

Public Document Pack

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA



**North East
Derbyshire**
District Council

Our Ref:

Contact: Alan Maher

Tel: 01246 217391

Email: Alan.maher@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk

Date: Monday, 20 July 2020

To: **Members of the Planning Committee**

Please attend a meeting of the Planning Committee to be held on **Tuesday, 28 July 2020 at 2.00 pm using virtual meeting software**. Access credentials to the meeting will be sent to you separately. The public parts of the meeting will be streamed from the Council's website.

Virtual Attendance and Hybrid Meetings

I have provided the Leader and Deputy Leader with advice on the holding of "hybrid" meetings outlining the risks including to employees dealing with the Chamber and to Members. Hybrid meetings are those where some attendance is in person in the Council Chamber and some is virtual.

I would encourage you all to attend virtually.

Accordingly if you attend in person you will be deemed to have accepted the following disclaimer as applying.

Risk Assessment Disclaimer

When attending this meeting in person, I confirm that I have read and understood the contents of each of the following risk assessments and agree to act in line with its content.

- ☐ RA – Return to Work Mill Lane Covid 19 V9
- ☐ Mill Lane Coronavirus Control Measures V4

Both documents have been emailed to Members and are available on the Modern.Gov App library.

The same advice is given to officers who are also encouraged to participate in the meeting remotely.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sarah Skerby".

Joint Head of Corporate Governance and Monitoring Officer

Members of the Committee

Conservative Group	Labour Group
Councillor Diana Ruff Councillor William Armitage Councillor Peter Elliott Councillor Mark Foster Councillor Carol Huckerby Councillor Maureen Potts Councillor Alan Powell	Councillor Jayne Barry Councillor Tracy Reader Councillor Jacqueline Ridgway Councillor Kathy Rouse
Liberal Democrat Group	Independent Group
Councillor Ross Shipman	Councillor Andrew Cooper

Any substitutions for this meeting to be made to Alan Maher by 12 Noon on Monday 27 July.

For further information about this meeting please contact: Alan Maher 01246 217391

AGENDA

4(b) Late Representations Summary Update Report (Pages 4 - 27)



North East
Derbyshire
District Council

***We speak
your language***

Polish

Mówimy Twoim językiem

French

Nous parlons votre langue

Spanish

***Hablamos su
idioma***

Slovak

***Rozprávame Vaším
jazykom***

Chinese

我们会说你的语言

If you require
this agenda in
large print

or another
format
please call
us on

**01246
217753**

If you require an adjustment to enable you to participate in or access the meeting please contact the Governance Team at least 72 hours before the meeting starts.

Planning Committee 28th July PM 2020

SUMMARY OF LATE COMMENTS/REPORT UPDATE

The aim of this report is to seek to avoid the need for lengthy verbal updates that Planning Officers have sometimes needed to provide in the past at the Planning Committee. In consultation with the Chair, it has been decided that on the evening before committee a summary of all the late comments/representations received so far will be emailed to the Committee Members by the Governance Team.

It is possible that verbal updates will still be required at the meeting as sometimes comments are received at the last minute or Officers may wish to amend their recommendations: however Officers will seek to keep verbal updates to a minimum.

At the meeting Officers will only refer briefly to any key points of the case in the summary that has been emailed, as well as providing the usual verbal update for any additional last minute items.

If Members have any queries about the comments or the application itself please feel free to contact the relevant case officer given beneath the title of each summary below.

PARISH: Shirland and Higham

APPLICATION: 19/00335/OL

CASE OFFICER: Phil Slater

1. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Email from CPRE Derbyshire

DATE RECEIVED: 27/07/2020

SUMMARY:

I am writing on behalf of the Derbyshire branch of CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England), to make a late representation in respect of the above application. CPRE has already registered objections (22 April 2019, reiterated 29 February 2020 by email) both to the original application for 120 dwellings and also to the current application. However, we do not feel our objections have been fully reflected in the officer report to committee, and we would also like to take issue with some other matters in the report.

We were surprised to find that the officer report does not mention CPRE by name as an objector. We understand that the organisation is not a statutory consultee. However, it is a well established national charity of almost a century's standing, and has a recognised reputation for expertise on planning matters and their impact on the countryside. We would like our objection to this development brought to the attention of the committee.

We have identified two major problems with the officer report. Firstly, the report suggests that members do not need to give substantial weight to the provisions in the Emerging Local Plan (ELP) in determining this application. Secondly, the characterisations of the social, economic and environmental benefits of the scheme are far too narrowly focused and extremely weak.

