

From:

To:

Cc: RE: Comments on officer's report for applications HPK/2022/0495 and HPK/2023/0323

Subject: 16 June 2024 22:08:48

Date:

Dear Ms Simpkin,

Thank you for letting me know about the publication of the Updates Report. I've just taken a look, and would add to my previous comments to note that it likewise seems unnecessary to restrict the applicant by way of planning condition to a parking management scheme involving permits, even if this is the applicant's current assumed basis for the scheme. I would **suggest the deletion of the reference to permits** in your revised condition 14 wording, to provide the applicant with maximum flexibility while developing the scheme, and to keep all options open for when the LPA and consultees consider the applicant's proposal at DOC in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Benjamin Read

On Fri, 14 Jun 2024 at 11:24, Rachael Simpkin

<> wrote:

Dear Mr Read,

Thank you for your comments, which will be considered as part of the Committee Updates Report to be published later on today.

Kind regards,

Rachael Simpkin Senior Planning Officer (Majors & Commercial)

(She/Her)

Development Services

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

Mob: | Connect with me on [LinkedIn](#)

www.highpeak.gov.uk | Follow HPBC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)

www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk | Follow SMDC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)

From:

Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2024 4:18 PM

To: Planning Comments (HPBC)

Cc:

<>; Whaley Bridge Matters

<>

Subject: Re: Comments on officer's report for applications HPK/2022/0495 and HPK/2023/0323

Dear Ms Simpkin,

I can confirm that I am happy for my previous comments, and those that follow in this message, to be included in the Updates Report.

On my points about bollards, it might be worth me taking this opportunity now to clarify that others may disagree with me, and that bollards may ultimately be the best solution to meet the stated and necessary aims. (There have already been examples of residents of the new estate parking in this area, albeit without any signage in place.) My concern is primarily about fettering the applicant's options by insisting on the inclusion of bollards in the final scheme, if there is a better option to be found without the drawbacks I mentioned. I hope this is clear.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Benjamin Read

On Thursday 13 June 2024 at 15:35:33 BST, Rachael Simpkin
<> wrote:

Dear Mr Read,

Thank you for your comments.

Would you kindly confirm if you are happy for these comments to be set out in the Updates Report to DC Committee which will be published tomorrow afternoon?

Kind regards,

Rachael Simpkin Senior Planning Officer (Majors & Commercial)

(She/Her)

Development Services

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

Mob: | Connect with me on [LinkedIn](#)

www.highpeak.gov.uk | Follow HPBC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)

www.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk | Follow SMDC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)

From:

Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 10:36 PM

To: _____

Cc: <>;

<>; _____

<>; _____

<>; _____

Subject: Comments on officer's report for applications HPK/2022/0495 and HPK/2023/0323

Dear Ms Simpkin,

I have read your report for planning applications HPK/2022/0495 and HPK/2023/0323, which are due to go to Committee on Monday.

Please can I start by thanking you for the close attention you have given to these applications, and for taking the time to thoroughly consider the issues surrounding them. It is clear that you have taken on board the consultation responses you have received, and have responded proactively by altering the proposed wording of the relevant conditions. The result is a much more sensible and balanced proposal - it is greatly appreciated, and I believe it will contribute positively

to the eventual outcome here. If only a similar approach could have been taken at earlier stages of the process at this site!

On the supporting documents:

1) Landscape Management/Maintenance Schedule Rev D, section 1.16 (second occurrence), refers to "Communal Visitor Parking (opposite plot 58)". Please can you ensure that this area is properly classified as parking exclusively for residents of Macclesfield Road in any binding documents - consistent with the overarching principle outlined in paragraph 7.26 of your report. Further, I would suggest that consideration be given to extending the definition of "stored vehicles" (LMS 1.16 iv) to explicitly include campervans, and possibly also large commercial vehicles, to ensure the achievement of the principles of Local Plan Policy EQ6 ("requiring that development achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and does not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, [...] overbearing effect, [...] or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity").

2) Also, although perhaps only a technical issue, please can I draw your attention to plan 466/ED/CMS2 Rev E referenced in the proposed revised conditions. I am concerned that it may not be possible for the parking for residents of Macclesfield Road to be provided in the stated timeframe/phasing in accordance with this plan, as it appears to illustrate access via the northern edge of the site, alongside Zones 12 and 19, rather than via Zones 9-11. Apologies if I have misunderstood the plan.

In relation to paragraph 7.31 of your report, I recognise and appreciate the effort being made to "secure appropriate management of the dedicated Macclesfield Road residents parking area to prevent inappropriate car parking". However, I would like to raise several concerns about the requirement that any scheme includes "security collapsible bollards", which I think may be an unnecessary and unduly restrictive condition, and potentially give a result that is undesirable:

- The existing interim unrestricted parking area is largely working well as it is, and the situation would be expected to improve further once signage and proactive site management are in place.
- Raising/lowering bollards is impractical, making life harder on a daily/regular basis, particularly when coming and going, when leaving in a hurry, or in wet/icy conditions.
- Bollards may present accessibility issues for elderly, infirm or disabled users.
- The parking provision needs to be sufficiently flexible that, for example, different residences could each use several spaces on occasion when hosting visitors.
- Bollards could prevent spaces being more generally available to authorised users along Macclesfield Road.
- The LMS already has provision for resolving disputes with unauthorised users, if required (LMS 1.16 ii).
- Bollards would be unsightly and have a detrimental impact on the visual character of that part of the site.

I understand that the details of the management scheme will be considered subsequently at Discharge of Conditions, but I wouldn't want Barratts to be set up to fail with complex scheme requirements which might provide little or no net benefit to residents of Macclesfield Road.

In contrast to the proposed bollards, I wonder whether MORE detail via conditions might be useful and appropriate for the signage, with the stated aim to "secure appropriate management of the dedicated Macclesfield Road residents parking area to prevent inappropriate car parking" (again with details to be considered at DOC). For example, in addition to requiring a statement of reserved usage by residents of Macclesfield Road only, maybe allowed or prohibited vehicle types and/or purposes should also be specified (see LMS 1.16 iv, and my comment on stored vehicles above). I don't think a limited duration of stay necessarily needs to be specified to serve the stated aim, but any such imposition should not be unduly restrictive (e.g. no shorter than 14 days), to avoid unnecessary vehicle movements.

Thank you in advance for considering my comments as the final recommendations to Committee are prepared. I hope that it might be possible for the discharge of these conditions also to be brought before Committee, so that the residents who will need to work with the scheme day-to-day can have a say on the details of what the applicant puts forward in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Benjamin Read

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.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/YourData>

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.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/YourData>
