

FAO Mr James Stannard
High Peak Borough Council
Planning Department
PO Box 136
Buxton
High Peak
SK17 1AQ

Date: 21st June 2024

By email to: planning@highpeak.gov.uk
james.stannard@highpeak.gov.uk

Dear Mr Stannard,

CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATION - RESIDENT RESPONSE

APPLICATION NUMBER	HPK/2024/0143
APPLICANTS NAME	The Frith Pension Scheme Mr Joe Sizeland
LOCATION	Derbyshire County Council Works Department Ashbourne Lane Chapel-En-Le-Frith SK23 0PA
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	Demolition of existing workshops and retaining walls and erection of 3no. new workshops with new retaining structures, landscaping, and car parking.

Thank you for your letter dated 29th May 2024, concerning the above Planning application, the contents of which I have noted and which requires a response to be submitted to HPBC by 27th June 2024; confirmation for which I obtained from the HPBC Planning Support service via an email dated 14th June 2024.

I have reviewed the details of the application and, in order to help me formulate a response, I have had regard to the following HPBC Planning Policy documents, namely: '*High Peak Local Plan Adopted – April 2016*', '*Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2013-2028*' (C-E-L-F Neighbourhood Plan), and '*High Peak Design Guide SPD*'.

I have also had regard to the '*National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*' and the scope of '*The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015*' and in particular the scope of Class H in Part 7 of Schedule 2 and I wish to object to the proposal having regard to following matters.

A. Local Plan Policies –

- **S 1 Sustainable Development Principles**
 - Making efficient use of land by ensuring that the density of proposals is appropriate (and informed by the surrounding built environment);
 - Seeking to secure developments provide a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, ensuring communities have a healthy, safe and attractive living and working environment and the risks from potential hazards are minimised
- **EQ 6 Design and Place Making**
 - All development should be well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to both its environment and the challenge of climate change, whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place.

This will be achieved by:

- Requiring development to be well designed to respect the character, identity and context of High Peak's townscapes and landscapes
- Requiring that development contributes positively to an area's character, history and identity in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials, and the relationship to adjacent buildings and landscape features
- Requiring that development achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and does not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity

- **EQ 7 Built and Historic Environment**

- Particular protection will be given to designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings including:
 - Archaeological Sites or heritage features

This will be achieved by:

- Requiring all works that could impact on a heritage asset or its setting or sites with the potential to include assets, to be informed by a level of historical, architectural and archaeological evidence proportionate to their significance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of a proposal. Where appropriate, the Council may also require historical research and archaeological recording to be undertaken before works to a heritage asset commence
- Preventing the loss of buildings and features which make a positive contribution to the character or heritage of an area through preservation or appropriate reuse and sensitive development, including enabling development, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss or other relevant provisions of the NPPF apply.
- Requiring proposed developments that affect a heritage asset and / or its setting, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to demonstrate how the proposal has taken account of design, form, scale, mass, use of traditional materials and detailing, siting and views away from and towards the heritage asset in order to ensure that the design is sympathetic and minimises harm to the asset

- **EQ 8 Green Infrastructure**

- Identifying and protecting key wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect sites of importance for biodiversity, including creating or restoring habitats of nature conservation value, in accordance with Local Plan Policy EQ5

- **EQ 10 Pollution Control and Unstable Land**

- The Council will protect people and the environment from unsafe, unhealthy and polluted environments.

This will be achieved by:

- Ensuring developments avoid potential adverse effects and only permitting developments that are deemed (individually or cumulatively) to result in the following types of pollution if

any remaining potential adverse effects are mitigated to an acceptable level by other environmental controls or measures included in the proposals .

This may be achieved by the imposition of planning conditions or through a planning obligation. The Council will not permit any proposal that has an adverse effect on a European site:

- Air pollution (including odours or particulate emissions);
- Pollution of watercourses (rivers, canals reservoirs, streams, ditches, ponds and wetland areas) or groundwater;
- Noise or vibration;
- Light intrusion;
- Land contamination; or
- Other nuisance, environmental pollution or harm to amenity, health or safety

- **E 1 New Employment Development**

New business and industrial developments will primarily be focused on designated employment sites in close proximity to other employment premises. Such locations provide better infrastructure and services for employers and are likely to have less impact on residential amenity. Business and industrial developments elsewhere within the built-up-area will also be supported to encourage economic growth, subject to the impact of the proposal on the local area.....

