



**North East
Derbyshire**
District Council

Contact: Amy Bryan - Governance Manager
Tel: 01246 217391
Email: torin.fuller@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk
Date: Monday, 22 September 2025

To: **Members of the Planning Committee**

Please attend a meeting of the Planning Committee to be held on Tuesday, 30 September 2025, at 2.00 pm in Council Chamber at the District Council Offices, 2013 Mill Lane, Wingerworth, Chesterfield, S42 6NG.

The meeting will be live streamed from [The Council's YouTube Channel](#).

Yours sincerely

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

Assistant Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer

<u>Members of The Committee</u>	
Councillor L Hartshorne (Chair) Councillor D Cheetham Councillor P Elliott Councillor C Gare Councillor H Liggett Councillor K Rouse	Councillor T Lacey (Vice-Chair) Councillor A Cooper Councillor M Foster Councillor W Jones Councillor F Petersen

Any substitutions must be notified to the [Governance Manager](#) in advance by midday the working day before the meeting.

A G E N D A

Public Session

8 Late Representations - Summary Update Report (Pages 3 - 17)

(Planning Manager – Development Management)

Access for All statement

You can request this document or information in another format such as **large print** or **language** or contact us by:

- **Phone** -01246 231111
- **Email** - connectne@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk
- **Text** - 07800 00 24 25
- **[BSL Video Call](#)** – a three way video call with us and a BSL interpreter. It is free to call North East Derbyshire District Council with [Sign Solutions](#) or call into the offices at Wingerworth.
- Call with [Relay UK](#) via textphone or app on 0800 500 888 a free phone service
- **Visiting** our offices at 2013 Mill Lane, Wingerworth, S42 6NG

Planning Committee 30th September 2025

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: Wingerworth

APPLICATION: 23/00877/FL

CASE OFFICER: Alice Lockett

1. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Various objectors

DATE RECEIVED: 22/9/2025

SUMMARY:

Five further objection comments were received. These reiterated comments from previous objectors about:

- lack of capacity in the schools and doctor's surgery,
- impact on highways
- lack of capacity in the sewerage network
- loss of green space,

One objector questioned how the bridge would be designed and who would manage the attenuation pond.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

If granted the application would be subject to a S106 agreement which will secure financial contributions to primary education and the Wingerworth GP surgery, to provide extra capacity. The Highway Authority have raised no objection.

On 28th August Yorkshire Water Authority have commented that:

a.) Regarding the foul water proposals, the local public sewer network does not have adequate capacity available to accommodate the anticipated foul water discharge from this proposal directly adjacent to the site.

b.) A robust build plan and start date is required, so we can undertake an internal (Yorkshire Water) network reinforcement study to determine the suitable point(s) of connection to the available network, along with the relevant timescales required for any upgrade work which we will facilitate.

c.) Yorkshire Water will promote an internal sewer network reinforcement investigation. The developer is required to provide a proposed start date and build program. The cost of the investigation and any subsequent works will be the responsibility of Yorkshire Water.

The applicant has confirmed that they expect the attenuation pond to be adopted and managed by Yorkshire Water (subject to adoption criteria). If approved the design of the bridge will be subject to a condition as requested by the Lead Local Flood Authority.

The impact on landscape is dealt with in the officer report.

2. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Lewis Price

DATE RECEIVED: 22/9/2025

SUMMARY:

We do not object to new houses being built in Wingerworth. What we object to, very strongly, is our private and narrow lane being abused by non-residents.

Hockley Lane is not a public highway. It is privately owned, maintained at the expense of the people who live here, and wholly unsuitable for through traffic. When Stancliffe Homes built nearby a few years ago, we suffered constant construction traffic, deliveries, and trucks using our lane without permission. It caused damage, disruption, and expense for residents. We will not tolerate this again.

We know residents of this proposed development will be tempted to cut through our lane. That would mean hundreds of extra vehicle movements every week on a road they do not pay to maintain. To be absolutely clear: we are united in opposing this and will implement measures, including blocking off one end of Hockley Lane, to prevent it being used as a rat run.

The houses themselves are not our issue. The access is. It is unfair, unsafe, and unsustainable to allow a major development of 180 dwellings to impose its traffic burden on a privately maintained lane.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The use of the private road is a private legal matter between the owners and those using the lane. It is not a material planning matter. As such it cannot be placed in the planning balance against the development.

3. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Stephen Squires

DATE RECEIVED: 23/9/2025

I wish to object to the proposed development on its present form....

