

Gallacher, Hayley

From: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

-----Original Message-----

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk [mailto:planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk]
Sent: 05 April 2017 14:14
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HPK/2016/0692
Site Address: Land Opposite Alders Meadow Buxton Road Chinley Derbyshire
Comments by: Diana Gibbz

From:
51
Buxton Road
High Peak
Chinley

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: My reasons for opposition to the proposal for the building of 38 houses are that the area will be grossly overdeveloped, there is an ever increasing drainage problem in the west area, there is already insufficient parking, and there will be an increase in traffic, noise AND pollution. I have detailed issues below:

The Design and Access Statement document [1.00] rationalises that Chapel-en-le-Frith will provide good employment opportunities with bus services connecting the site to Chapel and Whaley. These buses ONLY run every two hours and the employment opportunities have been greatly exaggerated. With already existing proposals for new housing there will be a lot of competition for employment. Of course there will be opportunities in Manchester, making it necessary to commute. Again, the trains run only every two hours on weekdays and the fares are prohibitive for most working people therefore necessitating MORE traffic on the roads to Manchester.

In the Design and Access Statement [2.00.1] the design criteria says they are taking into account the townscape. Chinley is a village, NOT a town. Three stories is excessive and will not fit harmoniously into the environment. The two houses in the area with three stories are an exception, not the rule, and they are only discretely evident from the rear and not obvious from the streetscape.

There are no facilities to accommodate bicycles within the site and most families that live here will use them as well as cars.

[2.00.8] In keeping with the appearance of the existing area the drystone walls should be preserved. Open park railings will not be ¿attractive¿.

[3.00] How sustainable is ¿sustainable development principles¿? Pretty poor from what I can see. The existing houses in Alders Meadows have only ONE solar panel on each side of the roofs. That is farcical, a token gesture that is ineffective and a total waste of money. The design shows that there has been no consideration for passive design therefore the houses cannot be described as sustainable. IT IS NOT A SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.

There is no economic rationale that the quality of sustainable developments should be sacrificed for so called affordable housing.

The development of this site is well over the desired contribution (number) of the housing target for Chinley as recommended by the Parish.

[4.00] ¿The affordable housing requirement of the authority will be met by the provision of 30% of the total dwellings.¿ Of the 38 dwellings planned only about 12 will be affordable as stated on the document. This is not good enough.

[5.00] The document states: Trips generated as a result of the proposals will have no material impact on the adjoining highway network. This is a fallacy as the congestion along Buxton Road, and frequent near accidents on the junction of Alders Avenue; not to mention the menace of drivers constantly exceeding the speed limit, is already dangerous.

[5.00] The claim that the site proposals provide good accessibility by cycle, foot and for those with disabilities for public transport is deceitful. There has been an ongoing debacle about the inability of people in wheelchairs, mothers with prams, and the elderly with shopping buggies, being able to access the train facilities. Riding a bicycle down Buxton Road can be risky because of the line of parked cars and traffic congestion.

[6.00] There is no dispute about contamination on the West side (unless you include the rats, shrews and moles); whereas there is about the severe drainage problems and the flooding which does occur. More paving will put all of the existing houses at a greater risk of damage from flooding and subsidence from the increasing (climate change) rainfall and runoff.

[6.00] As the developers seem to acknowledge the inevitability of climate change they have not taken into account the rainfall and drainage problems that are getting worse by the year. Also the strength of the wind that blows garden furniture and bin contents around the area. On many occasions I have had to cram everything into the garage because of the prevailing wind that creates eddies due to the contours of landscape. Bins, pots and garden furniture go flying in all directions. The claim that the site is screened from high winds is incorrect. More housing will increase the turbulence that occurs when there are high structures close together.

[6.00] It is stated that the area is not located in an area of flood risk. Not true. The house at the end of the terrace in Alders Lane has been flooded on many occasions. The west field is getting boggy by the year. The flora has evolved from good grazing land to wetland. It is not a good site for housing. It will certainly get worse with building and paving stopping the absorption of constant rainfall. There will not be sufficient drainage to compensate for this and the existing houses to the west and south will be significantly affected in future.

[6.00] The environmental analysis states the site has the benefit of being adjacent to attractive open areas with views of the Peak District hills ¿ for whom? I will not be able to see these hills with a two storey house blocking my view! I want to retain the quiet enjoyment of the hills and landscape from my rear garden.

[6.00] The impact on the bats that frequent the eastern aspect will be significant, not just in the building stage but forever.

On the existing plan there seems to be no allowance for me to access the rear door of my garage. Am I to squeeze past two cars to get in to it? And will there be room for me to maintain the windows to my garage?

I am also deeply concerned about the security of my garage and shed, as there is fenestration on the north and west sides. Is the developer planning to compensate for me to have a more secure door and windows installed in my garage and shed? At the moment no-one is ever in the field and with increased traffic of strangers there is increased risk to our security.

No provision has been made for a play area: the existing yards/gardens are too small forcing children to play on the road which is already causing problems in Alders Meadows. The plans do not include a communal play area for children.

With 152 extra bins for refuse what considerations have been planned for access by the council collection?

With the eventual loss of the existing garages to the rear of the West area and the improvised parking by desperate residents not wanting to park on an already crowded Buxton Road and Alders Avenue there is no provision. This is an inconvenience and a safety concern for the whole community.

I wholeheartedly agree with all the other points of opposition made by other concerned residents and councillors to date.