

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 27 June 2023 13:36:05

Application Reference No. : HPK/2023/0061

Site Address: Land to the west of Bridgemont Whaley Bridge Derbyshire SK23 7PB

Comments by: Peter Hannan

From:

34

Bridgemont

Bridgemont

Whaley Bridge

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: Further to the letter submitted by Emery Planning on 20/06/2023, I would like to reiterate my objections to the proposed development citing comments made by the relevant authorities in their respective areas to support said objection.

I would like to bring the committees attention to the regeneration report which confirms the fulfilment of the provision of affordable housing in accordance with the local plan for the local and wider area. Despite the report clearly stating that "Based on the pipeline of sites coming forward, there is evidence of affordable housing delivery being achieved on both S106 and wholly affordable sites in the Central Area" the applicant appears to be ignoring these significant details in their most recent letter. I am also deeply concerned by the complacency of their response to the finding "The applicant has provided a suggested layout including property mix which does not align with the housing need identified in both the Home Options data or the HELNA" suggesting that these details can be fixed later as it would take too much time to amend the layouts now. Hardly indicative of a cooperating developer with the wellbeing of locals at the forefront of their mind.

Keeping with the regeneration report; the idea that Bridgemont with its requirement of 2 houses warrants a site of 42 additional houses is quite frankly laughable, especially when one takes into consideration the 13 additional affordable houses built in Bridgemont recently. Despite the applicants best efforts to ignore these figures with the argument of ¿what if the other planned sites aren¿t built¿; I would prefer not to insult the committees or anyone else¿s intelligence and simply ask this question: is the local need being met? If the answer is yes; then a development of this size on green belt land is out of the question and this ill-fated application must be put to rest once and for all.

I would like to bring the committees attention the response from DCC Policy and Monitoring. The report lays bare the simple fact that our schools cannot cope with the inundation of pupils that would arise from this development. In fact they can hardly cope with their numbers as it is. The report states that our primary schools or secondary schools "would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate" the numbers resulting from this development. Seeing as development on green belt land requires the applicant to take into account the potential strain on local facilities; I would consider this a damning indictment of the inappropriate nature of this application.

I would also like to bring into question the decision by Whaley Bridge Town Council to talk down the merits of the site as a green space. When I look at the site I don¿t see a scrap yard. I see a space that has been neglected by an owner who had only one intention; build. I see land that has been put to better use by locals who have

decided to make better use of the space, rather than leave it to become overgrown and unsightly; which conveniently lends itself to Town Councils flippantly writing the land off as green belt only in name.

The previous application was refused on several grounds including the following: "Insufficient information has been submitted with the application relating to matters of access in order to assess adequately the impacts of the proposed development having regard to matters of highway safety and design for the development proposal". With this in mind I would like to bring to the committees attention the following quote from DCC Highway's most recent report: "This drawing does not show enough information to determine the exact extent of the proposed access". Can we honestly say that this reason for refusal has been meaningfully resolved?

Another ground for refusal was: "Insufficient information has been submitted with the application relating to drainage in order to assess adequately the impacts of the proposed development having regard to matters of local flood risk of the development proposal". The following quote is taken from the most recent comment from United Utilities: "there is insufficient information on the detail of the drainage design". Once again crucial information is being swept under the rug in favour of cosmetic solutions and easy answers.

To be going through this routine once again is disheartening and quite frankly putting undue stress and anxiety on a community who just want to sleep easier, knowing their homes won't be flooded overnight, or a retaining wall that will be disrupted by the works won't have its structural integrity compromised and pose a serious safety risk to those homes adjacent to the site. I can't help but notice these concerns are yet again being ignored.

I would finally like to draw the committees attention to the decision to refuse this application last year on similar grounds to what I have laid out. When this decision was rightly made; several councillors justified their decision with the following quotes taken from the Buxton Advertiser published 18/02/22:

Councillor Charlotte Farrell - "We need affordable housing but not on green belt land. We once refused permission to allow someone to build a shed on green belt land so 38 houses is totally unsuitable. If we had approved the plans it would have changed Bridgemont forever and turned it from a small hamlet into something much bigger and that precious green space would have been lost forever".

Councillor David Lomax - "We recently approved affordable housing in Bridgemont, and there are also affordable sites in Furness Vale and Whaley Bridge so we don't need them on our green belt land."

Councillor Graham Oakley - "The right decision has been made. If the plans were approved it would have been harmful to the village which would have lost its identity."

To Councillors Charlotte Farrell, David Lomax, and the rest of the committee; I ask just one question: what has changed?

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>
