
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 23 August 2024 15:33
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : HPK/2023/0192 Site Address: Land at Hoghaw Fairfield Buxton Derbyshire Comments by: Ian Bailey

From:
40 Saint Peter's Road
Buxton
Land at Hoghaw Fairfield Buxton
Buxton
United Kingdom
SK17 7DX

Phone:
Email: ian.bailey1@sky.com
Submission: Objection
Comments: Application Reference No. : HPK/2023/0192

Site Address: Land at Hoghaw Fairfield Buxton Derbyshire

Comments by: Ian and Andrea Bailey From: 40 St Peters Road Fairfield BUXTON SK17 7DX

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: 40 St Peters Road Buxton SK17 7DX

Comments concerning the development on the land at Hogshaw, Fairfield.

Application Number: HPK/2023/0192 Submission: Objection

1. On the Government website, the National Planning Policy Framework, section 13 Protecting Green Belt Land, parts 142 onwards makes statements that only under exceptional circumstances can Green Belt boundaries be moved and should be fully evidenced and justified. In the High Peak Local Plan Revised Deposit 2003 it states that 'Phasing will also be applied at Hogshaw to ensure that the previously developed part of the site is developed AHEAD of the greenfield part.' Also it states that 'REMEDIATION OF THE CONTAMINATED LAND WILL BE COMPLETED BEFORE THE COMPLETION OF THE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREENFIELD PART OF THE SITE, INCLUDING THE RESERVED LAND.' (The capitalisation of the quote is from the document, not us.) Later on in the document it states (again in capitals) 'RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE LAND IDENTIFIED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP AS 'RESERVE LAND' WILL BE ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE IF IT CAN BE SHOWN THAT ITS DEVELOPMENT IS NECESSARY IN ORDER TO SECURE THE REMEDIATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONTAMINATED LAND AT HOGSHAW.' The 'reserve land' is what is now being put forward for this development. Is any work being done by HPBC or the developer in regards to the contaminated land? Or are local plans just ignored or forgotten about when a developer wishes to build houses on a green field site?

2. In the document H8797-URG-XX-XX-RP-LA-205001-P06-Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment-UG1795 LVIA P06_Part1, 2.0 Planning Policy Context, figure 2.2, it shows a housing allocation area and the proposed site boundary. Why is the council allowing the building of houses outside the area allocated for housing, especially green belt land? Is the council going to stick to its Local Plan or not? If the Local Plan is not going to be adhered to, what is the point in having it!

3. In the document Proposed Development of 99 Dwellings, Response to Urban Design Comments and the H8797-BAH-XX-XX-DR-CE-300001-P07-Preliminary Drainage Layout document, there are still no recommendations for: rainwater collection (to help mitigate flooding further downstream – although the assessment says that this will be slightly reduced due to the culvert being built – and to help with the overall flow of rain water within the development); electric car points (to help residents mitigate the pollution of extra cars on Fairfield Road) or any statement on Photo Voltaic cells on the rooves; it seems that pv cells have been completely removed from the planning proposals. We, HPBC and the country as a whole, need to stop building houses which do not meet the requirements needed to help combat climate change. These houses are still going to have gas boilers, because it is cheaper for the developer, instead of HPBC insisting that air or ground source heat pumps are installed.

4. In the document H8797-SCP-XX-XX-RP-TP-206100-P05-Transport Assessment_Part1, in the High Peak Local Plan, page 21 it states at the bottom of section 6.96 –a new access to the site is required from the A6, which is congested for much of the day.– This new access route to the proposed development from the roundabout is now in place, but the HPBC already know that the A6 is congested, so how will adding more traffic make it better? Or further down in Section 4.11, page 22 –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–. This part of the A6 cannot satisfactorily accommodate more traffic. In the proposals, there could be 232 extra cars using the access road onto the roundabout, although maybe not all at peak times though.

5. In section 5.4, Table 5.1 of the same document, it still states that Aldi is 600m away from the development. As Aldi has now moved to the other side of Buxton, car journeys down and up Fairfield Road will increase as Aldi is only now accessible from this development by car instead of being within walking distance and so any figures given in the document are now out of date and take no account of these increased journeys to go to the shops. This mistake also appears in H8797-SCP-XX-XX-RP-TP-206200-P05-Travel Plan Table 3.1. The H8797-SMI-XX-XX-RP-NA-208001-P05-Air Quality Assessment.pdf R3258-R01-AQ Assessment document takes no account of the move by Aldi across town or the proposed building of extra houses on the Granby sites within Fairfield, all of which will result in poorer air quality down Fairfield Road.

6. The table at the bottom of Appendix J in document H8797-SCP-XX-XX-RP-TP-206100-P05-Transport Assessment_Part2 shows that 56% of all journeys to work are DOWN Fairfield Road, so if there is a potential of 232 more cars from this development, then there will be another 130 cars using Fairfield Road to get to and from work, mainly at peak times.

7. In the same Transport Assessment document, page 21, it states that there is only emergency vehicle access from Hogshaw Villas, Glenmoor and Nunsfield Road, but in the revised plan it still shows a –potential future link road–. Where to and why? Developers are not going to waste money on even considering doing this unless there are already plans in the pipeline, which we have not been told about, to develop further into Hogshaw.

8. As we have stated in previous objections, how is HPBC going to attract extra doctors and dentist resources to Buxton considering the lack of funding they already have; the NHS centre at Devonshire Place has not appeared! The housing developer wishes to make a profit out of building houses, but then this takes no account of the wider infrastructure that councils have to put in to support the growing population. Buxton does not get the resources allocated to larger urban centres and we are not likely to just because we are building more houses. Infrastructure needs to come WITH housing development, not after. Are Barratts going to help in any way? We think not.

9. We would also reiterate all objection comments that we made on 15 May 2023.

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>
