

## Barlow, Lynn

---

**From:** planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 29 April 2014 15:24  
**To:** Planning Comments  
**Subject:** Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HPK/2014/0119  
Site Address: Linglongs Road Whaley Bridge High Peak SK23 7DS  
Comments by: Louise  
From: Gough

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Submission: Objection

Comments: I strongly oppose and object to Planning Application HPK/2014/0119 Linglongs Rd Whaley Bridge for the following reasons:

### Ecology & Wildlife flora & fauna

Loss of habitat for: Owl, Bat, Badger, Red Deer, Birds, Insects, and Reptiles - Especially as Bats and Badgers are protected species.

The Badger survey is confidential (Ecology Report Appendix B) and not attached to the planning application. Why is this, what do the results show? Badger evidence is only mentioned twice in the whole planning application and each statement contradicts the other; Point 4.32 in Ecology report states there is evidence of Badgers yet in the point 7.3.2 of the Planning Statement it states there is no evidence of Badgers. This contradictory information and the confidential report leads me to think that the developers are hiding important information.

The destruction of 16 acre green field site.

The botanical study appears to have been completed after the field was mown and used by cattle? Surely a study cannot be undertaken after any subject matter has been removed?

The planning application states that any TPO is overridden by a planning application? Surely this is incorrect or why have TPOs?

I also believe that any housing and in-turn domestic cats, so close to the national park, will have a detrimental effect on the ecology of the park. Please see below for 2 quotes taken from scientific papers, studying the effect of domestic cats on wildlife and national parks.

Our results reveal that free-ranging domestic cats roam through and potentially impact the entire national park, thus reducing its effective protected area, Wierzbowska et al 2012. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1616504712000183>

domestic cats will hunt and kill wildlife (including endangered species), Meek 1998. <http://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/108626#page/49/mode/1up>

## Traffic

Macclesfield Road is not safe enough to support any increase in traffic. The road is effectively only one car wide in certain places, this is due to all the parked cars that currently line the street (in some places cars park on the pavement as well due to the lack of room).

Lower Macclesfield Road only has a pavement on one side of the road (left as you drive towards the traffic lights). Residents leaving their homes on the right hand side already have difficulty crossing the road. For reference I have attached two photos showing the view I have leaving my house, and I have to cross the road with a pram! Any increase in traffic will only make this crossing more perilous.

There have already been several traffic accidents on Macclesfield Road and at least 1 further accident since April 2013 (the cut off point for the accident report in the traffic assessment).

The Linglons/Macclesfield Road junction is too narrow and poorly suited to be used as an exit and entry point to a housing estate this large. 107 homes means 150 cars (current average is 1.4 cars per home) will be using this junction twice a day.

Derbyshire County Council (DCC) as the highways agency have already stated that satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site without the purchase of third party land (HPBC Meeting Minutes p31). <http://www.highpeak.gov.uk/sites/default/files/meetings/papers/papers-1699339090/106.pdf>

Have DCC been asked to comment on this planning application ¿ what is their assessment?

Traffic already backs up in each direction from the traffic lights ; any increase in traffic levels will only exacerbate this problem.

I really cannot understand Gladman's claims that traffic levels will only be increased by 1% (Point 4.6 Ecology Report). This is contradicted by the inclusion in the application of a Travel Plan. Further in the planning application it is stated that; "Where the development is expected to generate a higher level of car use than can be accommodated by the maximum parking standards or will significantly exacerbate existing traffic problems, the applicant should submit a Travel Plan to reduce car dependency". Therefore the inclusion of a traffic plan must be deemed as evidence that the planned site is creating a greater volume of traffic that the roads can handle?

The traffic report does not include the additional traffic created from other planned housing developments in the area. 1000 homes in Chapel would mean an extra 1400 cars on the road!

Any increase in vehicles will also increase the pollution in the air; as a resident of Macclesfield Road I do not want to be breathing in all those car fumes and surely as both Whaley Bridge Schools are situation so close to the road HPBC does not want to be poisoning children and potential voters.

I would also like to request that any site visit is completed at a time when traffic & parking will be at there worst ; there is no point in viewing Macclesfield Road & the site when traffic and parking levels are at their lowest. I would therefore suggest that a site visit be completed at the end of the day.