In paragraph 6.5 of the officer report, it is stated that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recommends a presumption in favour of development when local plans are out of date. However, we would draw the committee's attention to paragraph 48 of the NPPF under the heading '**Determining Applications**'. This paragraph states:

"48. Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);

b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given);

and c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)."

We suggest that **this section points to the need for significant weight to be given to the ELP in determining this application.** The NEDDC ELP has completed virtually all its statutory phases and is on the point of approval, there are no major unresolved objections to relevant policies, and the Plan is generally consistent to the Framework. In our view, the committee must therefore give substantial weight to the fact that this site is not included for development in the ELP and there is no proposal in it to extend the settlement boundary, and therefore **refuse the application.**

As regards the supposed social, economic and environmental benefits of the development as set out in the officer report, we would contend that these are far too narrowly defined and in fact spurious.

The **economic benefits outlined are extremely general**, and seem to consist simply in the assumption that the people living on the site will contribute to the local economy. However, this argument would apply to any and all new developments. The Council has already identified sufficient land to meet its 5 year housing supply, therefore the cumulative effect of all these developments will deliver the desired economic benefits, which are by no means dependent on the development of this particular site.

The supposed **social benefits are even weaker**. It is acknowledged in the report that the contribution from the development for educational provision is simply a recompense for the increased demand generated by it, and therefore the benefits are neutral. As regards the 20% affordable housing provision, these will be delivered by the development of the sites already identified in the ELP, so this provision is not dependent on this particular site. **No argument is made that the overall target for affordable housing provision in the district is in any way dependant on the approval of this application.**

We agree that **the environmental impacts should be given careful consideration, and in our view are sufficiently detrimental to merit refusal of this application.** As we have said in our objection to the original application, Shirland is already experiencing relatively large scale (for its size), new housing development. The addition of yet another development, outside of the settlement boundary and bordering on open countryside, would irrevocably change the character of the village from rural to suburban and must be resisted. The idea that somehow this loss of rural character can be mitigated by screens of trees and swift boxes is entirely fanciful, in our view. Such measures would not compensate for the loss of rural character.

For the reasons set out, CPRE Derbyshire would like to reinforce our opposition to this unnecessary development, and to urge the Planning Committee to reject it.

On behalf of the CPRE Derbyshire Branch

CASE OFFICER COMMENTS:

The comments of the CPRE are noted and officers consider that these are covered within the committee report.

Whilst the comments of the CPRE were not noted specifically within the report along with the statutory consultees, the comments submitted were incorporated into the wider objections to the proposals that have been received.

The emerging Local Plan (ELP) is addressed at paragraph 7.7 of the report; and the social, economic and environmental impacts would be for members to weigh in the planning balance.

2. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Email from Laura Mahadevan

DATE RECEIVED: 22/07/2020

SUMMARY:

I'm writing re. the proposed housing development at Hallfieldgate Lane on behalf of myself and my mum who reside at 23 Hallfieldgate Lane. I've lived in Shirland all my

life and have always valued the small, community feel of the village. Although I'm now in the position of (attempting to be) a first time buyer, ready to move out of the family home, my mum and other residents will sadly be highly affected by this development in multiple ways.

Many of us chose to buy houses and settle in Shirland because of the quality of life here and the invaluable community feel. Having grown up in Shirland, I had the benefits of a home that didn't overlook an estate or busy road. Being in the garden or out the front of the house always felt safe, without strangers onlooking as we played as kids, nor having the disruption of excessive noise and traffic on Hallfieldgate Lane. Now more than ever, green spaces and nature are crucial to the wellbeing and mental health of residents in Shirland: individuals have less mental distress, less anxiety and depression, greater wellbeing and healthier cortisol profiles when living in urban areas with more greenspace compared with less greenspace (source). Crucially, during lockdown under the coronavirus, the only saving grace has been the privacy of our garden, or local walks in the village. If the development is to go ahead, the invaluable peace, tranquility and rural feel of the village will be threatened. The existing housing development in Shirland, which is still incomplete, has already damaged the wildlife and green spaces around us, with noise pollution and rubble clear when walking through the village. It's devastating for us to see the village this way, and I'm sure more so for the elderly residents who have lived in the village for decades. Another housing development simply isn't necessary, and will cause far more damage than good - physically, to the wildlife and the beautiful green spaces that are left untouched in Shirland, and mentally and financially for the residents.

