

13<sup>th</sup> December 2021

**HPBC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**UPDATE SHEET**

**HPK/2019/0316 – Shire Hill Hospital**

Additional Neighbour Objection received and summarised below;

- Our objection is based on the current and planned residential building does not allow for the extra traffic flows in Glossops already insufficient road and arterial infrastructure
- High peak to place a temporary ban on all new development until a road and traffic management plan is submitted and considered.

Officer comment

A travel plan and transport assessment have been submitted in support of the application. The highway authority and Highways England have been consulted on the proposals with the response from Derbyshire County Council highways contained within the report. The response from Highways England is awaited and will be reported at committee.

**HPK/2020/0064 – Trenchard Drive**

Additional Neighbour Comments

The response we received last February from William Treves of DCC flood team, explains the risks posed to our property by the design of the attenuation crates to the side, in plot 30.

In regards to the retaining wall, our understanding is that at 2m high a retaining wall will need planning permission as a structure in itself, we believe that the reason Persimmon Homes are attempting to falsify the ground levels on the design (hence why we have asked HPBC to take new levels and measurements), is to ensure that the retaining wall structure remains under the 2m high level.

We have a report from a structural engineer stating that the wall would be prone to toppling and that the fence would act as a sail putting pressure on that wall, we have now seen how the fence is attached and this is a real concern, they have actually bolted it to the wall using upright posts, so I totally understand what the structural engineer is stating, again I will email over his report later.

The concerns are several fold:

- Our property can become flooded by the design of the surface water drainage and the attenuation crates.
- The flooding issue alone could affect the structure of the retaining wall, the pressure the water puts on the wall and the risk of toppling the wall poses.

- The flooding could further undermine the wall structure, causing its integrity to be compromised as time goes on.
- The wall itself is prone to toppling according to a structural engineer.
- The manner in which the fence has been attached to the wall is putting pressure from force in high winds (which are regular in Harpur Hill).
- The wall is holding back the hardcore which was used to raise the ground level to 2m above original level.

We have repeatedly raised these issues with HPBC and they have never been taken seriously, but they need to be, they are making decisions which come with extreme risk.

What happens if my son or daughter is in the back garden playing a game of football together, as they do most days and that wall fails?

This is not about the look of the wall, the positioning of the wall, the property to the side, this is so much more than that and HPBC don't seem to want to acknowledge the huge risks they are taking, by proceeding along this path, so determined are they to get this planning done and dusted and move on to the next, it's a risk and according to experts it is a real risk. We have had no guarantees or evidence to prove that the structure is safe.

The way we have been ignored and treated in raising these issues, the way my families safety has been ignored, I don't think anything will change the path HPBC have decided to take, I sincerely hope they don't live to regret it.

#### Officer Comment

Planning permission is required for the wall / fence and is being sought through the application which is under consideration on this agenda

Structural integrity of the wall is a matter for the Building Regulations but 2m retaining walls with fences on top are commonplace on new residential development and can be found at a number of sites across the Borough where they have been installed without safety or structural issues arising.

#### **HPK/2020/0298 – The Beehive Pub**

Further to the assessment of impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, (sections 7.26-7.42 of the committee report) it should be noted in addition that the neighbouring house at no 17 Hague Street (to the immediate north) includes a first-floor window overlooking the deck, which is understood to serve a bedroom.

Whilst there are sightlines between parts of the deck and this window, it appears that the screening installed at the rear of the deck has limited these, thus avoiding a harmful loss of privacy.

Comments were received from the owner no 17, noting support of the application and not raising any objection in this regard. The owner has provided an interior photo

from the bedroom which confirms that the screening is effective in eliminating views from the deck into the window.

No change to recommendation.

**HPK/2021/0216 Forge Works**

No updates

**Bowden Hall - TPO confirmation**

No updates