

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 02 November 2022 21:20:23

Application Reference No. : HPK/2022/0350

Site Address: New Mills Football Club Church Lane New Mills Derbyshire SK22 4NP High Peak

Comments by: Andrew Ellis

From:

Hollinsmoor Rd
Rowarth
New Mills

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: My name is Andrew Ellis and I write to object to planning application HPK/2022/0350 (20 dwellings at New Mills Football Club, Church Lane).

I do so on behalf of a group of 27 people (named below) who use the under threat astro turf pitch on a twice weekly basis.

We are an inclusive group, ranging in age from 17 to 59, who meet for social, recreational and exercise purposes. Some of us have lived in New Mills all our lives, others have moved here as adults and some have even come from other countries.

We have provided an important social link at the site that allows people to make friends and gives both physical and mental health benefits for around 15 years. Should the development go ahead this will be lost as, even if the club pitch is made all-weather and given over for community use, it is likely and understandable that other teams will be given priority. There are a large number of junior teams in New Mills and others in nearby towns, so there is a strong chance our group will have nowhere to play as there is no other similar facility locally.

There are also a host of planning reasons that mean this application should be rejected.

1 Highway safety. Church Lane is not a wide road and as well as the football club has a large church (opposite), parish hall, secondary school (also used as a drama academy for more than 100 children at weekends), primary school and existing residential dwellings. Between them, these existing developments mean there are many points in the week where traffic is heavy. A mix of 10 two and 10 three bed houses can conservatively be estimated to add 40 cars into the area, often moving at peak rush hour times when children are making their way to school.

2 Junction safety. The nearby Church Lane-Church Road junction is already at capacity. Church Road is a long, straight road where cars often travel above the speed limit, making it difficult to turn out of Church Lane and, especially when turning right across traffic, the risk of an accident high.

3 Existing development. Opposite Church Lane at this junction is Marsh Lane and within 100m is another development (already with planning permission) of 37 houses adding extra pressure to the junction.

4 Access road. The proposed road off Church Lane to the 20 houses would also present a danger. It is a narrow

junction with no scope to expand with the football club immediately on one side and St George's Primary immediately on the other. Furthermore the football club stands and frequent parked cars (from all the nearby amenities) make visibility at the junction limited, in fact the parked cars can effectively make the junction blind.

5 Parking. The housing development would see the football club lose the large car park next to the club house. Even now this is not always big enough when a match is taking place and cars are parked up and down Church Lane. The loss of the car park would increase this problem exponentially as the club would, in effect, have no parking facilities and force all cars onto the road. Saturday matches can clash with events at the church such as weddings and the use of the secondary school by a drama academy with more than 100 youngsters. The other frequent match day - a Wednesday - clashes with a Brownie group at the parish hall. The chaotic mix of all this traffic and parked cars would be dangerous at a time when a large number of children are in the area. As it is there have been occasions where emergency vehicles have struggled to gain access, this problem would become a more frequent one - with potentially serious consequences.

6 Resident parking. Although the 36 car parking spaces proposed for the development are within the council's guidelines, in practice there is likely to be more than 36 cars across 20 households, even before guests' vehicles are taken into consideration.

7. Pressure on local infrastructure. New Mills is a growing town with a population well above 12,000 currently. Particularly since the BBC moved to Manchester it has become a popular commuter town and additional houses are frequently being built. While the number of residents is growing the amount of infrastructure is not. For example this leads to increased pressure on schools, doctors and dentists. The last published CQC inspection of Settle Valley Medical Centre (the nearest GP to the proposed site) was in 2016 so there is no up to date official figures that can be used. But anecdotally patients at the surgery struggle to get through on the phone, have a wait for an appointment that can be measured in weeks rather than days, and can experience 30-40 minutes sat in the waiting room past their appointment time. This is not because of poor staff - they are diligent and efficient - but because of increasing pressure on the service. Similarly, stories of parents taking children to dentists outside of New Mills are becoming more common because of insufficient NHS spaces.

8. Inaccurate information in the planning application. The planning statement by Geraint John Planning states that the proposed development would be in a sustainable location, claiming the site is within half a mile of New Mills Central Station. Google route planner shows it to be more than this. Even measured from Church Lane the distance is 0.7 miles. Add on the necessary walk around the football pitch from the actual houses and it would likely be almost one mile. This makes the location less sustainable than claimed, particularly as the main nearby bus service, the 358, was recently earmarked for the axe. It survived this time but may not in future.

The report also describes the astro turf pitch as often in a condition that means it cannot be used, in a bid to underplay the worth of the asset that would be lost. Our group uses it twice a week, every week and other than in times of heavy snow (when facilities everywhere are rendered unusable) we have never been unable to use it.

9. Phone mast removal. According to plans the development would lead to the removal of a phone mast on site. What affect will this have on connectivity in the area? Will a suitable alternative site be available? Will any subsequent application itself be met with opposition?

10. Amenity for future residents. When building new houses, is right next to a football ground the best place? Residents will suffer from the associated noise, disturbance, litter, traffic and light pollution from floodlights.

We hope that for these reasons council planners will refuse permission for this residential development.

Thank you for your time,

Andrew Ellis

Chris Todd

Rick Adrio

Gavin Hough

Harry Sadler

Rob Preston

Will Jones

Chris Dakin

Matt Jennison

Graham Pridding

Elliott Donaghue

Alex Scapens

David Barnett

Mike Leatham

Jay Humberstone

Rick Handford

Scott Mitchell

Lee Hampson

Wayne Arnfield

David Adrio

Nick Barbian

Kieran Murray

Tony Jennison

Jack Kirk

Jack Hamnett

Thom Jennison

Simon Jordan

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>
