

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/24/3348508

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/H1033/W/24/3348508

Appeal By HIGH PEAK RETREAT

Site Address
Land off Long Lane
Chapel-en-le-Frith
Derbyshire
SK23 0TQ
Grid Ref Easting: 405266
Grid Ref Northing: 379960

SENDER DETAILS

Name MRS LESLEY BROWN

Address
Stable House Bankhall
Chapel-En-Le-Frith
HIGH PEAK
SK23 9UB

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

High Peak Borough Council have refused Planning Permission for the proposed development for valid reasons and in support of the numerous valid objections from the local Chapel-en-le-Frith residents. There are some extra points which we would like to be considered:

1. The land in question is supposed to have a covenant deeming it for agricultural use only - has this been changed/revoked?

2. Actual ownership of Bank Hall Drive is a consideration - it is a Private road - under the ownership of various residents. It is maintained and financed by all the 13 households. Its construction is not designed for continual business use/extra traffic wear. Its surface breaks down often and is continually in need of maintenance and repair. There will be an increase in wear and tear from the camp site traffic. Are these residents/owners expected to continue supporting the maintenance and increased costs in support of the Applicant's business enterprise?

Re appeal points:

1.2 Yes - it WOULD have an adverse effect on the visual landscape and spoil the rural view which consists of an open panorama of fields and hills, typical of the High Peak scenery, and enjoyed by all who see it. The camp facility would be the first thing to be seen and detract from the view.

2.2 There is a well established and patronised camp site in Combs (a short walk from Bank Hall) with shepherds huts, caravans, yurts and tents supported by the necessary facilities. It is of exceptional quality and well patronised by visitors to the High Peak.

Chapel Campsite, as quoted, does have the said large capacity but has always been under-utilised - so how would an additional site in a field opposite be necessary or more successful? In addition, access to Chapel Campsite is via a Public Highway.

Chapel has a significantly increased population due to several major housing developments so how would this low volume business make any meaningful contribution to local businesses - the supposed "public benefits" would be negligible if any.

However, the public nuisance elements, as experienced in a previous un-approved, un-authorised "trial run" would be significant.

3.2 Considering the amendments to site volume/occupancy and availability of the other sites - it is an unsustainable business model with in-built failure, designed for a "change of use" application to facilitate future housing development - as this is the actual core business of the developer's other companies.

4.6 + 4.8 There isn't an urban backdrop - and the application site is not on an urban fringe. There are 2 residential developments at the immediate rear and they were built on marshy land, with no rural quality, unsuitable for agricultural use and contained within the railway track and a busy road.

The application site cannot be seen from the so called "urban fringe"

The impact of this supposed urban development IS most definitely curtailed by passing under the railway bridge - to very dramatic effect - with an immediate cut-off and no continuity.

If there is "no significant visual impact" of the development with loss of view - as quoted - why create a new hedgerow "to soften the visual impact of the proposal"

4.16 Bank Hall Drive IS a secluded lane - only 13 properties spread from the Downlee Farm lower segment to Bolefield house 1 mile further up the hill.

It is a sheltered and low "traffic" volume lane - single track - where even the residents experience difficulties when negotiating by vehicle.

The applicants claim that post development, Bank Hall Drive "will still be a narrow lane" begs the question: how then would this narrow lane be able to cope with the additional traffic from the camp site construction work, site occupancy vehicle levels and its service vehicles?

This seems to be an early and opportunistic appeal based on an assumption that the new Government will relax Planning and Development regulations.

Thank you for your attention.