

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/H1033/W/24/3341260

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/H1033/W/24/3341260

Appeal By TREVILLE PROPERTIES LTD

Site Address
Land to the west of Bridgemont
Whaley Bridge
SK23 7GW
Grid Ref Easting: 401209
Grid Ref Northing: 382381

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR PETER HANNAN

Address
34 Bridgemont
Whaley Bridge
HIGH PEAK
SK23 7PB

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☒ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☒ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

The planning application was turned down as per the local plan and neighbourhood plan which was voted in by locals last winter. The argument by the applicant that houses were granted at the bottom of Bridgemont is null and void as the local plan has changed since they were built. The building of said development has also meant that the housing need for Bridgemont has been met as per the HELNA. Simply put; the local need is being met, thus developing on GREEN BELT is not acceptable, nevermind a development the size and scope of what is being proposed.

In relation to the drainage, one only has to come on a rainy day to see the amount of standing water on the road at Bridgemont which would be downhill from the development and with the best planning and engineering, concrete is never going to be provide better drainage than natural soil. I am seriously worried about the risk of flooding to my property.

Other concerns that haven't been addressed include the access road going through a retaining wall that runs along the back of the houses that will be overlooked by the new development and the increased strain the development would have on local amenities such as the Goyt Valley Medical Practice, dental surgeries and schools. The DCC Policy and Monitoring response states that our primary schools or secondary schools would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the numbers resulting from this development.

A development of this size, on green belt, in this area is simply unwarranted and has been refused for justifiable reasons on two occasions, none of which have been effectively addressed by the applicant. The 'local support' being supplied by people who are not directly affected by the development should have no bearing on the decision. Therefore the decision for refusal must stand.