

From: [Caroline Austin](#)
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#); [James Stannard](#)
Subject: URGENT - planning application HPK/2023/0532
Date: 20 March 2024 11:34:58

Hi

I'm writing in regards to the above application on land off Eaves Knoll Road.

The application has surpassed the 21 days consultation period (which ended on 15th February) and therefore a decision regarding the application should be being made rather than the applicant submitting altered plans (on 18th March) 32 days after the end of the consultation period . This is completely unacceptable.

The time frame and the fact that the plans have significantly changed means a new application should be submitted or at the very least, there should be publicity of the changes and consultation should be reopened in the interest of fairness so that there is an opportunity for residents to express their views on the amended application as the revised application does not overcome objections from the local community.

Whilst consultation has ended, I would still like it be known that I strongly object to the revised plans.

My reasons for the objection:

Policy EQ4, within the adopted Local Plan, states clearly " Within Greenbelt planning permission will not be granted unless it is in accordance with national planning policy". The National Planning Policy Frameworks makes very clear that development within Greenbelt will only be permitted when 'very special circumstances are demonstrated. The definition within this context sets a very high bar and means that significant reasons must be proven to mitigate for development. The applicant has simply not demonstrated any' very special circumstances' - The land is agricultural and not attached to a property and therefore there is no reason to require off road parking. The proposed parking is also disproportionately large.

Policy S6 makes clear the Council's policies to protect the greenbelt and to ensure that any development enhances the distinctiveness of the Peak District area and to enhance its setting. The parking of a camper van (see photos submitted by c austin on 8th February) for prolonged periods, including overnight, in an elevated position prove that significant harm will be a result if this application is approved. The visual impact on the landscape of this application must be considered 'severe' when short, medium and long range views from Public Rights of Way are considered. There is no attempt to even screen the obtrusive and incongruous proposal.

Please could you call me ASAP to discuss this further as I'm extremely unhappy that a revised plan was added on 18th March with an extension until 21st March and we were not advised about this and i want to understand why this has possible.

I look forward to your call today due to the urgency of the matter.

Many thanks

Caroline

Sent from [Outlook for Android](#)