○ This will be achieved by:

- Supporting business development outside of allocated employment sites or Primary Employment Zones but within the built up area when it would not create undue harm to the character, appearance or amenity of the area.

- **CF 6 Accessibility and Transport**

The Council will seek to ensure that development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner.

Proposals should minimise the need to travel, particularly by unsustainable modes of transport and help deliver the priorities of the Derbyshire Local Transport Plan.

○ This will be achieved by:

- Requiring that all new development is located where the highway network can satisfactorily accommodate traffic generated by the development or can be improved as part of the development
- Requiring that new development can be integrated within existing or proposed transport infrastructure to further ensure choice of transportation method and enhance potential accessibility benefits
- Ensuring development does not lead to an increase in on street parking to the detriment of the free and safe flow of traffic
- Approving developments provided that the capacity and design of the transport network serving the site will reasonably accommodate the anticipated increase in travel without materially harming highway safety or local amenity. In addition, the traffic generated by the development will not unduly interrupt the safe and free flow of traffic on trunk or primary roads or materially affect existing conditions to an unacceptable extent

B. C-E-L-F Neighbourhood Plan Policies

- **EP 1 Design of employment sites**
 - Development should be visually attractive, compatible with the character of the surrounding area, include necessary screening and be of a scale, design and finish appropriate to the locality, particularly where the development can be viewed from main roads or other heavily used areas, including high ground and beauty spots
 - Development must not cause detriment to valuable areas or features of nature conservation or man-made heritage.
 - Development must not exacerbate flooding and must deal satisfactorily with waste, emissions and effluent.
 - Proposals must include details of appropriate treatment of boundaries and means of enclosure and surfacing within the site.
 - Development should have no unduly adverse effect on residential amenity.
- **EP 2 Existing employment sites**
 - Proposals which lead to the improvement, modernisation or upgrading of current employment sites will be welcomed and supported, subject to there being no adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbours.
- **EP 5 Existing employment sites** – I note that whilst there is no site specific requirements for the DCC yard in the C-E-L-F Neighbourhood Plan, I believe the policies that relate to other sites mentioned in the plan, within the C-E-L-F locality, can be equally applied to this site. In particular –
 - No unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties through noise, vibration, smell, smoke, dust, fumes, lighting, litter, traffic and other disturbance, and no unacceptable impact on residential amenity including consideration of hours of operation
 - Buildings should not breach the ridgeline/skyline and, where appropriate, should be cut into the hillside to minimise their visual impact.

C. High Peak Design Guide SPD

- **Section 3. New Development – Designing in Context**
 - Large Buildings – 3.6**
 - Accommodating large buildings within the area needs to be handled carefully. Their appearance is usually driven by their use and may not sit comfortably within a more traditional context.
 - However, they are often essential to the local economy and should be designed to be as inconspicuous as possible.
 - This can be achieved by giving them a low profile, a shallow pitched roof to reduce the ridge height, and ensuring they are in dark or recessive colours.
 - For very wide buildings, creating a series of parallel roofs rather than one enormous roof will help to break down the apparent bulk of the building.

- Sites on the skyline should be avoided. Instead, wherever possible, such buildings should be sited in shallow depressions or otherwise positioned to fit into the landform.

Scale – 3.8

- A new building should respect the scale of those surrounding it.

Proportion – 3.12

- Where possible new buildings should pick up on the proportions of neighbouring buildings in some way.

Points to remember – page 17

- In towns and villages be guided by the existing context, pattern and grain of development and building heights.
- Respect surrounding scale.
- Reflect the proportions of neighbouring buildings.

D. The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 - I'm conscious that, whilst the GPDO does not relate to this development/application, this class is noteworthy in that it suggests that a threshold building height, having an industrial type of use, should be as shown below. Clearly the control of the scale of this type of use was considered important when considering it for PD.

- **Schedule 2, Part 7, Use class H**

- H.1 Development is not permitted by Class H if—
 - (c) the height of any part of the new building erected would exceed—
 - (i) if within 10 metres of a boundary of the curtilage of the premises, 5 metres.

Consideration of the proposals against the above policies etc and my grounds for objecting

1. Impact on our land/property and the local amenity

- **Choice of location and proximity to neighbouring residential properties**

I have noted the history of the area, as has been outlined in the ARC Environmental report (Ref: 23-873-The Former Depot...) and that it would appear that, from the 20th century onwards, the area around the site has been developed principally for residential purposes.

