

Planning Committee 16th November 2021

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: Heath & Holmewood

APPLICATION: 21/00853/FL

CASE OFFICER: Graeme Cooper

1. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Chesterfield Civic Society

DATE RECEIVED: 3 November 2021

SUMMARY:

I have received, via various organisations I am connected with, numerous requests from Mr and Mrs Roberts, who I understand live next door to the above property, asking me to write to your Council in support of their attempts to dissuade it from granting an application to demolish the existing buildings on the site and replace them with 19 new houses and flats. Holmewood is too far away from Chesterfield for me to write as chairman of Chesterfield and District Civic Society but I wish to make some observations in a professional capacity.

Since I intensely dislike bogus appeals to 'heritage' I wish to support the application. I do so as a retired university teacher of history with a specialist interest in the local history of Derbyshire, especially the north-east of the county. I included an account of Holmewood's history in my book *Hardwick Hall: a great house and its estate* (2009), since the Cavendish estate historically included most of the parish of Heath, in which Holmewood lies. I suspect I am rather more familiar with the history of the area than Mr and Mrs Roberts.

It is of course true that Ellen House is part of Holmewood's 'heritage' in the dictionary sense that it is an inheritance from the past. The village's other inheritances from the past include very poor housing, very poor school buildings, very poor community facilities, very poor personal health, very low household incomes and very high unemployment, all of which combine to make Holmewood, even by the standards of the former North Derbyshire coalfield, a deeply deprived community.

Ellen House, I can assure your planning committee, is of no architectural merit, nor is it of the slightest historical interest. Since it was vacated a few years ago it has become an eyesore and a potential danger to trespassers. The sooner it is demolished the sooner one small corner of Holmewood will look better. There are plenty more corners to deal with.

I have studied the application to build 19 houses and flats on the site. As far as I can see this is a well worked out scheme to give 19 families a decent home by making available comfortable modern houses and flats at a reasonable price. It may not attract new families to move to Holmewood but it will give 19 families already resident in the village a chance to move to new homes. It will also bring back into beneficial use a piece of derelict land. To leave land derelict is economically irrational and morally wrong, especially in a place like Holmewood, which has more than its fair share of such land. The site should be used for new housing.

I have a shrewd suspicion that objections to the application owe less to a sudden interest in 'heritage' than a desire not to have working-class people as neighbours. If so, I suggest those concerned find somewhere else to live and do not try to obstruct the efforts of others to improve life for people in Holmewood.

Yours faithfully,

Philip Riden MA, MLitt (Oxon), FRHistS, Honorary Research Fellow, Dept of History, University of Nottingham - County Editor for Derbyshire, Victoria County History

OFFICER COMMENTS:

These comments add no further material considerations to the report before members.

2. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: North East Derbyshire Industrial Archaeology Society

DATE RECEIVED: 08 November 2021

SUMMARY:

I sympathise very much with the feelings/views of Mr and Mrs Roberts and agree that in the best of all possible worlds Ellen House and the Mews should be saved. The buildings have historic meaning and have definitely deteriorated because of neglect. Ellen House has been used for many different purposes over the years and adapted accordingly which has not helped. A sympathetic redevelopment would be ideal and should be supported.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

Officers can only consider the proposal before them, as such these comments add no further material considerations to the report before members.

3. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Email from Chesterfield Royal Hospital

DATE RECEIVED: 10 November 2021

SUMMARY:

Thank you for your letter regarding Application Number – 21/00853/FL

Having reviewed the report this application appears to be 100% affordable housing with no Section 106 funds so unless you state otherwise, we see no reason to attend the Planning Committee.

Tracey Queenan

Business Delivery Officer

OFFICER COMMENTS:

These comments add no further material considerations to the report before members.

4. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Arboricultural information from agent

DATE RECEIVED: 12 November 2021

SUMMARY:

The applicant's arborist (FPCR) has undertaken a further site survey and prepared an updated Arboricultural Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement at the request of the LPA.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The documents submitted seek to address the concerns outlined by the Councils independent arborist, Weddle Landscape Architects.

5. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Weddle Landscape Architects

DATE RECEIVED: 15 November 2021

SUMMARY:

Thank you for your revised information. I'm afraid there are still some fundamental issues with the method, but can be quickly revised / omitted please.

The following paragraph appears three times in the AMS:

The cutting of roots shall not entirely be avoidable during these works. As such any roots located / identified during these works shall be pruned back to the face of the trench as they became exposed. Roots shall be wrapped with hessian material, which is to be kept damp, until the area can be back filled with topsoil.

This is not acceptable and should be removed. All works need to be above formation level and there will be no trenching in these areas, and certainly no cutting/severance of roots.

C3 Figure 2 is not acceptable for the carriageway construction and should be removed.

Graeme - Assuming the above changes are made I am happy to support the proposal from an Arboricultural perspective. I would suggest the following planning condition is attached to secure the site specific details, should you recommend granting the application.

Notwithstanding the submitted arboricultural information, prior to the commencement of the development (including demolition and all enabling work), a scheme for the protection of the retained trees, in accordance with BS 5837:2012, including tree protection plans and a specific arboricultural method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall also include;

- a) Location and installation of services/ utilities/ drainage.
- b) Methods of demolition/existing hard surface removal within the root protection area of the retained trees.
- c) Details of construction within the RPA or that may impact on the retained trees.
- d) Specification for the installation of boundary treatment within the RPA of retained trees
- e) A full specification for the construction of any roads, parking areas and driveways, including details of the no-dig specification and extent of the areas of the roads, parking areas and driveways to be constructed using a no-dig specification. Details shall include relevant specific sections.
- f) Detailed levels and cross-sections to show that the raised levels of surfacing, where the installation of no-dig surfacing within Root Protection Areas is proposed, demonstrating that they can be accommodated and tie in with surrounding surfacing
- g) Arboricultural supervision and inspection
- h) Reporting of inspection and supervision

Reason: Required prior to commencement of development to satisfy the Local Planning Authority that the trees to be retained will not be damaged during demolition

or construction and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

An updated Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) was requested to take into account the changes requested by the Councils Arborist.

The proposed condition above should be included in any decision issued by the LPA. For the avoidance of doubt the condition should read:

Condition 39 - Notwithstanding the submitted arboricultural information, prior to the commencement of the development (including demolition and all enabling work), a scheme for the protection of the retained trees, in accordance with BS 5837:2012, including tree protection plans and a specific arboricultural method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall also include;

- a) Location and installation of services/ utilities/ drainage.
- b) Methods of demolition/existing hard surface removal within the root protection area of the retained trees.
- c) Details of construction within the RPA or that may impact on the retained trees.
- d) Specification for the installation of boundary treatment within the RPA of retained trees
- e) A full specification for the construction of any roads, parking areas and driveways, including details of the no-dig specification and extent of the areas of the roads, parking areas and driveways to be constructed using a no-dig specification. Details shall include relevant specific sections.
- f) Detailed levels and cross-sections to show that the raised levels of surfacing, where the installation of no-dig surfacing within Root Protection Areas is proposed, demonstrating that they can be accommodated and tie in with surrounding surfacing
- g) Arboricultural supervision and inspection
- h) Reporting of inspection and supervision

6. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Arboricultural information from agent

DATE RECEIVED: 15 November 2021

SUMMARY:

An updated Arboricultural Method Statement (Rev C) has been submitted to the Council omitting the matters raised by the Councils appointed Arborist (see point 5 above). For clarity, amendments have been made to Pages 10, 13 and 47 for the omissions of the paragraphs referring to the cutting of roots.

In addition, the original Figure 2 (plus associated text references) has been omitted from Appendix C3, and the original Figure 3 has now been updated to become Figure 2 - occurs on Pages 40-41.

Finally, a minor updated to the stepped process listed on Page 47. This now runs Step 1-8, as opposed to Step 1-7 and then Step 9 (omitting Step 8).

OFFICER COMMENTS:

Officers are satisfied that matters relating to the impact on the protected trees have now been addressed and condition 39 above should be included in any decision issued by the LPA.