#### Amenities

In the planning application Gladman's state that local schools, doctors and dentists would be consulted to check that they can support the housing development ; Surely the availability of local amenities must be assessed before the homes are built ; not after when it is too late!

I also understand that HPBC & Dai Larner are currently speaking to DCC (as the local education authority) to re-assess the number of available spaces at the local school as a result of local head teachers confronting Mr Larner at a recent meeting with the towns folk of Whaley Bridge. How can any application be approved if HPBC do not know if the schools can support the influx of additional children? And if the larger proportion of houses are to be 4/5 bedroom ; you can safely assume there will be a lots of children!

## Midshires Way & Goyt

Whaley Bridges main industry (tourism) will be affected by building a large housing estate on the Midshires Way and the entrance to the Goyt. No matter how much this is 'sexed up' no one wants to hike through a housing estate!

## Visual Impact Assessment

It's interesting to note that the visual impact does not consider/show the viewpoint from residents currently living on Macclesfield Road - I wonder why? The houses on Macclesfield Road will lose any views they have.

The Visual Impact Assessment states that it is of 'medium sensitivity to change' even though the majority of viewpoints are described as 'high sensitivity' with 'major adverse effects'.

All effects are also presumed to decrease in adversity over time - where is the evidence to support this?

I'm also unconvinced how any housing development will improve the 'local landscape character' - How can a large housing estate look nicer than green fields (apart from to the land owners & developers).

## Geo Environment Assessment

States that a Phase 2 Geoenvironmental Assessment (Site Investigation) will be required - Why has this not been completed already?

I also cannot understand why the site soil chemistries are all estimates - Surely these need to be tested?

## Statement of community

In the Statement of Community it states that 'GDL have completed a comprehensive programme of community engagement which is considered appropriate for the proposed development on these sites'. This is utter rubbish as:

Gladman only leafleted a small % of the homes that back onto the site

Gladman organised for the consultation to take place over the Christmas period when attentions are focused elsewhere ; This entire process was just a rubber-stamping exercise

The Statement of Community Includes the of minutes from Whaley Bridge Town Council Meeting showing that their decision on the planning application was deferred until a later meeting, however it fails to mentioned that since that meeting Whaley Bridge Town Council have come out against the development. Gladman appear to cherry pick information that backs their application!

#### Travel Plan

The travel plan states that Whaley Bridge is a walkable town ; this however does not mean that people necessary choose to walk ; I suggest standing outside Whaley Bridge Schools at opening/closing times and count how many cars are parked up.

The travel plan also states that the housing development would include parking restraint; ;A degree of parking restraint is likely to be critical to the success of the plan in reducing car use. Parking provision should be consistent with chosen targets in the context of local parking standards, i.e. parking provision should be limited to cater for planned levels of car use if targets are met.; From this statement we can deduce that to try and force people away from cars use they are not going to build enough car parking spaces. This would be absolutely mental! In the real world the majority of families have 2 cars (more if children are over 17) and what happens when people visit their friends/families who live on this estate? The only result would be even more parking on Macclesfield Road.

A recent review by the Traffic Planning Society states:

;Increasing stress on on-street car parking is often viewed unfavorably by local residents, councilors, local authority officers and planning inspectors;.

;especially given the less than favourable public opinion of restrictive parking;

;it is concerning that these policies now appear to have been introduced without considering fully (or perhaps even partially) the impacts they may have on society;.

¿Indeed, after five years of government policy reducing household parking provision through the planning system, car ownership continues to rise¿.

The travel plan also states that Whaley Bridge residents have access to high quality public transport facilities. Please let me elaborate further on the so called high quality transport facilities;

An hourly train to Manchester.

Irregular bus times to Macclesfield ¿ If you work in Macclesfield there are 2 buses that you can catch to go to work. One arrives in Macclesfield at 8am, the other 10:45am (timetable attached for reference).

The Travel plan quotes the 2006 Local Plan & saved policy TR1: ¿Planning Permission will be granted for a new development provided that it seeks to:

reduce the need to travel.

widen transport choice for people and goods.

integrate transport and land use¿.