The only exception to this type of residential development was between 1960 – 1970 when Derbyshire County Council (DCC) created a depot on the land that was, otherwise, undeveloped land. I can say this because the residents who live at No. 8 Netherfield Road, who have lived at the same address since 1960, have photographs of the land (the site) the depot was built on, which is to the rear of their property, and which clearly shows the area as undeveloped.

The creation of a semi-industrial use in this location was, even then, not in-keeping with the overall style of development for this area. However, it is likely that Planning controls at that time may not have been as robust as they are today. Notwithstanding this, it's clear that the proposed site has been put to semi-industrial use for the last 50 – 60yrs.

However, the development proposed in this planning application is significantly larger and is not in-keeping with the area and the building types, styles and sizes/scale that surround the site. In particular, I

note that the proposal for the site will consist of buildings that could be used for either storage or industrial purposes – namely: Class B2, B8, and E use categories.

I note that there are to be three buildings – Units A, B and C, albeit Unit B appears to be laid out so as to be flexible enough to be subdivided to create three smaller Units. As such it's possible/likely that the site could be used by up to five businesses. This is in contrast to the former use whereby the site was occupied by only one business – DCC.

I have noted that the C-E-L-F Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of employment sites within the area. This site is not one that is identified in that Plan. As such the creation of what can only be considered to be a substantial industrial/business park within an otherwise quiet, family oriented residential area seems incongruous and disproportionate to the type and scale of the of the buildings in this area.

I have, since receiving the consultation letter, looked at other similar business sites within the surrounding Chapel-en-le-Frith (C-E-L-F) area and, with the exception of some long-standing existing business premises such as those occupied by Kelsa Trucks, former Longson's depot, Somersets haulage depot, and Street Crane, I can find no recent examples of buildings of a similar size/scale such as those proposed in this application that have being located so close to/within a residential area and positioned at such close proximity to residential premises.

Of the most recently developed business/industrial type sites, where the scale is similar to the proposal, such as those on Bowden Lane and Frith Knoll Road, these are distant to residential developments and have little impact on the amenity of residential properties nearby. In many cases these sites are both substantially distant and, either, elevated, sunken or screened from residential properties.

The housing development on Hayfield Road, is similarly protected by way of screening and distance from the buildings within the Ferodo site.

I have yet to be shown any existing industrial buildings that have imposed themselves on the amenity etc of their residential neighbours. In the main, industrial use within the C-E-L-F area, has satisfactorily coexisted with residential uses based on appropriate protections afforded by their location and/or protecting features such as distance/separation/screening etc.

- **Size and scale of the buildings within a residential area**

From the details provided by Wainwright & Co Chartered Surveyors I have noted the size/volume of each of the proposed buildings in tables 1 and 2 below.

The dimensions used are derived from assessment/inspection of the floor areas and building/roof heights which are those shown on the proposed plans and elevational layouts for Units A, B and C (Wainwright project No. WAC 1813) and the Hydrock proposed site levels plan (Ref: 32978-HYD-XX-XX-DR-C2000-P02).

Table 1.

Unit Ref	External Floor Area (m ²)	Wall Height (m)	Ridge Height (m)	Average Height (m)	External Volume (m ³)
A	228	7.0	8.95	7.975	1,818
B	485	7.0	8.94	7.970	3,865
C	280	7.0	8.19	7.595	2,126
Total Floor Area	993			Total Volume	7,809

The above compares to the existing buildings that currently exist on the site and which are referenced in Table 2 below, for which I have applied the same numbering convention as that used by Wainwright and Co in their existing plans and elevation drawings (Wainwright Refs: WAC 1813-01 – 05 Incl). I have taken the liberty of allowing for an average building height as there are no dimensions or survey measurements for the existing building heights, so I have had to refer to scaling from the Wainwright plans to arrive at a reasonably pragmatic value.

Table 2.

