principles of the 'Active Design Guidance'.

Crime & Safety

May I refer you to the consultation response from Derbyshire Police received on 25/11/2022.

In particular one objector has pointed out that the site boundary is close to Holy Trinity Dinting Cricket Club. Has there been any thought around the safety aspect of hard cricket balls which could not only damage properties but could also injure people if they happened to be hit over the boundary?

Additionally a number of comments were received relating to natural surveillance of the street with regard to specific plot numbers.

Utilities

May I refer you to the consultation response from United Utilities received on 28/11/2022.

Vitality & Viability

We are awaiting a response from the consultee for this topic area.

The above is not exclusive and any response should take into account informal feedback provided at the pre-response meeting along with formal consultation responses uploaded onto the council's planning application webpage.

Please can you provide amended plans by the close of 22nd December 2022.

Kind regards,
Steven

Steven Gunn-Russell
Senior Planning Consultant
BA(Hons), DipTP, MRTPI

E: Stevengr@whitepeakplanning.co.uk

T: 0845 034 7321

M: 07706 325799

W: www.whitepeakplanning.co.uk



Didsbury Business Centre, 137 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester M20 2PW

This email is sent for and on behalf of White Peak Planning Limited which is a private limited company, registered in England and Wales, registered number 08271631. Registered address 26 Parsonage Road, Manchester M20 4PE

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication you should destroy it without copying, disclosing or otherwise using its contents. Please notify the sender immediately of the error. Internet communications are not necessarily secure and may be intercepted or changed after they are sent. We do not accept liability for any such changes. If you wish to confirm the origin or content of this communication, please contact the sender using an alternative means of communication. This communication does not create or modify any contract.