

Dear James

In relation to my previous objection to the proposal of replacing the current wooden post and wire fencing to a 2.4m high palisade fence, I wish to add further comments and questions:

I am assuming at this initial stage your remit is to carry out a desk top assessment of the proposal.

On a visual site inspection you will see that where the current fence line is, there are a large amount of trees along this line and a myriad of lower branches, leaning trunks, and young growing trees. Currently the established old trees and newer growing trees and large saplings are in the path of the new proposed fence.

Surely it is impossible to place a 2.4m fence of any type along this tree line without interference or damage to trees young and old.

The current style of fencing is ideal as it allows natural tree growth and branch expansions, not interfering with overhead branches and allowing growth over and through the wire. A palisade fencing would prevent this.

In relation to the installation of a palisade fencing in particular, surely this requires deep concrete footings, regardless of height, and must affect tree roots?

As a resident looking out on this every day from windows and the garden, I know there are no issues on the land.

There is no fly tipping: no anti-social behaviour: no vandalism: no graffiti: no gatherings: no abuse of the land: There is no graffiti or interference on the substation (which could be singularly secured anyway)

If it is possibly for security- what is it securing and why?

Is there any explanation of :

1. Why it had to be an obtrusive palisade type fence, which is not in keeping with the area's natural landscape and beauty
2. Why it has to 2.4m
3. Why the land has to be so securely fenced

I understand Mr Robinson has the right to secure his land, and acknowledge the current fencing has gaps and not in the best condition.

However, as specified in my previous objection I really hope this matter can be resolved in a sensible, sensitive manner, according to High Peak Council and National policies (as stated in my previous objection) – so a more suitable option can be agreed in keeping with the area, alongside the protection of trees.

I also enclose a list of local people who frequent the area on their walks, who also object to the proposal on the grounds of adverse visual impact.

Objectors to HPK/2023/0022 Planning Proposal
for erection of 2.4m high palisade fencing
with gates to boundary fronting access Rd to Thornsett
Industrial Estate and around existing sub station.
on the grounds of adverse visual impact.

NAME	ADDRESS	DATE
BRYAN KEALY	45, BATEMILL RD N/M.	22-3-23
MARILYN FLETCHER	2 GARRISON VIEW BIRCH VALE	22-3-23
JANICE WEST	2 CARLANDS HAYFIELD	22.3.23.
Wayne Flanagan	22 Spencer Bottom, Birch Vale	22.3.23.
Wendy Goodwin	55 BATEMILL RD NEWBILLS	22-3-23
Abbie Nicholls.	67 Batemill Rd, Birch Vale High Peak, SK22 1BB	22.3.23.
Will NICHOLLS	67, Batemill Road, Birch Vale High Peak, SK22 1BD	22.03.23
Leonie Jodrell	7 Conal Street Whaley Bridge High Peak SK23 7LS	22.3.23
DARREN SMAILES	95 THORSETT SK22 1AS	23.3.23
NICOLA SMAILES		

Photographs showing tree line and current fencing



Application number HPK/2023/0022 Erection of 2.4m palisade Fencing: Fronting the access road to Thornsett Industrial Estate and around Existing Sub-Station



Application number HPK/2023/0022 Erection of 2.4m palisade Fencing: Fronting the access road to Thornsett Industrial Estate and around Existing Sub-Station