

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 04 November 2021 10:15:30

Application Reference No. : HPK/2021/0060 Site Address: 2 - 6 Leek Road Buxton Derbyshire SK17 6UD
Buxton Comments by: Andrea Needham

From:

8

Macclesfield Old Road
Burbage
Buxton

SK17 6UB

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: I am writing to confirm that I maintain my strong objection to the above application. I was reconsulted by letter and the deadline for the response is today (4th November). I am a bit disappointed to see therefore that the application status is down on the website as 'recommendation entered'. I am guessing this means you have already come to a view before the consultation period has ended?

I am afraid I wholly disagree with the response by the agent on the impacts of overshadowing on our property. To say that there would be no overshadowing is frankly untrue. As I am sure you will appreciate the submitted 'impact on amenities' plan shows the maximum overshadowing at 12pm at winter solstice. The shadow at the time appears to just skim our front elevation. However what it fails to show is that for all of the daylight hours before 12pm (when the sun is lower) our house will be wholly in shadow. I must emphasise again that these are rooms that provide PRINCIPLE LIVING ACCOMMODATION. There are no other windows serving the rooms in question and in the winter the only time they receive sunlight is in the morning. The result will be that the development would block light and be overbearing to an unacceptable degree. This is directly contrary to adopted policies and design guidance.

The agent emphasises that the shortfall between the proposed separation distances and the local plan recommended distance is relatively small. If the building were to be the same height as ours I might accept this argument. But it is substantially higher than our house which significantly increases its impact.

I am yet to see any good planning reason why the Council would not give substantial weight to our concerns and ask for the scheme to be amended. The issue could be simply resolved by setting the building back and lowering its height. No information has been provided to suggest that this would result in an unviable development.

The agent says that the dormers were included to 'enhance the traditional appearance'. I would say that it is dubious whether they do add value and in any case the amenity concerns should outweigh this point. This is such a simple amendment that would go some way to reducing impact.

Separation distances between nearby properties may be less but these are historic properties, built long before planning regulation was in place and their presence should not preclude a good standard of amenity in new developments today.

I trust that these comments will be considered carefully. I would be grateful if you could confirm.

With kind regards

Andrea Needham

P.S. if permission is granted I hope that a condition to agree the stonework will be appended and the poor quality artificial stone that is currently stored on the site will not be permitted. I also hope that any external lighting will be controlled.

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>