Building Ref	External Floor Area (m ²)	Wall Height (m)	Ridge Height (m)	Approx. Average Height (m)	External Volume (m ³)
1	406	Varies	Varies	5.000	2,030
2	212	Varies	Varies	4.500	954
3*	327	Varies	Varies	4.000	1,308
Total Floor Area	945			Total Volume	4,342

* Building 3 is hidden from view as it is located at a much lower level than the ground level for the majority of the site and which cannot be seen by the majority of buildings on Netherfield Road, Buxton Road, or Ashbourne Lane. Only properties at 22C Buxton Road and some of the premises on Netherfield Road, can see the roof of this building when looking down from 1st floor bedrooms. But in many cases even these views are screened by fences, trees, hedges etc.

The above volumes present a different perspective to the suggestion that the scale of the development might be in-keeping with the existing buildings on the site. Whilst the total external floor areas between both the existing and proposed buildings area similar – with the new development proposed as being only 48m² larger than the existing – the volume of the new buildings is substantially greater than the existing – approx. 3,500m³ larger overall.

However, if we discount Building 3 – because it's impact on the scale of the buildings on the site is very much reduced as it is substantially sunken into the site landscape formed by the former tramway – then we can say the scale of the new buildings will be almost 5,000m³ greater than the existing buildings – this being the visible increase in volume/mass of the new development, which will be viewed from all the residential properties within the Netherfield Road, Buxton Road and Ashbourne Lane triangle.

The proposed volume/mass of the suggested buildings amounts to between approximately a 200% to 300% increase over that of the existing depot buildings, which is between a 2-3 to 1 increase in scale.

I have also noted from the Wainwright and Co planning statement that the site has an area of approx.. 0.3ha (3000m²). By inspections this appears to translate to a cover ratio of approximately 0.331 amounting to just over 1/3rd of the site being covered by large volume, tall industrial units.

I have also noted the height and proximity of the proposed buildings – particularly Unit C, which is proposed to be (having scaled from the drawings as there no suitable survey dimensions to work to) circa. 4m to the boundary wall to our land at 22B Buxton Road.

Our property is at a reduced level to the existing/proposed site and, having had regard to the survey drawings, I have taken levels that indicate a difference in level of c. 2.m from the finished ground level outside the rear door to the house, to the floor level of the proposed new unit. Add to this that the min wall height of Unit C is 7m and the max wall height is 8.19m this produces a building that is, at its tallest point, 10.2m^{+/-} above our property (c. 33ft 6").

To put this into context this is equivalent to more than two double decker buses stacked one on top of the other. Similarly, the tree that is referenced G8 on the tree survey plan/schedule (Plan/schedule Refs:CCL-11749/TCP-Rev 1 and 11749 Tree Schedule) provides a good visual indication of the height and scale of

Unit C in relation to our property. This tree, which is proposed to be removed, is surveyed as being 8m high – slightly lower than the ridge height of the unit!

It would also appear that the highest part of the Unit C roof, in comparison to the roof of our house will be higher by approx.. 2.5m (based on the Hydrock proposed site levels plan Ref: 32978-HYD-XX-XX-DR-C2000-P02) to 3m (based on my own estimation), which is c. 8ft – 10ft higher, depending on the roof height levels adopted. Unfortunately, I have not had the opportunity to obtain the services of a professional surveying consultant, so my own roof height dimension is subject to a nominal margin of error.

In order to show this more graphically I have taken the opportunity to show Unit C as it might appear in cross section and also in elevation in the drawings included at annex 1, which is attached to this letter. Drawing 01 shows the rear elevation of Unit C. Superimposed onto this is – in blue – an outline of the houses at 22B and 22C Buxton Road. I have also superimposed – in red – the outline of the corrugated asbestos cement sheet building, that is intended to be demolished. Also, I've added the top of the retaining wall behind Unit C together with other features such as the timber fence and the outbuilding in the garden of 22C – all of which show the scale and size of the building in comparison with our properties.

Drawing 02 is a cross section, through the garden of 22B, which indicates how close and overbearing Unit C will be. A thumbnail image (top left corner of drawing 02) of the rear garden of 22B with Unit C superimposed is also provided as an indication of the potential scale/size of the building.

Other properties adjoining our own (22C Buxton Road and 2, 4, 6, 8 and Sandybank Netherfield Road) will be similarly dwarfed by the sheer scale of the new Unit(s). The new buildings will be significantly out of character to the scale of both the existing buildings on the site and to the size and scale of the residential buildings surrounding the site.