I do not see any sort of travel plan congestion nuisance air pollution noise pollution health and safety risk assessment of people affected by the development ..desk top studies or otherwise which reflects that,

Spindle Drive is the only access and egress for 50 houses currently.

Spindle Drive will become the only access and egress for 230 Houses.

Spindle Drive will be used as a site haul road for several years.

Spindle Drive will be used as a carpark for workers on the project.

The hazard of the blind bend junction with Deerlands Road and Spindle Drive.

I have marked on the drawing below where I believe if the development is to go ahead would be a far better access



OFFICER COMMENTS:

A travel plan has been submitted. The applicant has not put forward any other options for the access. The application has been assessed on the access put forward.

The impact of building works is not a material planning consideration although limits on work times would be secured by condition. Other impacts are controlled by separate legislation.

4. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Stephen Squires

DATE RECEIVED: 22/9/2025, 24/9/2025 & 25/9/2025

Mr Squires' comments include objections to:

The impact of the access and bridge on the public open space.

The use of Spindle Drive as the site access

The use for Spindle Drive as a haul road.

Site/road safety during construction

Health and Safety Law has not been addressed.

Particular concerns about the impact of noise and dust pollution on nearby residents.

Mr Squires also points out that Phase 1 of Spindle Drive has not been completed.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The loss of a small area of POS will be offset by POS on the site. The proposed POS includes a new Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) which will be located to the south of the site and is accessible for residents from Spindle Drive. In remaining new POS will also be accessible from Spindle Drive. As such officers consider that the propose POS will mitigate the loss.

Enforcement related issues on other sites are not material planning considerations.

The impacts of building work are not a material planning consideration although some of the issues brought up here would be controlled via the construction management plan condition as requested by the Highway Authority, and conditions imposed by the councils Environmental Health Officer with regard to contaminated land, dust control and working hours. Other issues of pollution (including noise) are controlled by other non-planning legislation, the environment agency, environmental health and building control.

5. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Mark Pearson

DATE RECEIVED: 26/9/2025

Having read the Committee Report for the meeting scheduled for 30th September at 2pm, I wish to register my **objection** to planning application 23/00877/FL. My concerns are set out below:

1. Access via Spindle Drive

- The proposed access through **Spindle Drive** is wholly unsuitable and dangerous.
- The junction sits on a **blind bend**. Even with widening and a visibility splay, drivers cannot see around the corner. This risks creating an **accident blackspot** with the inevitable increase in traffic from 180 homes.
- **Child safety** at this junction is a primary concern. The poor visibility and increased traffic will put children at risk when crossing the road to reach schools and local amenities.
- Residents would suffer **years of disruption** from construction vehicles, noise, and pollutants passing through the village.
- In particular, those on Spindle Drive will be directly impacted by alterations, heavy machinery, and construction traffic. I see no evidence of a thorough **health and safety assessment** covering these risks.
- The **Biodiversity Net Gain report** itself highlights a **net loss to watercourses** due to the proposed bridge. This harm could be avoided if an alternative access point were chosen.
- The scheme would also cause **irreversible harm to the Public Open Space**, reducing its enjoyment and damaging wildlife habitats.

Alternative Access

A far safer and more appropriate access would be from the **bend of Deerlands Road near its junction with Hockley Lane**. This avoids the blind bend of Spindle Drive, protects existing residents, and reduces impact on biodiversity and public open space.

2. Questionable Reliance on 2018 Appeal Decision

- The planning officer's report relies heavily on the 2018 Inspector's judgment that the site is in a "sustainable location".
- Circumstances have **materially changed in the past seven years**. Hundreds of new homes have been delivered along the A61 corridor, particularly at The

Avenue site in Wingerworth. The sustainability judgment of 2018 is outdated and should not carry weight in 2025.

3. Affordable Housing Arguments

- The need for affordable housing should be addressed **district-wide** through the new Local Plan, not piecemeal through speculative applications.
- Until the Local Plan is reviewed and tested, no assumptions should be made about how many affordable homes are needed specifically in Wingerworth.

4. Education Provision

- Local schools are already under extreme pressure.
- Hunloke Park Primary has already been extended, is oversubscribed, and cannot realistically be expanded further.
- The long-promised new school at The Avenue has been repeatedly delayed, with government funding now frozen and no confirmed delivery plan.
- In reality, families from this development would look to **Deer Park Primary**, which is within walking distance. Yet there has been **no consideration of the additional strain** this would place on Deer Park.