We must see the importance in preserving semi-rural villages like Shirland before it's too late - homes with privacy and unspoilt outdoor space like ours are becoming rarer and rarer. We're all starting to realise, but perhaps not soon enough: nearly three-quarters of property insiders* say demand for a home near a green space like a park will rise over the next two years, while 68 per cent believe properties with more private space and fewer communal areas will be top priorities among potential buyers. 60 per cent believe properties in urban areas which are very built up will also become less desirable to prospective buyers.(thisismoney.co.uk* surveyed)

Moreover, the housing market is unstable as it is, let alone with the loss of property value the residents will experience as Hallfieldgate Lane continues to become built up and boxed in. We must not ignore that the benefit of this development is purely monetary, and only lies with the developers. As a first time buyer, with most of my friends also looking for housing for the first time, I can confirm that it's not the amount of housing available that's the problem for our generation - it's people buying up second homes for holiday or investment use, or rising property costs. Following covid, there's been a surge of city residents snapping up second properties in the countryside to use as holiday homes, or relocating to them. If these housing developments keep going ahead, villages will only become more overpopulated and

overcrowded. Pollution levels will rise. Green spaces will be littered. Local schools will be turning more local children away. There will be unbearable amounts of traffic outside our houses. Gardens will no longer be private, instead onlooking one another. The residents of Hallfieldgate Lane will suffer greatly from this, and to add a further blow, if they want to move (and many will feel like they have to), they are bound to lose a lot of money in the process.

CASE OFFICER COMMENTS:

The representations are noted, however officers consider that the issues raised have been addresses within the committee report.

3. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Letter from Mr John Shaw

DATE RECEIVED: 23/07/2020

SUMMARY

I have lived in Shirland since 1953. Between 1964 and 1967 I worked for George Shipman who actually lived in Hallfieldgate Hall,. He was the main contractor for subsidence work for the NCB. I worked as an apprentice joiner and worked on the subsidence in Shirland including Hallfieldgate Lane on the north and south side. The work involved easement of doors and windows etc.

Shirland was quite badly hit by subsidence and one house on Streata Lane had to be re-built. .

I also remember the outcrop in Shirland and the whole area was devastated on the south and west side. I remember large holes where coal was extracted. It has taken 60 years to re-establish itself now hedgerows and wildlife are flourishing.

Mining was a big part of Shirland and the large coal extractions beneath ground could cause problems for the new build.

I am also concerned about the traffic from the build. This will cause problems with heavy plant machinery and lorries etc either coming from the east or west entrance.

The exit leading onto the A61 is quite notorious to the locals who use it regularly as it is a difficult junction for large vehicles.

I totally disagree with the planning application made by Mr Speed with all its complications. Once the green land has gone its gone.

I urge the committee to reject the application

CASE OFFICER COMMENTS:

The comments regarding subsidence and highway implications are noted, however officers consider that these issues have been addressed in the report, and

specifically that the Highway Authority and Coal Authority have not raised an objection.

4. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: email from Ms Sarah Hopkinson

DATE RECEIVED: 23/07/2020

SUMMARY

If lockdown has taught me anything is that we should look after nature as much as possible for mental health , I can't understand why we should have more building on this site at all , hopefully common sense instead of profit will win in the end ! We will see

5. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: email from Nicola Mahadevan

DATE RECEIVED: 23/07/2020

SUMMARY

As a resident of Hallfieldgate Lane, I strongly object to this development on the grounds that it is a major development which would extend the village boundary onto a greenfield site. Recent development within Shirland already far exceeds that stipulated in the village development plan and is unwanted and unnecessary. The proposed development would be detrimental to existing residents, future generations to come and the biodiversity of the area. My areas of concern include, but are not limited to, the following: character of the area, wildlife, NHS & school services, traffic and the mental health and wellbeing of the residents.

Currently, our village is prided for its close, community feel and its semi-rural qualities, such as open green spaces and thriving wildlife. Unfortunately, due to recent housing developments, we are already facing existing problems that threaten the character of the area and wellbeing of our residents, including the following:

- Overly congested roads, with Hallfieldgate Lane being used as a rat-run, resulting in damage to parked vehicles and a risk to children walking to school
- Limited local amenities - the shops on Hallfieldgate Lane and on the main road towards Alfreton have closed in recent years. The nearest general store is now in Higham, with the walk from Hallfieldgate to Higham being hazardous with incomplete footpaths.
- Over-subscribed schools and NHS services
- Loss of green space and wildlife, including UK priority species, such as the Grasshopper Warbler, due to the recent development of 92 houses north of Hallfieldgate Lane. Another at risk species, the Cuckoo, did not return this year.