Our property and the rest of the residential properties along Buxton Road, Netherfield Road and Ashbourne Lane are all low/medium rise two storey dwellings, with wall heights in the region of 5m high and roof heights of between 7m – 9m AFGL. Admittedly, some properties are more elevated than others (Netherfield Road) but this will not assist in bringing the new Unit(s) down to a reasonably equivalent scale to the rest of the buildings in the neighbourhood.

As with my own property I have surveyed, by use of a laser level, and transferred the approx. ground floor level (by reference to the proposed and existing site level plans) of Unit C to the garden of No 8 Netherfield Road and then on to the ground level of Sandybank on Netherfield Road. Having regard to the ridgeline of Unit C this would appear to correlate with the 1st floor guttering of Sandybank, meaning that the residents in the properties between 4 – 8 and Sandybank will also be confronted with an imposing and dominant vista from this Unit to the rear of their homes – again it should be noted that Sandybank is a substantially elevated position to that of 2 – 8 Netherfield and ours and our neighbours properties at 22B and 22C Buxton Road.

The size and scale is similarly disproportionate and imposing along the Ashbourne Lane corridor, with the ridgelines of Units A and B proposed to be at a level of +234.45 and +234.09 respectively. This compares to the ridgeline to the terraced house numbers 28 – 32 Ashbourne Lane of +233.99 and the eaves level of the terraced house numbers 34 – 38 Ashbourne Lane of +233.83.

These levels translate to a substantial domination of the street scene to the front aspect of these dwellings, which will be left looking over a mass of grey cladding – bearing in mind that all these properties are also elevated by the rising ground of Ashbourne Lane – North of Anchor Avenue.

- **Daylighting and shading**

Because of the new development's scale and proximity to our property it is likely to have a significant impact on shading and overshadowing throughout the year and more particularly during the winter when the sun is much lower in the sky.

Taking account of the height and distance of Unit C from our boundary, I estimate that it will cause a significant loss of daylight to the rear of our property.

Currently, during the winter, the rear first floor bedrooms are able to obtain some direct sunlight, since the existing DCC building (Wainwright Ref: Building 1), whilst of a similar height to our house (c. 7m high due to its elevated position), has a steeper roof pitch than the proposed buildings and allows some sun to break through between sunrise and sunset during the limited daylighting period in winter. However, the height and expanse of the proposed Unit C will cause more profound overshadowing and will mean our property will be reliant on using more artificial lighting during the day, even at 1st floor level. Moreover, the likelihood is that the size of Unit C will, on most overcast days, make the rear of the property dull and uninviting.

I believe the same will be true of the proposed building during the summer, since the building will tower a further 5m above our first floor bedroom windows. This will create a narrow lightwell that has a limited upward outlook and will create nothing more than a deep courtyard lightwell, devoid of good daylighting.

- **Privacy and security**

Given the proximity of the rear of Unit C with the boundary retaining wall adjoining our property and the lack of screening proposed, we are concerned that occupants of this unit could use the rear as an informal break-out/smoking area. I'm only too conscious that, fire exits can, when open during fine weather, become an opportunity for staff to use secluded areas for smoking/tea breaks. I fear this could lead to staff/visitors to stand and overlook the rear of our property – the rear garden, ground floor living room and first floor bedrooms.

The potential for reduced privacy could be realised 7-days a week, depending on the nature of the business and hours of operation.

On a similar theme, I'm also conscious that many businesses and their insurers demand improved security measures. As such I also have concerns that the development may install CCTV cameras, which would also be an unacceptable intrusion on the use and privacy of our property if they are positioned so as to capture the rear of our property.

Our home adjoins a Buxton – Manchester Airport (199 service) bus stop. In the past we witnessed trespass across our land and the land at 22/22A Buxton Road, with residents and employees of businesses alike, using the gardens as a short-cut from the Bus stop to Ashbourne Lane – rather than walking to the Junction of Market Street/Ashbourne Lane.

We are particularly concerned that without appropriate boundary treatments to the site, employees travelling from Buxton by bus, may consider the route via our land an opportunity to short-cut Ashbourne Lane to the site, or from the site to the bus stop on Sheffield Road – to travel back to Buxton.

- **Nuisance and pollution**

The proposal leaves the way open for a variety of storage or industrial uses. The former depot operated a joiner's workshops and wood store. Whilst the DCC yard was occupied, noise was limited to that of the sound of staff talking, woodworking machinery operating, materials being moved and light vehicles manoeuvring.

