

28.11.2016

Thorncroft,
Park Road,
Chapel-en-le-Frith,
High Peak,
SK23 0LL

Planning Support,
Customer Services,
High Peak Borough Council.

To Whom It May Concern:

**Re: Consultation on Revised Plans: HPK/2016/0201: G & W Drabble: The
Factory: Sunday School Lane:**

I have decided that I would rather not remove the Elm tree. As I have mentioned previously the tree can be trimmed back to make room for the new units, with the roots out of harms way and this would be done as minimally as possible and in a sensitive manner. A trim would not go amiss as it is very overgrown and would look a lot tidier and pleasant. I would neaten up the tree with little change to the residents' view and pleasure of having it there. Precautionary measures we would take in order not to disturb and to preserve any major roots (>50mm in diameter) when digging the foundations would be to dig very carefully - particularly the foundations for what will be the south east facing walls of unit one. This will involve hand digging and moving very carefully with any mechanical machinery we use. We would then bridge over any roots we came across that needed protecting. It is my absolute full intention to keep the tree (we like it) if there were to be any problems going forward with the elm tree I would replace it with two more.

Trimming the canopy evenly all round should not be a problem. The real risk to this tree's survival will be from the long term seepage of lime from the concrete footings / foundations. Replacing this beautiful tree by two saplings can never recompense the residents for this loss.

I have attached a revised layout showing detailed parking spaces and turning / maneuvering space and unloading areas. I have shown spots for three parking spaces and up to four if needed to accommodate visitor and service delivery vehicles. I

The ramp up to the new opening into the factory has taken one parking space and will preclude a safe turning circle from using this area.

just want to answer the point that highways makes about refuse collection. Any commercial waste would not be collected directly from the site, users would have to wheel their refuse down Park Road to the main road for collection. The bin men don't come down to collect.

Wheeling the refuse along the road to Market St. is unacceptable.

Not installing gates - I have no problem with at all.

The installation of gates was promised in order to improve the appearance of the unsightly space.

A condition applied for hours of use is understandable and I agree with as long as it's

within reason and not too restrictive. I agree also to the units only being used for B1 or B8 purposes.

Class B1 - c) and I quote, "for any industrial process, being a use which can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, (plus smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit)."

Park Road is particularly vulnerable to these conditions because of its narrow and confined width. It measures only 14 foot wide from boundary wall to house wall in parts and 19 foot from boundary wall to boundary wall in others, in the area of the factory. Comparing these measurements to the average of 43 foot width of the average residential road in the area, boundary wall to boundary wall, there is a huge difference. The detrimental effects on the structures and amenity of the narrow road will be exasperated because close proximity will magnify the problem.

The above paragraph suggests the dimensions of this road are not suitable for industrial use and this, when added to the facts that it is maintained at private expense, is also overlaid by a full width non-vehicular highway (FP189) perhaps Council could find it acceptable for these conditions to be a just and reasonable criteria for refusing this application?

It is appreciated this Consultation is pertinent only to the application referenced above. However, the new industrial activity at the factory, the refurbishment of classic cars (of which the Council has been notified) needs to be addressed in conjunction with the above application as it is already having noticeable effects on the area. Noise from grinding plus the smell and fumes of either, cellulose, thinners or Two Pack paint spraying and possibly other pressure sprayed metal finishes; is suggestive of a B6 classification.

Also to add, I made another slight adjustment to the units in deciding instead to use roller shutter doors as they are more safe and secure.

In terms of evidence on whether I have the right to use Park Road

There is not and never has been any dispute regarding the Drabble's entitlement to use Park Road to access their land and property. They are "Frontagers" even though in the eight (8) years of their ownership they have not once contributed, by physical effort or financial input to the maintenance of this road.

Any recent disagreement with the Drabbles; conversationally or otherwise, regarding access to the factory from Park Road has been to dispute industrial use of this route, and has been well documented.

firstly I have a site entrance from Park Road that is very evident. There is a gate post and a wall on the left of the entrance that clearly marks out the entrance that has been there from the very beginning.

Agreed, the original entrance was wide enough to allow a car through for use by owners and staff who then entered the factory from the rear, by walking up the side of the factory which is now the drive to Thorncroft.

As you enter the site, there is a door into the main building. Below is a quote I previously gave to give some historical context to the site:

The only official doorway / entrance into the factory from Park Road is an emergency exit for personnel from the factory.

"The site has had a number of uses over the years. In the 1980's to approximately 1992, the factory was home to Arcflex a metal hose works2. Between then and 2006

it was used as a granite works and then in April 2007 we rented the premises before buying in March 2008 to use as a warehouse.”

“Since locating to the factory premises we have enjoyed free, unchallenged and unfettered access, with and without vehicles, from Park Road onto the site. This is over a 9 year period,

As stated above – that is their right as owners. However, I have never seen them on the Park Road side of the factory until a few weeks ago when we had a meeting.

in the same way that numerous previous users of the site had. In the past businesses have used it as their main access to the factory.”

This statement is disputed. Since 1998 when we moved here, I cannot vouch for activity before then: there has never been any industrial activity at the factory accessed from Park Road until the Drabbles leased out space and I would swear an oath to that effect.

Since taking on the property, we have actually downgraded the level of intensity of use after many, many years of industrial use.

Perhaps from Sunday School Lane only – *see my statement above.

My last point to make is in the past, other residents have spoken to me about mending Park Road in collaboration, which would mean that we are considered a resident (and therefore have access) of Park Road.

I have always shown support and have put forward ideas in the past for fixing the road. And we are always happy to contribute to any agreed plans going forward in the future. You yourself have been made aware of this before there was any dispute over whether we have access or not. I mentioned near the beginning of our proposal, when addressing objections residents had made, I was willing to talk to local residents about my ideas for fixing the road as it was a major concern. It is a private road, there is no legal jurisdiction to say we don't have access and we have an obvious access point on to Park Road. The idea that we don't have access, to me seems to be a rumour put out there for the sake of arguing against our proposal. Do the objectors have evidence that we don't have a right to access?

Lastly I want to add that any short term disruptions from this small development will be far outweighed with the benefit of regeneration of the site, for all the residents.

Signed.

Edith D. Sanders