The new development will only worsen these issues, simultaneously contributing further problems. I strongly believe that the proposed planning is not only inappropriate to the area; it is unnecessary and a complete intrusion to our rural community and treasured greenfield landscape. Please consider the future problems that the development will bring to the area.

Character:

Shirland is prided for its close community and its semi-rural qualities, such as open green spaces and thriving wildlife. Following recent and proposed developments, we will quickly lose this, becoming susceptible to the problems that come with the introduction of urban housing developments and destruction of green spaces. As our rural village involuntarily becomes more of an urban sprawl, mental health will be significantly affected, as will the rural feel and closeness of our community.

The area is beginning to lose its street/lane linear character. This plan would see development outside the existing limits of our village, extending into rapidly diminishing greenfield spaces. Our residents have chosen to live here over large housing complexes as the quality of life is higher, with greater space between properties and gardens, greater levels of privacy and reduced levels of air, light and noise pollution. The proposed development will see new houses backed onto gardens, a huge reduction of green spaces and privacy of residents, even with the proposed 'privacy' barriers.

In the wake of recent climate change reports, the proposed development of 90 houses in a rural area is simply inappropriate. The destruction of green spaces, farmland and thriving wildlife is irreversible, and we must set a precedent for this by fighting against it. As more large-scaled housing developments are approved, we are losing valuable green spaces across North-East Derbyshire at a rapid rate. The importance of green space has been invaluable to the mental health of the local population during the recent lockdown and ongoing pandemic.

The area will become unrecognisable as the rural and historic village that is our community. The development will not contribute positively to the existing community here or the environment: instead, the immediate and long-term effects of the proposed development will be hugely damaging to the character and future of the village.

Traffic:

Again, recent developments already pose a risk to Hallfieldgate Lane and to the already busy A61, which is often gridlocked. The proposed development will only add to this risk, resulting in more accidents and damage to residents' vehicles.

More specifically to the lane itself, the lane is narrow and used frequently as a 'rat run', with cars seen speeding, knocking wing mirrors of parked cars and mounting pavements. Footpaths along the lane are also incomplete. Both ends of the lane are

notoriously dangerous already, seeing frequent near misses. The junction between Hallfieldgate Lane and the B6013 Belper Road (east and west) is a partially blind staggered junction. For traffic emerging east from Wessington, the junction is particularly dangerous as there is zero visibility towards Oakerthorpe. We do not want to risk this worsening near the school in Shirland, which is situated at the top of Hallfieldgate Lane. Increased traffic flow puts our children at risk and contributes to noise and pollution levels outside the school. We have already exceeded the necessary level of housing development for our area - we stress that this development really is not crucial and not something we should be risking the wellbeing and safety of current residents and schoolchildren for.

Infrastructure:

Our schools are already oversubscribed. Children that come along with the recent development of 92 houses, and the proposed development of up to 90 more houses, will struggle to find places at local schools. The over-filling of our local school will, naturally, have a negative effect on the learning and wellbeing of existing students there.

We have very limited NHS services available to the residents of the village already. Our local health services are already over-stretched with the current population of the village. Waiting times are very long and it's difficult to get an appointment. This will worsen with the recent and proposed housing developments. Again, I must stress that the proposed housing development is not a necessity to the area, but it will have a hugely negative impact on our local schools and services.

Wildlife:

Living in the community, I have enjoyed the rural aspects of the village, with regular visits in our garden from hedgehogs and bats. Cuckoos and owls can also be heard. In the adjacent fields, where the proposed development will take place, we frequently see hares playing, badgers (resident), buzzards, and other birds of prey hunting. I have endeavoured to maintain a wildlife friendly garden that benefits from backing on to green open spaces. However, this is all under threat from loss of habitat, broken wildlife corridors, light and air pollution. We have already started to see the effects of the loss of valuable habitat north of Hallfieldgate Lane which was a magnet to summer breeding migrants such as warblers including a UK priority species, the Grasshopper Warbler. Teeming with invertebrates, it provided food for other animals further up the food chain including small mammals and ultimately birds of prey.

For the last seven years, I have provided records of moth trapping in my garden (released without harm) to organisations such as Butterfly Conservation and the Garden Moth Scheme. Data collected and analysed by such organisations provides a valuable insight into the state of the local environment as well to global issues such as climate change. I have recorded around 350 different moth species in my garden including 28 UK priority species listed on the Lowland Derbyshire Biodiversity Action

Plan list. Light pollution extending from recent and the proposed development, in the form of street lighting and security lighting from properties, will have a huge impact on the local moth population and animals further up the food chain. Moths are one of the main food sources for bats. Again, I am already beginning to see a reduction in the total number of moths as well as the number of different species because of recent loss of habitat. With large scale developments of this kind, come the inevitable problems of increased numbers of domesticated animals being introduced into a rural environment and the huge impact these have on the local wildlife. I'm already seeing increased numbers of dead Field and Bank Voles, frogs and birds being killed by domestic cats hunting in my garden. Any future development would magnify the problem.