Given that the site is proposed to be industrial the likelihood is that operators could be using heavy goods vehicles/heavy industrial equipment, machinery and processes that could be in operation 7-days a week and possibly 24hrs a day. The proposals for the site could, therefore, result in greater noise generation within 13m of our home.

Unfortunately, I have seen no commentary on the limitations of the industrial use, noise pollution mitigation measures, or anything restricting the hours of operation.

As with my concerns about a loss of privacy because of the potential for occupants to use of the rear of Unit C for smoking or tea/coffee breaks, I'm similarly concerned that the area to the rear elevation of Unit C could also be subject to littering and/or the storage of waste items arising from the use of the Unit, which would cause a visual disamenity/nuisance.

I have also noted that the doors and paths to the Northeast and Southwest elevations of Unit C will be illuminated by external exit lighting. This lighting proposed appears similar to that used for the Street Crane warehouse on Frith Knoll Road. The light intensity from the lights over the exit doors at the Street Crane building are tolerable given the distance but are none-the-less visible. The lights on Unit C will emit significant light levels in much closer proximity to residential premises and their luminance/brightness could cause unnecessary light pollution and nuisance to the properties on Buxton and Netherfield Road – particularly the properties along Netherfield Road and at 22C Buxton Road.

On a similar theme, the application does not articulate how demolition/construction noise will be controlled, so as to minimise the impact on residents and the enjoyment of their amenity. Moreover, any controls about hours of working. Traditionally construction work can be prolonged over many months and the noise generated by personnel/activities and machinery can be hugely impactful on private lives. Moreover, sites can be in operation from early morning 7am until late afternoon/evening – which could be quite late in summer months with extended daylight hours. Also, it is not unknown for some sites to operate on a 7-day/week basis.

All of this will add more inconvenience and nuisance to residents, given the industrial scale of the building work being carried out and should be guarded against whilst works are being carried out.

Consequently, it would be helpful to understand what measures the developer intends to put in place so as to be considerate of the residential amenity around the site and potential harmful impact on residents – in essence the site should be a good neighbour for the duration of any demolition/building works.

- **Appearance**

Along with their domineering size and scale within a residential area, the appearance of Unit C and the other units will be at odds with the materials and styles of the residential properties within the neighbourhood triangle. The nature of industrial buildings invites the use of functional and simple materials that are dark, harsh and imposing. The notional inclusion of a low height stone band should be seen as a token gesture to the materials used in the residential properties. But these softer appearance of these materials will simply be lost against the substantial dominance of the dark grey steel wall and roof cladding.

2. Transport and Traffic

As I have already outlined in my comments relating to increase noise generation, the proposed site will be used by up to five businesses. With this comes increased traffic from staff and visitors and from delivery vehicles.

I note, from the height of the vehicle/goods entry shutter doors, that each unit will have the capacity to receive a large goods vehicle of up to 4m high. This appears to coincide with HGVs of 7.5 – 18 tonnes of the 2 – 3 rigid axle style and being around the 4m high body. This together with cars, vans and other smaller commercial vehicles.

Our family have lived at this address for almost 30-yrs and have seen traffic size, speed and inconsiderate parking behaviour increase significantly over this time. Buxton Road is, whilst a feeder into C-E-L-F from the southerly slip road off the A6 bypass, at times, a bottle neck. I have had to report inconsiderate parking on both sides of Buxton Road to Parish Councillors, Robert Largan MP, DCC Civil Enforcement and Derbyshire Police.

I note that Ashbourne Lane is a weight restricted road of not more than 7.5 tonnes – except for access – and of course if the development proceeds, then it would be reasonable to assume that 7.5t+ vehicles will be able to access the road to visit the businesses in the development.

Ashbourne Lane, at its junction with Buxton Road and Beresford Avenue, is narrow and sightlines are obscured by the slow left hand bend. Most residents on Ashbourne Lane are car owners, some having two or more cars and, notwithstanding that parking occurs on the land to the rear of 23 Ashbourne Lane, parking generally occurs along the kerb to the Northerly footpath.

This on-road parking restricts the width of the Lane even further making Ashbourne Lane very narrow and generally single file. The route to the site also adjoins a recreational ground used by residents and their children and the Lane is also the route for parents and children to walk to Chapel-en-le-Frith Primary School. The increase in staff and business traffic into/out of the site has the potential to cause traffic congestion, obstructions, surface damage (potholing) and the increased risk of vehicle-vehicle and vehicle-pedestrian collision making the road more hazardous.

