



**FPCR Environment and Design Ltd
For High Peak Borough Council**

July 2023

Alderley Place, Dinting Vale, Glossop

FPCR REVIEW 2 – JUNE 2023 SUBMISSION

A review of the new application has been undertaken – specifically in relation to Reason for Refusal 10. Comments are provided here which highlight the main concerns. House types and street scenes have not yet been reviewed in any detail given the time constraints though it is noted that a new set of house types have been used with some complying to the M4(2) standard, which is welcomed. A sketch markup is attached to this note to aid further discussions.

Local Planning Policy

In Reason for Refusal 10. Design, HPBC's Local Plan policies S1, S5, EQ2, EQ5 are referenced as conflicting with the previously proposed development. Of particular note are the following bullet points taken from these policies:

“

- *Policy S1 extract:*
Taking account of the distinct Peak District character, landscape, townscape, roles and setting of different areas and settlements in the High Peak;
- *Policy S5 extract:*
Ensuring that development protects and/or enhances landscape character and the setting of the Peak District National Park
- *Policy EQ2 extract:*
Requiring that development proposals protect and/or enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape and landscape setting of the Peak District National Park
- *Policy EQ5 extract:*
Identifying local ecological networks and supporting their establishment and protection in accordance with Local Plan Policy EQ8

“

Policy EQ8 noted in the policy EQ5 extract above includes:

“

Requiring that development will not have a detrimental effect on the amount or function of existing green infrastructure unless replacement provision is made that is considered to be of equal or greater value than that lost through development; taking particular account of appropriate levels of mitigation where development would result in habitat fragmentation.

“

Some materiality choices have clearly been influenced by the local character which is positive. However, little other consideration has been given to the distinct local landscape and architectural character. The ecological green links proposed are disconnected and thus do not work – they need joining up to connect the woodlands surrounding the site and include new tree planting within.

In addition, it is felt that, on first glance, the proposed development fails to meet HPBC's Local Plan *Policy EQ6 Design and Place Making*. Amongst a number of bullet points, this policy states that:

“

All development should be well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to both its environment and the challenge of climate change, whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place.

This will be achieved by:

- Requiring that development on the edge of settlement is of high quality design that protects, enhances and / or restores landscape character...

“

HPBC's Local Plan Interactive Map shows that this site is on the western edge of the settlement boundary of Glossop. Thought should be given to the proposed design and character of the western edge. A suggested section is sketched in the attached markup.

“

- Requiring that developments are easy to move through and around...

“

The revised street network is convoluted and provides no street hierarchy or street character which limits the ability of the development to create a 'sense of place' or help users in wayfinding. It is also questionable whether the private drives are sufficiently setback from parking spaces to ensure cars can reverse into/ out of them – typically 6m is required. There also seems to be little to no visitor parking which will cause indiscriminate parking that is likely to inhibit movement through the site.

“

- Ensuring that development takes account of national design guidance and Supplementary Planning Documents

“

One of the most relevant SPD's is HPBC's *Residential Design*. FPCR provided comment on the previously submitted proposals in relation to this SPD. These have largely been ignored and so should be reviewed against the new development afresh. The revised Design and Access Statement is broadly the same and contains a few discrepancies between what is shown on other drawings with regards to proposed materials and detailing. The Design Evolution Statement is welcomed and helpful though it falls short of responding to all comments. A table of responses to FPCR comments made should be provided to clarify how the development can address the concerns raised.

One key concern is the apparent lack of any material variety on the Hardstanding Plan. It is unclear what 'black tarmac with stone setts' means. This should be explained. Regardless, streets need breaking up with alternative materials such as at junctions, 'squares', or areas of traffic calming. The block paving for the PRoW is welcome but it is unclear what this is i.e. colour, material type, surface finish. Hoggins should be avoided for paths.

Regarding the northernmost area of the proposals, a commitment to replanting the engineered slopes is welcomed as this will, in time, provide a visual screen of the rear gardens/ acoustic fence on the northern edge. A maintenance plan for the landscaping here should be conditioned to ensure this new planting reaches maturity.

National Planning Policy

Of particular relevance is paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (revised 20 July 2021), which states that:

“

Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined...

“

The tree pit in wider path solution proposed misunderstands FPCR's previous suggestion for large areas of frontal parking. See the attached sketch markup. The proposed solution is not practical and is also overly expensive. Street trees should generally be located in a designated verge, min. 2m wide. This could be to both sides of the street for the primary street, just one side of the street to secondary streets (or within well designed 'squares' utilising tree pits to save space). Tertiary streets on layout edges could be left facing the existing woodland/ proposed POS surrounding.

LVIA (LVA) Review

It appears that the same LVIA (LVA) report prepared by TPM has been submitted, albeit updated to reflect details of the amended scheme. Therefore, our review, dated January 2023, remains unchanged.

It is acknowledged that the TPM methodology has been provided however the report fails to come to clear and transparent judgements on sensitivity/ susceptibility/ magnitude of change and resulting overall effects – including long term effects (15 years) – upon receptors which is expected for a landscape and visual appraisal (refer to paragraph 1.11 of GLVIA3). Furthermore, where effects are mentioned within the report, they do not follow the terminology in the TPM methodology provided. An assessment of landscape value in accordance with TGN 02/21 (criteria included within the TPM methodology) is not transparently set out within the report which would provide a more robust assessment.

Assessment tables, while good practice and helpful, aren't essential, similarly it is good practice to set out the photographic viewpoints in line with LI TGN 06/19 but again not essential.

Incidentally, it is noted within the *rebuttal notes* (points 5 and 7) that the report is an LVA (which we agree it should be) and not an LVIA yet is entitled 'Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal' on the front cover.

WESTERN EDGE

CONSISTENT FRONTAGE
ALONG MAIN STREET

POSITIVES

- PROW CROSSING
- RELOCATION OF APARTMENTS
- IMPROVEMENTS TO PROW

AREAS TO IMPROVE

- CONNECTED ECOLOGY "GREEN LINKS"
- CONSISTENT & GENEROUS DESIGN TO WESTERN EDGE (SEE SECTION)
- STREET HIERARCHY + CHARACTER
- FRONTAGE TO SOUTH SIDE OF PROW
- APPROPRIATE USE OF TREE PITS AS PART OF "SQUARE" DESIGN
- OTHERWISE TREES IN DESIGNATED VERGES
- TRAFFIC CALMING EG. RAISED TABLES OR RUMBLE STRIPS INSTEAD OF CONVOLUTED ROUTE
- PREFERABLY AVOID FRONTAGE PARKING ALONG MAIN STREET TO REDUCE VEHICLE DOMINANCE IN MOST PUBLIC AREA

Revision	By	Date
A	MB	27.09.22
B	MB	08.02.23
C	MB	18.03.23
D	MB	22.03.23
E	MB	30.03.23

Salldwin Design

Client

Project Title

Address

Drawing Title

Drawing No

Scale

Proposed Development

Dinting Vale, Glossop

BDC Colour Site Layout

WH/DV/CSL/01

1:500

Drawn

MB

14/06/2022

Checked

CC

Date

14/06/2022

Paper Size

A1

Rev

E

DINTING VALE, GLOSSOP

0 10 20 30 40 50

METRES (0.000)