Again, I strongly urge you to reject the proposed development, it is not necessary and would have a huge negative impact on the wellbeing of local residents, the environment and local services.

CASE OFFICER COMMENTS:

Officers consider that the comments relating to matters such as character of the area, wildlife, NHS & school services, and traffic have been addressed in the committee report and the comments do not raise any new issues.

As set out in the committee report officers consider that there are no technical issues weighing against the scheme and there would be a s106 contribution towards education provision.

6. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: email from Sarah and Richard Pinfold

DATE RECEIVED: 27/07/2020

SUMMARY

Due to work commitments we unable to attend the meeting on 28/7/20 but would appreciate it if the following could be read out.

I write in connection with planning application 19-00335-OL As residents of 15 Hallfieldgate Lane we wish to object strongly to this development.

We understand the need for affordable housing but this planned development is simply not the answer.

There is abundance of wildlife that rely on this site as a home and hunting ground. Bats, rabbits, here's, foxes, badgers and many more species are all evident here and all would suffer immeasurably.

The traffic is already a huge problem on Hallfieldgate Lane and would only become worse. There are daily examples of vehicles mounting the pavement as the road struggles to cope with increasing traffic. We have personal experience of a horrific

crash outside our house (photo attached) when a car mounted the pavement and smashed into our car, writing it off. It was a miracle nobody wasn't seriously hurt or killed.

From a personal point of view, our outlook from the rear of our property would be ruined. Sunlight would struggle to reach our house, especially in Winter. Damp and poor health will surely follow. The noise, dust and pollution during construction would be insufferable.

As the councillors are well aware, much more appropriate sites are available for development. This site simply isn't.

As keyworkers we have relied on our house and its surroundings as sanctuary during the Covid 19 crisis, invaluable for our mental health.

In summing up we urge you to refuse this proposal and ensure our community and its wildlife are preserved for generations to come.

CASE OFFICER COMMENTS:

Officers note the comments raised and consider that these issues have been covered in the committee report. With regards to the loss of outlook, the application is in outline and the masterplan that has been submitted is an indicative layout only; however officers consider this issue has been covered in paragraphs 7.31 -7.33 of the report.

Text of Speeches to the Committee

Those registering to speak have been requested to provide the text of their speech to the Committee. These will be read out on their behalf by the Clerk to the Committee if they are unable to join the meeting through the electronic conferencing call facility

NED/19/00335 – Outline planning application for up to 90 new residential units and site access with all other matters reserved (apart from access) (amended plans/amended title) (major development/Departure from development plan) at land south of Hallfieldgate Lane, Shirland for Trustees of Ted Speed and Pauline Speed Hallfield Trust.

Councillor C Cupit - Speech Text - Objector

I'm here today as a ward member to highlight the damage this application would cause as an unsustainable development in what is clearly open countryside.

As you can see even just from the map, this proposed site doesn't in any way relate to or infill with the main part of Shirland. It would quite clearly be outside the established settlement line and development limit visibly marked by the currently linear housing pattern boundary. This area at the moment is clearly rural, open green fields and countryside with far reaching views across the valley and, vice versa, from the surrounding fields and from as far away as Amber Valley this area can clearly be seen and marks out the prevailing rural character of our district.

In a similar way, at the bottom end of the application site lies the highlighted Hallfield Gate Conservation area, with several listed and historically important buildings. Whilst the application has been amended to slightly move away from this area, it is still the case that this proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the historic setting of these buildings and the Conservation Area. Previous appeal decisions on smaller applications near this Conservation Area have recognised that a main characteristic of it is the open fields and gardens, reflective of the surrounding open countryside.

The October 2019 Conservation Consultant comments recognises the importance of the remaining open fields in this application to the rural setting of the Conservation Area and considers these views as important. Just from the consultant's conservation opinions, they considered that the whole field directly to the east should remain as open space, whereas that field is clearly still marked out for quite a few houses in the proposals.

CPRE Derbyshire recognise and support these concerns and have also strongly objected to the plans on the wider basis that 'the proposed development would irreversibly change the essential rural quality of the south side of Shirland... [and] the character of Shirland would be changed from village to suburb.'