I cannot see how this planning application supports any of these points;

Whaley Bridge is a small town and a large number of people work outside of this area and therefore commute to work.

A large number of these people will travel by car due to irregular public transport.

The development does not widen the transport choice ¿ Cars, Bus, Train, Bike, Foot were all used before Gladman formed.

The Traffic Plan gives examples of obligation contributions but no actual answers or definitive answers ; purely speculation.

The traffic plan states that the ;TPC will highlight to residents the benefits of working at home, including teleworking on a part-time basis, thereby reducing travel to work for a portion of the working week; ; This assumes people have the luxury of choice and are able to work from home, again no evidence to back this up.

The Traffic assessment estimates peak hour traffic (total 2-way) generated by the proposed 107 dwellings (and that is used in all the TA modelling of junctions) is 64 vehicles in the AM peak hour. ; How can any scientific assessment be made from an estimate?

The traffic report quotes Saved Policy TR4 and it states: ;Planning Permission will be granted for development, provided that:

the capacity and design of the transport network serving the site will reasonably accommodate the anticipated increase in travel without materially harming highway safety or local amenity; and

the traffic generated by the development will not unduly interrupt the safe and free flow of traffic on trunk or primary roads or materially affect existing conditions to an unacceptable extent;.

I do truly believe that this proposed site fails both of these points and therefore should not go ahead.

Proposed housing estate

Noise pollution for local residents.

Light pollution for local residents.

Right to light for local residents ; In fact the sun barely makes it over the tops in Winter and any new houses will make this even worse for the houses located next to this site.

Right to privacy ; New homes on this site will have a large unrestricted view of the homes and gardens of residents on Macclesfield Road.

Building disruption ; Whaley Bridge residents would have to put up with a building site (dust/noise/traffic) for 5 years.

The proposed building site working hours of 7am-7pm Monday to Friday & 8am-4pm Sat. This will severely impact on local residents health and wellbeing.

The impact of lorries & construction vehicles on an already narrow and busy Macclesfield Road and Whaley Bridge town centre.

The potential of flooding due to construction vehicles compacting soil on the site (already categorised as Wetness class IV) and leaving nowhere for rainwater to soak away.

Gladman's planning Application

The application is for 107 homes, this is much larger than the local plan (currently under consultation and not finalised).

The planning application states that there will be 30% affordable homes (32), further investigation shows that this actually means 26 affordable rented & 6 available for purchase - how can they claim to support young buyers?

The majority homes are 4/5 bedrooms ; The sale of these homes will be targeted at people who travel & work outside the area & therefore not adding to local economy.

The whole planning application is full of speculation ; lots of; may, could, potentially (not factual).

The application is littered with spelling mistakes.

Ecology Appendix A labelled incorrectly.

Ecology Appendix B missing.

Transport Assessment part 3 added on 24th April ; why?

The application form was completed by a Mr Tracey McCann, who later on changes sex to a Ms!

Do HPBC not care about these errors?

AOB

I strongly feel that the priority should be to look at smaller brownfield sites.

The planning application states that the site is in a Radon a risk area but then does not elaborate further ; What about the safety of Whaley Bridge residents, building here could leave a ticking medical time bomb!

The word sustainable is used throughout this application; for a long list of reasons you can see that this is just not the case.

NPPF (para 7) discusses the promotion of healthy communities; specifically: ;Planning policies and decisions should support the development of healthy and inclusive communities; and guarding ;against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities services, particularly where this would reduce the community;s ability to meet its day-to-day needs; - If the community and its amenities cannot support this housing development ; how is this healthy???

Finally I feel that HPBC need to take note of Whaley Bridge residents and their views; negative feedback from 2 local plan consultations on this site (C9), a local protest march, two petitions, attendance at HPBC meetings, lobbying of HPBC Councillors, newspaper articles & Social media (Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/213528398836030/>, Twitter: <https://twitter.com/WhaleyBMatters>, Pinterest: [www.pinterest.com/whaleybridge](http://www.pinterest.com/whaleybridge) & WB Websites: <http://www.whaleybridge.com> & <http://whaleybridgematters.squarespace.com> ) all demonstrate how strongly Whaley Bridge residents feel against any housing development on this site.

