

**From:** [planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk](mailto:planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk)  
**To:** [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comment Received from Public Access  
**Date:** 12 February 2018 16:06:03

---

Application Reference No. : HPK/2017/0694  
Site Address: Land At Linglongs Road Whaley Bridge Derbyshire  
Comments by: Max Wellingham  
From:  
58 Macclesfield Road

Whaley Bridge

SK23 7DH  
Phone:  
Email:  
Submission: Objection  
Comments: Dear Sir

I have already written extensively about my objections to this development, on the grounds that - for a number of reasons - the site is wholly unsuitable.

Access is poor, the major roads on this side of town are already unsuitable for the traffic volumes being asked of them and cannot cope with the additional volumes this development will generate. Indeed, DCC Highways Department have themselves stated that the development will increase traffic significantly.

The site is an essential amenity to the local community, as well as providing the town its main economy: tourism and easy access to the national park. To allow this to be lost would be a travesty. It is also an important habitat of local wildlife, including areas of wetland and wildflower meadow. Has the badger impact assessment, for example, been revised to take into account the newly-proposed increased proximity of the site road to the edge of woodland where badger sets are known?

The proposed site acts as a soakaway protecting the local area from flooding. Even in high summer water table so high that surface water runs over. Indeed, the archaeological survey had to be abandoned because the trenches filled with water as fast as the engineers could dig them! Independent expert reports have confirmed that the current drainage proposals WILL increase flood risks further downstream; this should never be considered acceptable. There are noted examples across Whaley Bridge where significant local flooding now occurs as a direct consequence of greenfield development.

This latest application contains some significant changes carefully concealed within it - for example: a substantial increase in the proposed housing density; the change in approach to tree management proposed by condition 5 - the changes proposed in this application would permit Barratt to remove any and every tree on site; the proposed replacement of the word 'complete' to 'general' in relation to compliance with approved plans - this would give Barratt license to vary their plans without the need to consult with the Authority or the local community. Both Barratt and the Authority know this is a contentious development; to surrender full control of the design of the scheme would be foolish of the authority, who could have used that as a bargaining chip. Overall, I consider the nature of changes to be of sufficient weight that Barratt should be subject to re-application for outline permission.

I note that this site now has four open applications; it could be suggested that Barratt Homes were deliberately proposing outrageous changes in the hope that (pre-planned) watered-down amendments will be seen by the local community as 'gracious concessions' and 'backing down', or deliberately trying to confuse and mislead local residents in the hope that major changes to the design will be missed by residents. This is unfair abuse of the planning system, and presided over by an Authority that has already been rebuked by the Local Government Ombudsman for improper handling of applications related to this development.

It strikes me that, rather than wasting their money trying to fight this wholly unsuitable and unwanted development, Barratt Homes would be far better placed to invest their money exploring development on the other side of town, near Tesco and the A6, where development would be welcomed by the community with open arms. The flat, farmland would not be missed by the community, and the sites are easily accessible from a major trunk road, with easy access to building materials.