Therefore, particularly given the development currently underway on the other side of the road, for 92 houses, this application would overload the area and cannot be considered as sustainable. Even just from an affordable housing point of view, the Council's housing strategy officer has stated: 'Shirland is a small village in which there have been a number of developments in recent times, so there is not currently a high demand here....[and] at the current time it is not seen as a suitable site for affordable housing provision.'

As a final point, I also want to highlight the significant number of local written objections to this application. This demonstrates the strength of local feeling that this development would saturate and exhaust the village of Shirland and destroy cherished open countryside, so I hope you'll listen to these concerns and refuse this speculative application.

NED/19/00335 – Speech Text **Councillor Heather Liggett** - objector

On May 9th 2013 Wheeldens were given permission to build 90 + houses between the A61 and Hallfieldgate Lane Why was it that they were Not allowed to build without two entrances Their development is for the same amount of housing .The Wheelden development was split into two the east side exits onto the A61 The south end onto Lilac way which I turn comes out onto Hallfieldgate Lane only a few yards from the proposed new development entrance .This will mean an increase of 300 more cars using Hallfieldgate Lane What as the name suggests is aLane .The so called walk to school from the back of the development would come out onto the golf course (How safe is that for children)The T ing off would be straight towards oncoming children .This is a village the infrastructure can not cope The nearest doctors at Stonebroom is part of the Staffa Health group and may possibly close .At least a six week wait for a phone line to be fitted Even if needed for medical reasons A buzzer for falls Altimers etc. Sewers bursting at least three times a year Sanitary towels etc feet from where the new houses will be built on the east side .Surface water flooding which has increased since the Wheeldens development even though we were assured it wouldn't Gas cottage has been flooded twice This is only metres from where the houses will be built The school is full so is the school in the next village of Wessington New residents on the Wheeldens estate are taking their children to Crich for school this is even before the Wheeldens estate has finished being built never mind sold and lived in .I am also very concerned about safety from golf balls We collect about 50 a year from our field right next to the development site Gas cottage has so many cracked tiles Mr Southey has had to replace his utility roof this year .His father was hit on the head by a golf ball and suffered strokes and memory loss afterwards. To put housing right up to a golf course is madness People wouldn't be safe in their own gardens . We simply do Not need or want anymore houses in our village THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAN NOT AND WILL NOT COPE
Thankyou for listening

JOHN SHAW
11 HALLFIELD GATE LANE
SHIRLAND
DESS BAA
TEL 01773 835905

APPLICATION NO
19/00335/OL.

APPLICANT MR SPEED.

①
I have lived in Shirland since 1953.

Between 1964 and 1967 I worked for George Shipman who actually lived in Hallfieldgate hall. He was the main contractor for subsidence work for the N.C.B. I worked as an apprentice joiner and worked on the subsidence in Shirland including Hallfieldgate Lane. on the North and South side. The work involved ease-ment of doors and windows etc.

Shirland was quite badly hit by subsidence and one house on ^{SHIRLAND} Streaton lane had to be re-built.

I also remember the out-crop in Shirland and the whole area was DEVASTATED ON THE SOUTH AND WEST SIDES

I REMEMBER LARGE HOLES, WHERE COAL WAS extracted. It has taken 60 years to re-establish itself. Now hedgerows and wildlife are flourishing.

Mining was a big part of Shireland and the large coal extractions beneath ground could cause problems for the new build.

I am also concerned about the traffic from the build. This will cause problems with heavy plant machinery and lorries etc, either coming from the East or West entrance.

The exit leading onto to the A61 is quite notorious to the locals, who use it regularly, as it is a difficult junction for large vehicles.

I totally disagree with the planning application made by Mr Speed with all its complications. Once the green land has gone its gone.

②

I urge the committee to reflect on my
notes and reject the application.

Thank you.

A stylized, handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke.

Hallfieldgate Lane is a small, but busy village road. As residents of Hallfieldgate Lane, my wife and I are acutely aware of the vast amount of traffic that commutes along Hallfieldgate Lane and the adjoining A61 and B6013 roads. Also, whenever there is a traffic incident at junction 28 and 29 on the M1, which happens on a regular basis, the traffic travelling through Shirland increases drastically both North and South.

The B6013 through Shirland is both narrow and winding and therefore potentially very dangerous.

Hallfieldgate Lane, due to the amount of parked vehicles belonging to the residents, is effectively a single lane road. We have already noticed an increase of traffic on the road since the recent building of new houses to the North of the Lane and the surrounding area.

