

Subject: HPK/2017/0694  
Date: 08 February 2018 14:40:18

---

Daniel Ashton  
4, Linglongs Avenue,  
Whaley Bridge ,  
High Peak,  
SK23 7DT  
/02/18  
Objection

**Re. HPK/2017/0694** N.B. I use colour for emphasis

Proposed Level Changes and Tree Retention Plan, (Drawing D6270.003, and AMS Overview and Sign-Off, page Drawing Number D6270.009) of the ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT - TEP.6270.01.001, January 2018, cannot be viewed in confidence. It states in Planning portal ref: PP-06623759 S.73 application to vary conditions 5, 24 and 31 of planning permission HPK/2014/0119, 'We are instructed by BDW Trading operating as Barratt Homes to submit this S.73 application to vary conditions 5, 24 and 31 of planning permission HPK/2014/0119, which each make reference to the approved Development Framework Plan (drawing no. 5660-L-03 Rev Q')

Condition 5 would be reworded as follows:

including a site layout plan identifying land uses such as formal and informal open space and infrastructure, in general accordance with the details set out on the Development Framework Plan (drawing no. 466/P/DF/01) **5660-L-03 Rev Q (crossed out)** shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In particular the layout shall provide for the retention of the existing trees on the site **where this is justified**. The development shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.'

Tyler Grange 4th January : Landscape Officer (DCC )states : "The application site is environmentally and visually sensitive at a strategic level and any decisions made in relation to this site should reflect this sensitivity. Should HPBC be minded to approve this outline application the following are

recommended:

1. That a Tree Preservation Order is made on the trees within the site and adjacent areas to ensure their long-term protection and longevity.
2. That existing trees are retained and protected.
3. The delivery of an effective landscape master plan is required, which is crucial to mitigate the effects of residential development on such a sensitive site.
4. The drafting of more detailed, clear and robust conditions.”

If the condition 5 amendment that states, ‘In particular the layout shall provide for the retention of the existing trees on the site **where this is justified**. This does not comply with the above and so must not be accepted.

Friends of the Peak District: “the relative merits of any scheme for the site, should it eventually be allocated, would be heavily dependent on its response to its sensitive landscape setting, and on this basis we do not accept that the landscape framework can be a reserved matter: only a full planning application can be properly evaluated. • Whether or not the site is suitable in principle for a residential development, the proposals contravene a raft of existing Local Plan policies, most worryingly in relation to traffic generation and the safety and amenity of local residents.” • Planning Policy: Tree and Landscape Matters: “Policy OC10 of the adopted Local Plan identifies that new development should not result in the loss of, or materially injure the health of woodlands, groups of trees or significant individual trees. Within the site there are a number of mature and semi mature trees which are protected by TPO 262 (Taxal Lodge and Woods). Broadly the trees are positioned in two internal lines which run in a north/south and east/west direction. These lines of trees link with other adjacent mature trees and woodlands and form an important landscape and ecological features.” “Policy OC4 - Landscape, Character and Design of the adopted Local Plan, which reflects part of the aims of paragraph 109 of the NPPF requires that new development should be designed and be appropriate to the character of the landscape. Saved Policy OC5 seeks to protect the purposes or valued characteristics of the National Park. With respect to emerging Local Plan Policy EQ 3 Countryside and Green Belt Development only respect to emerging Local Plan Policy EQ 3 Countryside and Green Belt Development only limited weight can be attributed to this Policy given the level of objection raised.”

**These changes to Condition 5 can make significant changes to the Gladman’s application and as such this condition must not be accepted.**

Condition 24 would be reworded as follows: “Prior to the commencement of development detailed designs for pedestrian/cycle access and in accordance with the general arrangements shown on plan **ref 466/6/P/DF/01, (5660 L 03 Rev Q crossed out)** site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved details shall be laid out, designed, laid out and implemented prior the first occupation of the development in any phase hereby approved.”

I cannot see any cycle access or cycle paths in the plan 446/P/DF/01 and the pedestrian routes seen are only **proposed, subject to detailed location**. The proposed access and exit do not make provision for safe cycling. The footpath adjacent to proposed entrance road is too narrow to accommodate pushchairs, mobility scooters and mothers walking holding little children's hands. It is so dangerous a path, as are the narrow ones on Macclesfield Road, that safety and also the site's sustainability are compromised. Gladman's did not feel that they could submit a safe entrance and exit for successful approval, and these plans do not create safe entrances and exits either.

**These changes to Condition 24 can make significant changes to the Gladman's application and as such this condition must not be accepted.**

**Condition 31** would be reworded as follows: "The development hereby approved shall not be carried out otherwise than **in general (complete, crossed out)**, accordance with the revised plans and specifications shown on drawing no 2013-030-100-01 Rev B (Location Plan) and 5660-L-03 466/P/DF/01 (Development Framework P/DF/01 5660-L03 Rev Q including the junction arrangements at Macclesfield Road and throughout the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved details shall be laid out, designed, laid out and implemented prior the first occupation of the development in any phase hereby approved.

How can this condition be passed when the final complete plans cannot be seen?

Drawing: 466/P//DF/01 in Barratt's Development Framework states in The Key: **Potential** Access on Linglons Road and "in only "entrance of Macclesfield Road.

'**Proposed** residential areas', '**proposed** trees', and '**proposed** footpaths.'

**Potential**: meaning,

(*adjective*

1. having or showing the capacity to develop into something in the future.

*synonyms*: possible, likely, prospective, future, probable, budding, in the making;

*Noun*

latent qualities or abilities that may be developed and lead to future success or usefulness.

*synonyms*: possibilities, potentiality, prospects;

'**Indicative** Primary Road''

Indicative; meaning,

adjective: **indicative**

1. Serving as a sign or indication of something.

This implies that these plans are possible but not definite.

**These changes to Condition 31 can make significant changes to the Gladman's application and as such this condition must not be accepted.**

I have lived on Linglongs Avenue for 35 years and driven along Linglongs Road for 23 years. I strongly feel that the proposed entrance on Linglongs Road will be a hazard both to pedestrians and drivers. Those driving from Taxal will not have a good view of the traffic situation coming off, and/or, going onto the development at this point until the apex of the road at the junction with Linglongs Avenue is reached. It is bad enough at present with larger vehicles having to use the centre of the narrow road and lane.

In my opinion the junction on Macclesfield Road and Linglongs Road does not allow for two larger vehicles to pass adjacent to one another, indeed, any vehicles will struggle to pass causing a hold up. Obviously the red triangle road sign for risk of skidding is still necessary going into the bend the top of Macclesfield Road, or it would not be in position. Hold ups and traffic queues would make this an increased hazard owing to more vehicles using this junction, especially contractors' vehicles.

**Many more objections and causes for grave concern to these changes have been addressed by other objectors and I heartily join them in expressing my opposition and objection.**

**Daniel Ashton.**