The one way access into/out of the site is noted as being at a gradient of 1 in 13 – 14 (c. 8%-7% incline). The location of the access is at a narrowing of the Lane and leaves little room for larger (7.5t – 18t) vehicles to manoeuvre in and out, whilst also negotiating the steep incline. Moreover, site lines/splays for vehicles turning left into and right out of the site appear obscured and visibility impaired at the junction to the site because of the corner of Unit B, which will be over 7m high due to site levels and with a hedge/screen next to the East elevation/vehicle accessway.

In winter the traffic will pose a greater hazard with the potential for vehicles to skid/slide on snow and ice.

3. Impact on man-made heritage

- **The Peak Forest Tramway**

As the ARC report shows the DCC depot was constructed on the line of the Peak Forest Tramway, at the bottom of the 'Chapel Inclined Plane'.

The 18th century tramway is a heritage asset for the C-E-L-F local area and the Inclined Plane is considered to be one of three of the most important surviving features (together with Bugsworth Basin and Stodhart Tunnel) of the tramway, but which has, over time, had almost all of the visible features eradicated. Some signs still remain such as the infilled arch to the former A6 bridge that faces into the DCC Highways yard on Sheffield Road and also the cutting inside the depot site, within which some of the DCC workshops have been sunken into (Wainwright Ref: Building 2).

The proposal for the development will see more of the tramway, through the site, built over and lost.

As such the development does not appear to be respectful nor protective of the history and heritage associated with site and should be designed with sensitivity so as to retain and protect what remains of this man-made historical feature.

4. Impact on our own and other residents' health and safety during demolition/construction

- **Asbestos containing materials removal/disposal**

The existing building (Wainwright Ref: Building 1) consists of what appears to be asbestos cement corrugated walls and roof cladding sheets.

The ARC environmental report does not appear to specifically mention the composition of these sheets or of any tests carried out to determine if the material contains asbestos.

Given that the risk of serious respiratory disease is a possibility from asbestos fibre inhalation, which can be life limiting/threatening in some conditions, it would be helpful to understand how the developer intends to remove and dispose of the cladding sheets and any other asbestos materials that might be situated on/within the site.

An asbestos survey and recommendations for treatment during removal/disposal should be provided/made public in order that residents can be assured that the demolition will be carried out safely and having regard to the health, safety and welfare of the neighbouring residents.

- **Dust and fume control measures**

There is no mention of either the demolition or construction phase controls to mitigate for dust created during both the demolition and construction phases. It would be helpful if the Planning application contextualised how the works will minimise dust and fumes that could enter into the adjoining residential properties whilst work is in progress.

Similarly, there is nothing in the application that addresses how the developer/occupants of completed/operational units will control any fumes, smells or particulates arising from business activities – which being industrial could involve fumes from machinery/processes/vehicles etc.

5. Impact on protected wildlife

- **Bat colonies**

Our property, and those of our neighbours on Buxton and Netherfield Road, is regularly visited by bats – especially during summer. We are conscious that the existing buildings could be a habitat for bats which should be treated sensitively.

I note that the planning statement mentions that a bat survey has not yet been carried out and I would urge that one is carried out to establish if any bat colonies roost in the buildings, or if the site is a corridor for bats to travel to and from roosts for feeding purposes.

As a consequence of all the above I believe the development proposal to be disproportionate and inconsiderate of the scale and amenity of this residential area and does not appear to be in-keeping, nor in accordance with –

- The HPBC Local Plan Policies – S1, EQ6, EQ 7, EQ 8, EQ 10, E 1, and CF 6; and
- The C-E-L-F Neighbourhood Plan Policies – EP 1, EP 2, and EP 5; and
- Section 3 of the SPD

and will be seriously detrimental to the amenity of our property as well as to the wider neighbourhood.

I trust you find the above to be helpful in determining the application for planning permission.

Should this application require to be determined by the HPBC Planning Committee, I would welcome the opportunity to address the committee to reinforce the reasons for objecting to the development.

Yours sincerely,

Wayne Timperley

ANNEX 1

Elevational and cross sectional views of Unit C and 22B Buxton Road

01 – Proposed Unit C rear elevation looking South from 22B Buxton Road Scale – 1:100 at A2