The further increase of vehicles caused by the building of further houses to the south of the lane would undoubtedly cause a great deal of stress, danger and injury, or worse to the residents of the lane and those who use the lane. We feel a risk assessment of the traffic flow on the lane would highlight the problem we are facing.

The proposed site would also adversely affect wild life such as hares, badgers, owls, buzzards, small birds and mammals, which at present are living in this place of natural beauty.

We would therefore ask you to consider the effect these 90 houses and the increase of vehicles will have on the already suffering residents of Hallfieldgate Lane in particular but also including the whole population of Shirland.

Ian North and Trina North

Local Plan comments

In both the previous and emerging local plans this area falls outside of the Settlement Development Limit as determined by the Council policy LC1 which covers land allocated for development.

In my view, the fact that there has been a gap in the effective period of the previous plan and the implementation of the new cannot mean that we are left completely at the mercy of speculative development. In no other walk of life do changes in legislation mean that current law is suspended whilst new laws are drafted.

In any event, we are in the very last phase of consultation for the new Local Plan. As it is at such a late stage, with only areas to the north of the District still subject to discussion, and with no further consultation planned for the area in question, it is reasonable to expect that the provisions of the new plan are given full weight in this case. In particular, the housing supply estimates for Shirland have already been met and exceeded for the life of the new plan.

Permissions have already been granted on the allocated sites for Shirland in the draft local plan for around 130 houses. Another 90 here would lead to a near 70% oversupply of housing against projected need.

It is a fact that the applicant has made a number of attempts to have this area of land included in the new plan and, on every occasion, the Planning Inspectorate has rejected the proposal. It would be quite wrong to allow this application to be “back doored” in contravention of what is clearly the considered view of the Inspectorate after a very lengthy period of consultation with the widest range of consultees.

The tone of the officer’s report in general seems to play down the weight of the emerging plan.

This leads on to my next point. Planning policies SDC3 and GS6 are clear. Developments that cause significant harm to the open character of the land, a loss of amenity or which form a prominent intrusion into open country should not be permitted. The land is agricultural and forms part of the open rural landscape. The officer’s report does not give due regard to these factors in my opinion and underestimates the negative impact of this development.

Finally, part of the argument for approval refers to the land being adjacent to existing settlement.

Every piece of green space in this country, or anywhere else, is adjacent to a settlement. That is why I urge that decisions are made within the framework of the Local Plan if we are to protect the countryside from speculative proposals. Proposals that irreversibly damage precious and increasingly scarce rural amenity.

Kevin Bush

I wish to highlight the traffic issues on Hallfieldgate Lane.

The additional traffic from the existing developments and this proposed development is unsustainable. This will cause problems for all residents of Hallfieldgate Lane and adjoining roads.

Hallfieldgate Lane is already busy and used by many motorists as a 'rat run' and a cut through in both directions. The traffic surveys accompanying this application were written in 2017 ,prior to the additional traffic that has been created by new housing both in Shirland and the surrounding areas.

We have not yet felt the full impact of the housing development to the north of Hallfieldgate Lane as it is still under development, so that, coupled with this proposal would lead to traffic chaos.

Each new home is likely to have at least one car , probably two, all to be used for commuting or the school run, which due to the lack of places in Shirland school, this is likely to be outside of the village. With this and the other local developments it is estimated to well over three hundred additional car journeys will be made per day along the lane

Whilst the junctions at either end of the road are stated in the Highways report as being fit for purpose, I can only say this is far from the case in practice. It is quite common already to have to queue to join the A61 and speeding traffic at the Belper road junction is also an issue when trying to join from Hallfieldgate Lane.

As a local resident I feel that issues have been overlooked through lack of local knowledge.

For a distance of about 150 metres the road is effectively single track due to parked cars. It is not uncommon to see vehicles mounting the pavements to avoid queuing, putting pedestrians at great risk. This single track section lies between the proposed site exit and A61 increasing the danger to pedestrians. The applicant suggests that 80% of traffic leaving this proposed development will travel towards the A61. Refuse collection and some deliveries can bring the road to a total standstill along this section.

The road is not designed for existing volumes of traffic, never mind increased volumes. Whilst few incidents are reported to the police it is not unusual to witness accidents, one 'writing off' of my neighbours parked car, and other incidents ranging from, clipped mirrors, road rage and speeding.

These incidents can only increase with the proposed increase in traffic.

The main bus stop on A61 will be up to 800m away, Shirland school, if places where to be available, would be up to 1km, both of these distances make it more likely that residents will use their cars.

I would urge the committee to refuse this application.

I want to talk about safety.

