
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 22 February 2021 11:20
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HPK/2021/0055 Site Address: 22 Bowden Lane Chapel-En-Le-Frith Derbyshire SK23 0JQ
High Peak Comments by: Roger Yorke

From:
14
Bowden Lane
Chapel-En-Le-Frith
High Peak
Derbyshire
SK23 0JQ

Submission: Objection

Comments: As a resident and someone who regularly walks and drives a vehicle along the southern part of Bowden Lane, I wish to express my concerns about this planning application. I recognise this is a retrospective application and the applicant has no doubt already paid for the work that has been undertaken. Nevertheless, I would encourage the Councillors not to consider this a 'done deal' and demand that the original wall be re-instated.

I have three areas of concern plus a comment, the latter I appreciate you may not be able to consider at this time.

- 1) Appearance – When the properties, now known as 12 to 26 Bowden Lane were built retaining walls were constructed up from the road level, presumably to prevent movement of the earth bank on which the houses sit. The walls are of local sandstone and laid in, what I would call, a non-uniform rubble style. There is probably a better technical term! The wall fronting No. 22 was of the same construction. I do not recall there being any Marshalite blocks in that wall but if there was, they were probably used to effect a cheap repair. Whilst the new blocks will likely darken in colour as they weather the uniform layering is very much out of keeping with the surrounding walls in what I believe is a 2nd or 3rd grade conservation area. It seemed to me the original stones were in a sufficiently good state to be re-used if re-siting of the wall was ever necessary.
- 2) Safety of Construction – The existing walls fronting the other properties have stood for some 120 years and, although stones over the years have naturally weathered, they continue to do the job for which they were built with little sign of any movement. By comparison, the upper section of the new wall has already collapsed. It was built on a rather poor base and the mortar was clearly not a suitable mix as it quickly began to crack and the wall bulge to the point where the blocks fell down. I therefore wonder about the quality of construction of the remainder of the new wall and its footings and suggest these be inspected. The new blocks are not keyed into the flanking walls and the wall on the south side has not been properly re-rendered leaving it open to water and ice damage.
- 3) Obstruction of the carriageway – Although it is true to say that the retaining walls south of No. 22 are set further back, the space that has been created by moving the wall at No 22 is insufficient to prevent a standard size car protruding out into the carriageway beyond those cars parked in front of other houses. Interestingly the applicant has recently been parking her car in the space. It is a small, narrow car and even with its near side right up against the wall it still sticks out further than others parked above. As others have mentioned, this is at one of the pinch points in the Lane and immediately south of the bend in the Lane that blocks drivers' direct line of sight. The passage of refuse and other larger vehicles, already difficult, could be further restricted.

4) Necessity of the work : Having said all the above I do question why moving the wall was necessary. I am led to believe that the applicant is desirous of developing a piece of agricultural land betwixt the Blackbrook stream and the rear of the houses to the east of Bowden Lane and Fern Bank. The access to this land is via a field gate north of No 26 Bowden Lane. However, the bulk of this latter piece of land is occupied by a double garage, half of which the applicant uses (and owns?). There is sufficient room here to park one car in the garage and a second in front of it. Clearly, if the fields were to be built on improved access would be needed. It would seem the applicant is attempting to avoid a restriction that would block any future planning application by creating an alternate parking place. Whilst this is understandable the negative impact on the area, apparent poor construction of the new wall and adding to the difficulties of traversing Bowden Lane would suggest this proposal is not the right answer.

Thank you

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
