

12th August 2019

HPBC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

UPDATES SHEET

HPK/2017/0534 – Land off Hayfield Road, New Mills

DCC Education Officer Comments

The most up to date position regarding school capacity was been provided in the DCC letter dated 15/05/2019 in response to the re-consultation on HPK/2017/0534. This response still stands and is in accordance with the County Council's Developer Contributions Protocol which was approved by Cabinet and provides the basis of any requests for contributions to mitigate the impact of the development.

It is noted that the applicant has provided a number of responses to counter DCC's request for contributions towards the provision of primary places at the normal area primary school Thornsett Primary. The DCC response however remains in accordance with the approved protocol which provides a consistency of approach across the county.

DCC Highway Officer Comments

It is recommended that the proposed junction with Hayfield Road is formed using a 10m entry, as well as exit, radius. There are anomalies between the details (i.e. a 10m exit radius is shown on at least one of the drawings but not others), however, it's suggested that this revision is unlikely to prove a material amendment in planning terms and may be resolved as a part of the detailed design at Constructional Approval stage.

It is noted that there are proposals to enhance/ improve crossing facilities for the Sett Valley Trail. Again, it's suggested that the detailed design for this may be resolved at Constructional Approval stage and include for extending the 3.0m to the access to the Sett Valley Trail east of the site and improvements for crossing in the vicinity of Derby Road.

It is also noted that the local refuse collection service are satisfied with the proposals for their purposes. It's comforting to note that collections for multiple dwellings will be made from points located remote from the highway and thereby reduce the likelihood of accumulations of waste bins obstructing the footway. However, whilst placing waste bins in the footway may be acceptable and convenient for the collection service, as stated previously, identifying the footway for this purpose still represents acceptance of obstructions being located within the proposed highway, a situation that should not be necessary in a new build estate and one the Highway Authority cannot condone. Again, it is recommended that the views of the local access group are sought with respect to this issue.

The swept paths of Large Refuse Vehicle bodies pass over land beyond the rear of margin on the turning facilities of the two cul-de-sacs to the north of the proposed 'spine road'. All areas required for manoeuvring should be within proposed highway and it's recommended that a 400mm width margin is allowed to any potential constraints. It's recommended that the layout is modified to suit.

The private driveway serving Plots 24 – 26 is poorly aligned with the proposed turning facility. The layout should be modified in order that the driveway is located at 90° to the rear of footway and not require vehicles to be driven for a considerable distance along the footway.

Trees located in advance of the forward visibility sightlines, i.e. that on the frontage of Plot 42, will require species to be approved at Constructional Approval stage and a commuted Sum secured for future maintenance. The tree fronting Plot 70 is beyond the proposed highway and should be conditioned to be of a species unlikely to obstruct the sightline with the crown height being maintained in future.

There should be no proposed vertical deflection within the proposed adopted carriageways. The accesses adjacent to Plots 44 & 49 serving the private road between them should take the form of dropped kerb crossings of the footway. Any changes in level to delineate change in nature of a road should be within the proposed footways adjacent to transition strips. You may consider that these issues can be resolved at S38 Constructional Approval stage.

It is been advised previously that all dwellings should be located within the maximum recommended mancarry distance of 25m from a turning facility demonstrated as being suitable for use by a typical supermarket delivery type vehicle e.g. Plots 1, 15, 26, 96, etc. appear to be well in excess of such distance – the consequences likely to be awkward or over-long reversing manoeuvres on shared driveways, situations considered against the best interests of safety for the more vulnerable uses of the routes.

Full design details of any structures required to support the proposed highway (e.g. Plot 77) will need to be submitted for review and approval by the Highway Authority (again, you may consider it reasonable for this to be carried out at Constructional Approval stage) although support of the proposed highway should not be reliant on 'flag on edge' whether immediately adjacent or located a short distance beyond the proposed highway boundary (e.g. Plot 29).

The entire frontage of Plot 41 between the proposed highway boundary and dwelling should be conditioned to be maintained clear of all obstructions in order to maximise exit visibility from the vehicular access serving the same property”.

Applicant Comments

1. An updated Site Section B – B and C – C Rev A has been submitted.
2. An updated Boundary Treatments Plan Rev K has been submitted.
3. An updated Materials Layout Rev J has been submitted.