I am sure that the Planning Committee and it's officers would agree that, before any application is approved, every element of public safety must have been considered. This must be especially true where the safety of school children is concerned.

Unfortunately, the most basic need, for children to have a safe route to and from school, has not been considered in this application.

So - if children leave the proposed housing estate via the only exit that exists on to Hallfieldgate Lane, they must exit onto a road with no pavement.

Children would be left, standing at the side of the road, waiting for a break in traffic before they could cross to a pavement on the opposite side. This Lane is a very busy, narrow and dangerous.

Conversely, the children could use the back route from the estate via a public footpath suggested and described very eloquently by the applicant.

The first challenge for the children would be to actually get onto the public footpath which runs across the golf course. To do so they must trespass onto the golf course itself where they would doubtless be greeted with hostility from any golfers, as this path actually crosses the Fairway!

With some luck, the children may avoid being seriously injured by a golf ball.

Following this path, the children would climb a stile and enter a field in which, usually, two Highland cattle with their legendary, enormous horns, roam freely. At the moment, the huge beasts are on loan to a local farmer but the owner tells me that they could return at any time.

The next obstacle would be Pit Lane, a dark, overgrown narrow road leading to Shirland Golf Club. Not wide enough for cars to pass each other, vehicles reverse and manoeuvre around blind bends causing chaos.

Since this is a private, unadopted road, vehicles are not bound by the rules of insurance, licensing or even driving, as they would be on public roads.

To summarise, from this housing development, there would be no safe way for children to walk to school.

Being elected as a Councillor is a huge responsibility, because the general public expect decisions, taken on their behalf by Councillors, will be fair, logical and reasonable and will reflect and respond to the wishes of local residents.

I would respectfully ask members of the Planning Committee to think very hard about the safety of these children when considering the application.

The people of Shirland will see no benefit if permission is granted; in fact the only person to benefit from this proposal is a multi-millionaire who lives in his own Manor House many miles from Shirland and who recently sold Hallfieldgate Hall for well over a million pounds. Please vote against this application.

To define the historical context, landscape and setting of Shirland we must start with the history.

The hamlet of Shirland pre-dates the Domesday manuscript in 1086. St Leonards church was completed in 1226.

The village of Shirland pre-dates Wingfield Manor by more than 400 years and Ogston Hall by more than 700 years.

The fields, trees and hedgerows surrounding Shirland are ancient and remain virtually unchanged.

This is largely due to sympathetic and traditional farming methods used over many generations.

Maps published in the 1840's clearly show the field boundaries and hedgerows. They have remained unmolested for generations.

This naturally beautiful and rural setting is immediately adjacent to a conservation area and the centuries old Sheep Lane. The historical context of the area is further enhanced by the wider landscape which incorporates Amber Valley, the ancient monument of Wingfield Manor and the Roman road Rykeneld Street.

All of this combines to provide an extremely valuable local amenity that can be fully accessed by the local footpath and bridleway network.

The Proposed Development is not sustainable development.

Covering semi-rural Green farmland with concrete and tarmac is not a sustainable solution.

This application is in direct conflict with eight of the sustainable targets shown in the authorities own Climate Change Plan.

There is no additional infrastructure, for example schools, healthcare, leisure facilities, childcare.

Children from the Wheeldon development are currently being driven to Crich School because there are no places at Shirland Primary School.

To find employment, residents will be travelling by car to Derby, Nottingham, Mansfield, Chesterfield, Sheffield and further afield.

This increase in car use will result in more pressure on the existing pinch-points on the local road network which are Hallfieldgate Lane, Alfreton, J28, Clay-Cross & Oakerthorpe.

The increase in car journeys will increase pollution and even impact on the safety of residents.

On Hallfieldgate Lane we already have daily occurrences of road-rage and motor vehicles driving along pedestrian pavements.

The subject of sustainable development is considered in a detailed report published yearly by the CPRE. This report, 'State of Brownfield 2019', shows there is enough

suitable brownfield land available in England for more than 1 million homes across over 18,000 sites and over 26,000 hectares.

The local landscape forms a natural wildlife habitat. We regularly observe Hares, Badgers (moving away from the Wheeldon site), European Hedgehogs, Owls, Buzzards, Bats, Sparrowhawks and many small birds. Several of these species are under protection in the UK.

The residents of Shirland do not want or need this new development, This is an ancient, beautiful and rural setting . It supports local wildlife and is widely enjoyed by local residents.

The large number of objections to this development shows that it is not supported by the community or or local councillors.

This application must be stopped.

375 - 450 words

Richard Southey - This text is only available in hard copy letter with the Chair of the Committee.