

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 29 April 2024 16:29:58

Application Reference No. : HPK/2024/0147
Site Address: 95 St Johns Road Buxton Derbyshire SK17 6UT Buxton
Comments by: April Irwin
From:
93
St Johns Road
Burbage
Buxton

Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: Dear James

We object to the planning application named above for the following reasons:

1. Parking provision and proximity to main road

The Kedleston Group, have said there is room for 6 vehicles on the driveway. They have stated that,

„It has also been demonstrated that the home would provide a safe and stable environment for vulnerable young children without compromising residential amenity or parking issues;

We disagree with this assertion. Number 95 is two property lengths up from a heavily used pedestrian crossing on St Johns Road (A53). Many of our immediate neighbours, including ourselves reverse out of our driveways when leaving our properties. St Johns is a main route into and out of town and we have real concerns that we won't have clear sight lines at times to reverse out safely. While there is „hypothetically; room for 6 vehicles on the driveway, drivers will have to juggle vehicles in and out of the driveway to accommodate people who want to leave the proposed scheme and it's a fair certainty that vehicles will be parked outside on the road/grass verge to save visitors; time. As well as being a nuisance it represents a real safety issue to road users and pedestrians in the locality.

2. Character of the area

At present the properties that surround number 95 are all residential dwellings. The neighbourhood is well kept and quiet in nature. Local residents, live out their lives privately. If anyone smokes or vapes, they do this inside their homes or in their back gardens. The frontage of 95 is block paved and fronted by a low drystone wall. This means that is highly visible to neighbouring properties, passing pedestrians and vehicles. The proposed household will consist of five young people and five carers minimum (during the day). Any visitors to the property will further swell these numbers. Due to health and safety regulations anyone who is not a resident will have to smoke or vape outside. As stated this is completely different in behaviour to that of local residents.

The applicants state that the character of the house will be unchanged and people will not be able to identify any difference between it and neighbouring properties. This is not the case. The density of vehicles parked on the front of the property (see parking concerns above) and the second front door will make this property stand out as will any social gatherings outside.

Understandably young people will want to meet their friends and contacts in a private situation and might therefore be reluctant to meet them inside the property, where they might be monitored. Again, this would be

out of character for the area.

The Kedleston Group does have another location in Buxton on Palace Road (Dovedale House). This scheme, in comparison is on a quieter road (outside school drop off and pick up times) and is located immediately next to a school and is opposite business premises. The front of the property is completely private being screened by a large established hedge meaning that its occupants have complete privacy.

3. Noise/disturbance

The Kedleston Group have stated in their planning proposal that they offer,

„52-week residential placements for young people with social, emotional and mental health difficulties.“

By their nature, these difficulties may well lead to an increase in the locality of noise nuisance and associated antisocial behaviour which would fundamentally change the quiet nature of the area.

We note that the local Policing Team have not been copied in for consultation on this proposal and believe this is not right as it will impact their neighbourhood policing strategy and plans going forward.

The Kedleston Group have stated that,

„The comings and goings from the building are determined by the shift patterns of staff; their duties provide accommodation and care to the children residing at the property; and by visitors. Having regard to the levels of staffing proposed the use of the property is not considered to result in comings and goings in excess of those which could reasonably be expected from a large family house in a residential area.“

We disagree with this. The Kedleston Group have said that there will be 5 children at the property and 5 staff (a 1 -2- 1 ratio) apart from overnight. Five vehicles, plus visitors to the scheme, plus pedestrian traffic to and from the property, DO represent a greater volume of traffic than any average property in the vicinity. It is far too simplistic to say there is no difference. Ten people coming and going is in excess of normal household traffic.

The Kedleston Group have not detailed any shift patterns in their documentation. We are worried about staff discussions taking place outside the scheme late at night or early morning and the noise of vehicles being shifted around, doors closing etc. As residents, we don't have any of this at present.

The 1-2-1 staff ratio highlights the intensity of the issues that some of the children might be struggling with. We are concerned that whilst that could be sufficient for daytime hours, the nighttime cover proposals are insufficient, to fully monitor/safeguard the residents. Given their age range, we don't think that having one person sleeping in, is sufficient should incidents arise overnight.

4. Overlooking (properties directly affected are 93 and 97 St Johns Road and 90 Macclesfield Road).

The applicants, Kedleston Group have stated that,

„there will be no noise and disturbance arising from use of the garden area that is significantly over and above that which could potentially be created through its current residential use.“

We disagree with this assessment. The land elevates as you go up St Johns Road and number 95's garden is higher than ours, meaning that we are very much overlooked. Potentially having five children, five adults and also other visitors at the property, does add up to a significantly higher than average household size. We therefore fully anticipate that noise levels will increase. This will impact our enjoyment of the rear garden, particularly in Spring, Summer and Autumn.

We both work from home a number of days a week and rely on having the quiet environment that currently exists.

Further to this the physical changes that are being proposed will affect us more than neighbouring properties.

The change to the garage door and the insertion of an additional window on the gable end of number 95 is all located to the left of their property and is next to our boundary. There is very little room between our property and 95. The existing fence panels that were put up by our neighbours, following their building work, offer us no privacy.

Another planning application is cited (HPK/2014/0644) which relates to when number 95 underwent improvements and expansion. This was significantly disruptive for us. The owners were not present during the works and we had to cope with the incursion of debris over the boundary line separating us from 95. You will appreciate therefore, that we are reluctant to experience any other building related nuisance.

In conclusion we do recognise the need for specialist accommodation of this type, but crucially, it has to be in the right location. Given the volume of traffic on the A53, the nearby pedestrian crossing and the number of aggregate wagons that go up and down, we believe the location represents a significant risk to children who may have complex needs and also pedestrians and other vehicles, when the parking issues we have described above are taken into account.

Thank you for considering our objection. We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

April and Liam Irwin

93 St Johns Road

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>
