

**From:** [planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk](mailto:planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk)  
**To:** [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comment Received from Public Access  
**Date:** 20 June 2023 14:54:55

---

Application Reference No. : HPK/2023/0192  
Site Address: Land at Hogshaw Fairfield Buxton Derbyshire  
Comments by: C I & WERuddick

From:  
105  
Nunsfield Road  
Buxton  
Buxton  
Derbyshire  
SK17 7BS

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: Representation by CI & WERuddick on planning Application HPK/2023/0192 Land at Hogshaw, Buxton

We wish to register the following representation on the above planning application:

1. On the assumption that the application plan is north-south from top to bottom, there is an area included at the north-eastern corner comprising some sixty (60) plots. The high peak Local Plan shows Housing Allocation along the eastern side following a continuation of the boundary at the rear of Nunsfield Farm. The field between that boundary and the line of former Roman Road is shown for Agriculture and must therefore should be struck out from the development.

There is adequate housing allocation land elsewhere in this area that could be substituted. If developments are allowed on zoned Agricultural land, then what is the point of a Local Plan?

2. The application plan shows a potential future link road. This presumably is to allow for the development of further land to the west. If this is so then all access for future construction will need to be through what will then be an existing housing estate. Surely it is more logical to develop the furthest away land first?

3. The planning layout plan shows the easement width for the Buxton Mineral water pipe along the southern boundary where the existing Public Footpath is seemingly being replaced by a Bridleway. The actual location of the water pipe is not as shown, i.e. under the Public Footpath, but in the field underneath where adjacent houses are to be built. Does this mean that the water pipe is going to run under houses?

4. The Derbyshire County Council Travel Plan at para 2.15 states 'the A6 is congested for much of the day' this taken from the High Peak Local Plan at para 6.96. How the construction of 116 dwellings with provision for at least two hundred and fifty seven (257) vehicles can hope to improve that condition cannot be envisaged, the A6 being the ONLY road into Buxton from the North taking already increased traffic from extra developments in Fairfield, Dove Holes etc, and much HGV traffic from neighbouring quarries and Buxton Mineral Water.

5. Public transport links do not indicate that the bus stops on Brown Edge Road will be accessed by a steep footpath crossing two railway bridges. This to a bus of four times per day with no service evenings, Sunday or Bank Holidays.

Pedestrian access to the Town centre is shown to be approximately 2km. We do not feel that people will walk this distance to access the Town for shopping, schools, Doctors etc. Aldi is very neatly shown as being 'convenient' but is soon to close to relocate outside the Town on the Ashbourne Road. Considerable extra traffic on the one road into the Town itself and to gain access to towns to the south of Buxton will definitely occur thus increasing congestion. The Transport Assessment submitted by the Developer glibly shows the A6 into the Town Centre as giving access to Bakewell and Matlock no mention is made to the fact that access through the Town via the A6 to other towns e.g. Ashbourne, Leek, and Macclesfield.

Accidents on Fairfield Road are shown to be 'slight', despite there having been in recent times one fatality partly due to lack of visibility to the pedestrian crossing beyond the railway bridge.

6. The application states that there are no proposals for diversion/extinguishment/creation of Rights of Way. There is however, the question of a Bridleway being shown where none exists at present. The existing Public Footpath is used extensively by dog walkers, people with small children etc. If this path is to be simply upgraded, despite the denial in the application form with much greater use by cyclists and horse riders it will create more danger for pedestrians. If two rights of Way could be accommodated, i.e. a Public Footpath and Bridleway this would make more sense. Although illegal the existing Public Footpath does get used by motorcycles and a Bridleway will give easier access and encourage more of this illegal nuisance use.

7. There is already a shortage of Dentist, Doctors and School places in the Town, this development will simply increase demand and pressure on these and other Public Services e.g. Police, Fire etc.

8. It is to be hoped that there is no conflict of interest between the Local Authority and the Developer as the land required for access to the development is in the ownership of the Local Authority which will stand to benefit substantially from a sale of the land to the developer, particularly if there is any element of 'enhanced value' under the precedent created by Stokes v Cambridge Corporation 1961.

9. If the application is granted it is to be hoped that adequate and suitable landscaping is provided particularly along the southern boundary.

C I & WERuddick

20 June 2023

---

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>

---