Summary

This proposal should be rejected because:

- Access via Spindle Drive is unsafe, environmentally damaging, and will cause unacceptable disruption.
- A better and safer alternative access exists from Deerlands Road near Hockley Lane.
- The justification relying on a 2018 Inspector's decision is outdated and irrelevant given current housing growth.
- Affordable housing need should be properly planned through the new Local Plan, not by granting speculative developments.
- Local education capacity is already overstretched, with no realistic provision in place for additional demand.

For these reasons, I urge the Planning Committee to **refuse planning permission** for this development.

Officer Comments:

Most of the comments above are addressed in the officer report to planning committee. With regards to the other points raised:

Local Plan Review:

With regard to the references to the local plan review, the current plan still carries full weight. No weight can be placed on the local plan review or what might be new policies.

Schools:

Capacity of schools is controlled by the Local Education Authority (LEA), Derbyshire County Council, they set the number of pupils a school can take and allocate children through their applications process. The LEA are content that they can provide capacity through expansion of local schools or provision of a new school at the Avenue. They have requested supporting contributions be included in the S106 agreement.

6. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Mrs Jill Sloane

DATE RECEIVED: 26/9/2025

I wish to object to this planned large development of 180 homes. I believe the proposed access to these properties by car, via a single road (Swindle Drive) and then out onto the junction of Deerlands Road would become congested, and would be dangerous, close to the corner.

The large number of cars generated by a development like this, through the village, would cause increased pollution and noise, and road safety issues.

Already the Primary Schools in Wingerworth are full, the Doctor's surgery has limited capacity, and there have been even further huge housing developments in Wingerworth, since the original plan was put in by Rippon Homes in 2023, which have already impacted infra-structure in the village.

With the timing of this application, before a new local plan is adopted and government plans to increase housing, this would not count towards any housing development proposed for the village, and this needs to be carefully considered. This housing development is far too large and cannot be classed as 'in-fill'. Even if plans were granted previously in 2023 a lot more development has happened since then, that need to be reconsidered in this new application.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The impact on infrastructure is dealt with in the officer report. Depending on when the site is built out the numbers may contribute to existing and future housing supply.

7. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Mr Alan Marland

DATE RECEIVED: 27/9/2025

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the proposed development at Land North of Spindle Drive and East of Deerlands Road (Planning Ref: NED/23/00877/FL).

While I share the wider concerns raised about traffic, safety, and disruption, I feel it is particularly important to underline one key point: Hockley Lane is a private road.

It exists for the use of those who live on it, and it is maintained solely at the expense of residents. It is not a public highway, nor a through-route, and therefore it should not be used by construction traffic, service vehicles, or new residents from the proposed development. Any such use would not only increase wear and tear and compromise safety, but would also amount to unauthorised access to private land.

In the past, despite assurances, we have experienced repeated problems with non-residents using Hockley Lane as a cut-through. This has caused damage, increased costs for us as residents, and heightened risks for pedestrians, children, and horse riders. It is unacceptable that residents should bear the financial and safety burdens created by others who have no right to use the lane.

For these reasons, I strongly object to any proposal that does not include clear, enforceable measures to prevent access via Hockley Lane both during construction and once the development is completed. At the very least, the planning authority must make it a condition that Hockley Lane remains entirely off-limits to construction vehicles, new residents, and their visitors.

I encourage all residents to raise this issue in their comments ahead of the 30th September planning meeting, so that our rights as the legal maintainers and users of Hockley Lane are properly protected.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The use of the private road is a private legal matter between the owners and those using the lane. It is not a material planning matter. As such it cannot be placed in the planning balance against the development.

8. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Mr Bryan Luke

DATE RECEIVED: 28/9/2025

I object on several accounts to the proposed development of Land North of Spindle Drive and East off wetlands road (planning ref: NED/23/00877/FL)

-in the first instance 180 more new houses will destroy green land and local habitat . Destroying hedgerows and trees.

-The potential for flooding and contamination issues have not been fully addressed. The funding contribution proposed by the developer for healthcare and education is inadequate. It's significantly below a level corresponding with the number of people associated with 180 dwellings.

-Wingerworth does not have the facilities or amenities to support 180 families. Schools are already oversubscribed and the doctors extremely busy.

The building of the site will be very harmful to the current residents in Wingerworth both mentally and physically. Noise pollution, destruction of green land (which residents find solace in) there will be increased anxiety due to the construction activities and potential respiratory conditions as a result of the dust and dirt. General well-being of residents will be greatly harmed.

The traffic on Derby Road is already pushed to its limits and this will produce more traffic using Derby road when going in and out of Wingerworth.

On a personal level I wholly object to the use of Hockley Lane being used either by the construction workers and their vehicles or new residents as a way through.

