

Grounds of Appeal

Appeal Against Planning Decision – High Peak Borough Council, Glossop, Derbyshire

Applicant: Alex Barnes

Property Address: 15 Mount Street, Glossop, Derbyshire

Application Reference Number: HPK/2024/0370

Date: 4th May 2025

Introduction

I submit this formal appeal against the refusal of my planning application by High Peak Borough Council (HPBC) concerning my property at **15 Mount Street, Glossop, Derbyshire**. The refusal has been issued despite my proposals aligning with established conservation principles, precedent developments within the locality, and fundamental planning considerations. The alterations I seek will enhance the visual amenity of the property, provide necessary structural improvements, and mitigate existing inconsistencies within the streetscape.

Timeline of Events

The following timeline outlines the key dates and interactions that occurred during the course of my planning application:

- **04/04/2024** – Received pre-application letter from **Rosie Dinnen (HPBC)** stating that it "should be a straightforward application."
- **16/10/2024** – Planning application validated and listed on HPBC website.
- **24/10/2024** – Start of public consultation period.
- **11/12/2024** – Original determination date as noted on HPBC website. No decision was issued.
- **16/12/2024, 06/01/2025, 13/01/2025** – Contacted HPBC by telephone to request an update. Each time, I was assured I would be contacted within **three days**, but no response was received.
- **14/01/2025** – Finally contacted by **Pett Twigg of Planning Angel**, a third-party representative **not affiliated with HPBC**, requesting an extension to **24/01/2025**. I agreed.
- **21/01/2025** – Received an email from **Pett Twigg** with comments from the conservation officer, advising that my application would be refused unless I withdrew it.
- **28/01/2025** – Received an email from **Pett Twigg** suggesting I consider concrete 'stone' cladding.
- **09/02/2025** – Submitted a response declining the suggestion, with full reasoning.

- **10/02/2025** – Received an email from **Pett Twigg** stating that the application would be recommended for refusal, giving me **two days** to withdraw. I immediately responded requesting that the application proceed to determination.
- **10/02/2025 – 10/03/2025** – **A full month passed after I requested determination, with no formal decision issued, no communication, and no justification for the delay.**
- **Over a month later** – The application remained "**under review by the case officer**" on the **HPBC website**, with no progress or further updates.
- **Decision Finally Reached** – The planning decision was issued **only after an associate of mine contacted Pett Twigg directly**, prompting action after weeks of inaction.

Grounds for Appeal

1. Procedural Irregularities by High Peak Borough Council

- **Failure to Determine Within Statutory Timeframe:** The original determination date was **11/12/2024**, yet no formal decision was issued. Despite repeated enquiries (**16/12/2024, 06/01/2025, 13/01/2025**), I was assured a response within **three days**, but these assurances were never fulfilled.
- **Involvement of External Parties:** On **14/01/2025**, I was contacted by **Planning Angel**, a third-party entity unaffiliated with HPBC, requesting an extension to the determination period. Direct engagement from HPBC officers was absent, representing a serious procedural failing.
- **Unjustified Pressure to Withdraw:** On **21/01/2025**, Planning Angel advised me that my application would be refused unless withdrawn, despite no formal decision notice or adequate justification being provided. This approach lacks transparency and fairness.
- **Misrepresentation of My Communication Efforts:** The **planning decision** suggests that I had not engaged in communication with the planning office. However, this assertion is demonstrably inaccurate, as evidenced by the **timeline provided above**, which details multiple attempts on my part to seek clarification and progress on the application.
- **Prolonged Delay After Request for Determination:** On **10/02/2025**, I requested that the application proceed to determination instead of withdrawal. However, despite my formal request, **a full month passed without any decision, update, or reasoning provided for the delay**. This failure to act upon my request further underscores the procedural failings within the planning process.
- **Decision Reached Only After External Intervention:** The **planning decision** was issued **only after an associate of mine contacted Pett Twigg directly**,

demonstrating that progress was made **only after external pressure was applied**, rather than through the standard planning process.

2. Proposed Works and Environmental Considerations

- My application seeks consent to apply **White Render and Splifface Slate Tile** finishes to the front and rear elevations of the property to address existing structural vulnerabilities and improve its visual compatibility with the surrounding conservation area.
- Additional changes under **permitted development rights** include the replacement of **rotten windows, soffits, barge boards, and doors** with new **U.P.V.C. units in anthracite**, improving energy efficiency and durability.
- **Essential Rendering Requirement:** The **front and rear elevations require rendering** due to the **numerous holes drilled to install cavity wall insulation**. Without rendering, the **waterproof integrity** of the façades will be compromised, leading to **moisture ingress** and **structural deterioration** over time. Additionally, the application of render will **improve the insulation properties of the walls**, contributing to **enhanced thermal efficiency and reduced heat loss**.
- The proposed alterations will have **no detrimental environmental impact** on surrounding properties, trees, wildlife, or local drainage conditions.
- Existing **access arrangements** remain unchanged and unaffected by the proposed works.

Conclusion & Relief Sought

I submit that the refusal was **procedurally flawed, lacked substantive justification**, and failed to **acknowledge precedent examples and the essential nature of rendering for structural integrity**. Accordingly, I seek the following relief:

1. **Overturning of the refusal** and the granting of **Planning Approval**, recognising the scheme's **positive environmental, structural, and aesthetic contributions**.
2. **Acknowledgment of procedural deficiencies**, ensuring future applicants receive **transparent communication and due process** from HPBC officers.

Moreover, I would have been **happy to fully render the property**, omitting the **splifface slate**, had I been given the opportunity to amend the proposal accordingly. However, **no such option was offered**, which may have addressed concerns raised during the determination process.

I respectfully urge a **fair and balanced reassessment** of this appeal and request that HPBC act in accordance with planning precedents and statutory obligations.

Yours faithfully,

Alex Barnes