With regard to the highways comments, we comment as follows:

- The 10m radius at the access is not necessary for the left turn entry as shown by the swept paths on drawing ATR02, however the larger radius is achievable and SCP has agreed with DCC that this can be dealt with post-planning, as can the Sett Valley Trail improvements.
- On the bin collection points within each plot, we understood that DCC had agreed that this could be dealt with under a condition for the bin collection strategy. DCC was to provide some examples to justify this request but we have not received anything to date. Our view remains that these points should not be necessary but this can be dealt with by condition.
- The swept paths in the northern turning head are both achieved within the sections of the turning heads to be adopted. We do not consider the additional margin requested to be necessary but notwithstanding this it can be picked up as part of the detail design post-planning.
- With regard to the private driveway serving plots 24-26, pedestrian and traffic movements at this point will be extremely low; this footway leads only to the private drive area where a separate footway is not necessary. The layout is therefore considered acceptable as shown.
- It is accepted that planting within visibility splays would be restricted to a height that will not cause an obstruction to visibility, to be dealt with at detailed design stage.
- It is also accepted that the vertical deflection and dropped kerbs can be dealt with at detailed design stage.
- There is no requirement that all plots should be within 25m of the highway; this carry distance relates to refuse collection and bin stores are proposed within 25m of the highway to be adopted.
- It is accepted that any structures can be dealt with at detail design post-planning, as can the comment on the frontage of Plot 41.

In summary the comments in the response from DCC can be dealt with post-planning as part of the detailed design”.

Officer Comments

An updated Site Section B – B and C – C Rev A has been submitted. Section C – C illustrates the site levels relationship of plot 3 and 4 with the embankment and access road. It shows that there would be no adverse impact amenity impacts concerning this aspect of the scheme.

An updated Boundary Treatments Plan Rev K has been submitted. This shows the retention of the drystone wall to the southern boundary of the application site. An additional planning condition will be required to secure the implementation of the boundary treatment plan. As well, a planning condition has already been recommended in the officer report concerning the repair and maintenance of the dry stone walling to be retained.

An updated Materials Layout Rev J has been submitted. It shows a Marley ‘Eternit’ Slate Grey 18mm concrete tile. The officer report confirms that a good quality

artificial slate tile is sought for this edge of settlement location and this aspect of the scheme can be secured by means of planning condition DE01.

A further planning condition is recommended to secure and implement the detail of the trim trail / natural play equipment.

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION:

Delegate authority to APPROVE to the Chairman and Head of Development Services to resolve highway matters and a Section 106 Agreement to secure:

- 30% onsite affordable housing provision to be split as affordable rent (20 units) and affordable intermediate (10 units);
- The County Council requests financial contributions as follows: £319,432.56 for the provision of 19 primary places at Thornsett Primary School towards Project A - Creation of additional teaching spaces;
- The Council requests financial contributions as follows: £18,624 for the provision of improvements at Portland Road Play Area, £47,471.80 for the provision of improvements at Ollersett Playing Fields and £7,464.15 for the provision of improvements at Ollersett Avenue Allotments;
- Off-site highway mitigation sum of £43,261.46 to be index linked from July 2014; and,
- Travel Plan monitoring contribution sum of £1,015 per annum for 5 years totalling £5,075.

And conditions listed in the committee report.

HPK/2019/0239 – Land off Simmondley Lane, Simmondley

No updates to report.

HPK/2019/0180 – Land fronting 84 Buxton Road, Whaley Bridge

Additional information

The applicant's consultant has submitted further details and a method statement to address the issues raised by the Conservation Officer.

Details have been provided of the anchor face plates to be installed on the front of the rebuilt wall. Anchor faceplates will be attached to the concrete blocks which will be clad with the stone recovered from the existing wall. The anchors and face plates will not be visible.

A method statement has been provided which describes how the dry stone wall will be tied to the hidden concrete blockwork wall by ties and mortar. The Design assumes that the wall will be replaced at its downstream extent where it joins with the bridge and the upstream extent where it joins with the newer stone wall with lower concrete section. This will however be reviewed as the work progresses and

the downstream limit may be reduced if the existing stone wall and foundation is considered structurally sound and stable upon detail inspection

A timber post and rail fence is proposed at the top of the wall.

Canal and River Trust Comments

No objection. Access to the site to undertake the proposed repair work will require a temporary crossing of the existing Coombs Feeder Channel, some 20m east of the site. This channel provides a water supply from Coombs Reservoir to the nearby Peak Forest Canal. The applicant has already been in discussion with the Trust regarding this matter and has obtained a permit for a temporary crossing of the channel.

Revised Conservation Officer Comments

The additional details are acceptable.

Officer Comments

The additional details submitted address the matters raised by the Conservation Officer and are considered acceptable. Therefore, the 3 conditions in the original recommendation relating to details of face plates, fencing and a method statement for rebuilding of the wall have been deleted from the recommendation and the additional details would be included in the approved plans/specifications condition.

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to the following conditions:

Condition number	Brief description	Comment
TL01	3 year time limit on implementation of the permission	
AP01	Approved plans/specifications	
LA12	Tree Protection Scheme	