This is a private lane owned and maintained by residents on Hockley Lane.

The lane is used by horse riders and ramblers.

The lane should not be used by anyone in a vehicle other than residents and visitors.

The increased traffic will be dangerous for residents, walkers and horse riders.

Children also walk to school along the lane and there is no footpath due to the lane being narrow.

Increased vehicles produce damage to an already fragile lane. In no way is this acceptable.

I will fully support Hockley Lane being blocked/gated to any non-residents.

I urge the committee to take account of these objections and reject this planning application.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The impact on and mitigation to facilities in Wingerworth is dealt with in the Officer report, as discussed above the possible use of the private road is not a material planning matter.

9. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: NHS Derby and Derbyshire Integrated Care Board

DATE RECEIVED: 29/9/2025

The ICG has increased the request for contributions for improvements to Wingerworth Surgery to £225,000.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

This revised request for monies towards expansion of Wingerworth Surgery has been included in the s106.

10. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Highway Authority

DATE RECEIVED: 29/9/2025

SUMMARY:

The Avenue Area Strategic Framework highlights the importance of developer stakeholders working collaboratively to mitigate the cumulative traffic impact of proposals along the A61 corridor. It is therefore considered that the proposed development should be assessed alongside other committed schemes in the area and that proportional contributions be secured under a Section 106 Agreement, as part of a wider transportation strategy for the A61.

The methodology for calculating contributions, which has been established through The Avenue site and nearby developments and accepted by several developers along the corridor, results in a contribution of no more than £1,900 per dwelling. On this basis, the total contribution for the current proposal equates to £342,000, consistent with the contribution agreed under outline application 17/00268/OL.

In this instance, a number of alternative and complementary schemes have been identified within the A61 corridor where developer contributions could deliver tangible transport benefits. These are set out below:

1. CB178 – A61 / Halcyon Approach, Chesterfield
 - Upgrade of existing puffin crossing to a toucan crossing.
 - Contribution sought: £75,000.
2. A61 Corridor Network Study (Storforth Lane to Hornsbridge Roundabout)
 - This section of the A61 experiences severe congestion, with four major junctions and four pedestrian facilities in less than a one-mile stretch.
 - A contribution of £50,000 would fund a study including microsimulation modelling, network assessment, and optioneering to identify future interventions.

3. Derbyshire Key Cycle Network – Section 65 (Wingerworth to Chesterfield)

- The Derbyshire Key Cycle Network 2020 identified Section 65 as a significant missing 1.1km link in NCN Route 67, ranked 10th of 127 priority sections for delivery.
- This connection would unlock previous investment in A61 corridor cycling infrastructure, significantly improve accessibility, and support sustainable travel between Wingerworth and Chesterfield (within a 5km cycle-commutable distance).
- A contribution of £50,000 would support early project stage deliverables, including feasibility and options appraisal, preparation of an economic case, and outline business case documentation.

This allocation totals £175,000, leaving a residual contribution of £167,000. It is proposed that this balance be directed flexibly, either towards the delivery and implementation of schemes identified through the A61 network study, or towards advancing the delivery of the Key Cycle Network Section 65, depending on scheme readiness and strategic priorities at the time of expenditure.

This approach ensures that the full £342,000 contribution is proportionate, consistent with established methodology, and directed towards schemes that mitigate the cumulative traffic impact of the development, while supporting wider strategic objectives for sustainable transport, connectivity, and active travel in the A61 corridor.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

This information will be added to the S106 legal agreement between the Council and developer in the interest of mitigating the proposed development.

11. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Philip O’Gorman.

DATE RECEIVED: 29/9/2025

SUMMARY:

The 180 new houses will lead an increase in traffic on Hockley Lane which is a private road but already used as a short cut from the current housing estate to get to Long Edge Lane. Hockley Lane has deteriorated in terms of road surface over the past three years due to unauthorised use by non residents. If approved your development will increase traffic as keeping non residents use of the road is un-police able. If approved the Council should be forced to adopt Hockley Lane as it's effectively being used by the whole village.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The impact on the private road is dealt with in comments above.

PARISH: Dronfield

APPLICATION: 25/00522/FLH

CASE OFFICER: Kerry Hallam

12. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Mr Briggs

DATE RECEIVED: 29/9/2025

SUMMARY:

As I have been advised, could you please include the following photos in the supplementary information with regard to 62 Hilltop Road to be discussed at tomorrow's planning meeting.









OFFICER COMMENTS:

Officers have no comments in relation to these photos. All matters relating to privacy and amenity are covered in the officer report to members.