

From:
To:
Subject: Fwd: Comment submitted for Planning application
Date: 13 May 2025 09:02:19

Dear Mr Stannard and HPBC Planning admin.

Below is confirmation of my online objection to the recent revised Planning Application. The objection was posted shortly before the end of the day on the cut-off day of 17 April 2025 and was additional to my letter dated 14 April 2025.

However, I have not yet seen the objection listed within the planning application public access portal. Consequently, I'm concerned that you might not have received my comments in relation to the updated external lighting scheme by Ridings - their reference: 23328-RID-LTG-XX-DR-E-0001 - Rev P02.

Please could you confirm that you have received my online objection dated 17 April 2025?

I have also noted the recent (01-05-25) statement from Wainwright's in response to a number of the public comments that had been posted concerning their revised plans.

In particular -

The appearance of the building has been designed to closely replicate surrounding structures, as described in the design and access statement. The use of multi-pitched roofs, natural gritstone walling, corrugated metal sheeting, and timber fencing are not unusual to the local area, and can be found on numerous agricultural and commercial buildings around the Peak District. Overall, the proposed materials pallet will be a significant improvement over the quality of the existing buildings on the site. **[Response by Wayne and Tracey Timperley]** We note the comment highlighted in yellow. The Planning consultants comment is not sensitive to the substantially residential nature of the area. The proposed buildings remain of significantly greater height and volume to those already in-situ. Moreover, the appearance of such buildings is more in-keeping with similar warehousing and industrial buildings that tend to be sited outside residential areas or are appropriately screened by depressions or landscaping so as to prevent them imposing on the amenity of residential areas. Moreover, I cannot recall any agricultural buildings within such close proximity to residential buildings within the Chapel-en-le-Frith neighbourhood.

The consultee has taken measurements from the drawings using proprietary software and raised concerns about the scale and accuracy of the submitted drawings. We cannot comment on the accuracy of any third party software that has been used to scale from digital reproductions of the drawings. We can verify that drawing WAC 1813 2-01 Rev J is at scale 1:500. **[Response by Wayne and Tracey Timperley]** We note the comment and that the agent has verified the scale is 1:500. However, we would point out that the drawing is only as good as its inputs. The referenced software is that of the embedded measurement tool within Adobe and it seems somewhat ironic that for most other parts of the same plan and other plans the embedded scale works perfectly normally, but in relation to Unit C and its proximity to 22B and 22C Buxton Road and the 16m proximity line, the scale appears to be closer to 1:250.

The consultee questioned the accuracy of the indicative 16 meter offset from the rear of

their property, and provided measurements of their property that suggest the 16m offset as agreed with the LPA should be circa 1m further from the boundary. While the dimensions provided are helpful in understanding the relationship of the adjoining property to their side of the boundary wall, it is difficult and inaccurate to transpose isolated site measurements onto a pre-existing topographic survey that crosses property boundaries, especially over changes in level and orientation. However, we do appreciate the importance of maintaining an adequate offset between buildings with respect to their scale and massing, and have re-designed the scheme to respect this. Also, before commencing work on the foundation sub-structures, further routine surveys shall be undertaken to generate setting out coordinates for the proposed to ensure the building is correctly placed and respects the 16m offset. [Response by Wayne and Tracey Timperley] We note the yellow highlighted text. As a Chartered Surveyor myself, I find this comment somewhat difficult to comprehend. The comment we made about the 16m proximity line was not to seek that it be pushed back to 17m but to position the line 16m away from the rear of 22B and 22C Buxton Road, based on accurate survey measurements. The terrain is not difficult to survey.

Again we find this comment somewhat ironic, in that, the agent appears content to criticise comments about the lack of accuracy to determine measurements based on the stated scale when using the embedded Adobe measurement tool, yet they seem to have based their own measurements on 3rd party data which has not been fully verified by the developers agent - namely OS mapping data.

Moreover, we further note the agents comments highlighted in orange above. This suggests to us that the agent is not, themselves, 100% convinced in their own site measurements at this key stage - which is somewhat concerning.

I have rechecked the measurements we stated in our 14 April letter by way of laser measure and find the dimensions originally stated to be accurate to within +/-1%. We would be only too happy for the developer and their agent to arrange access to our property to take whatever measurements they require to ensure the accuracy of the 16m proximity line. If the developer would like to take advantage of our offer then we give permission for HPBC to pass on the following contact details: or to the developers' agent/surveying team.

Concerns were raised over the potential for water run-off from the yard to the rear of Unit C and the potential impact this may have on the integrity of the retaining wall on the Boundary with 22b Buxton Road. The proposed yards do not feature a permeable surface, and all surface water shall be appropriately drained into the below ground drainage connections within the site. Response by Wayne and Tracey Timperley] We note the agents response. However, we would welcome sight of amended drainage plans to show the proposed surface water run-off provision within the rear yard area of Unit C matches with the statement made.

Concerns were raised over the siting and position of the proposed fence on the boundary to the rear of Unit C. The proposed fence shall not be constructed atop the retaining wall, and shall be set back from the boundary and supported by its own foundation, with the maintenance of the new fence entirely being the responsibility of the applicant. Response by Wayne and Tracey Timperley] We note the comment and are reassured by the agents statement.

We would also point out that there is no additional commentary in the agents statement to allay any concerns about the use of the buildings and how the development will protect the amenity of the residential area from various nuisances/pollution impacts.

Thank you again for your continued consideration of our concerns surrounding this proposed development.

Kind regards,

Wayne & Tracey Timperley

----- Forwarded message -----

From:

Date: Thu, 17 Apr 2025 at 22:57

Subject: Comment submitted for Planning application

To:

Thank you for submitting your comments on the planning application. This is an acknowledgement to confirm they have been received by the planning department and will be processed within the next 5 working days. Please find a copy of your submitted comments below.

Application Reference No. : HPK/2024/0143

Site Address: Derbyshire County Council Works Department Ashbourne Lane Chapel-En-Le-Frith Derbyshire SK23 0PA High Peak

Comments by: Wayne and Tracey TimperleyNot applicable

From:

22B

Buxton Road

Chapel-en-le-Frith

HIGH PEAK

Derbyshire

SK23 0PJ

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: Following on from our letter dated 15th April 2025, we have subsequently noted the details for the revised lighting scheme shown in the Ridings plan - 23328-RID-LTG-XX-DR-E-0001 Rev P02.

On the plan there are 3No external lights to the rear of Unit C. These lights are likely to be higher than the fence line of 2.1m afgl. The Ridings plan shows various lux levels but suggests that there will be 0 lux in the rear garden to our property at 22B Buxton Road

The lights appear very similar to those that are fitted to the side of the Street Crane unit on Frith Knoll Road. The Street Crane lights are extremely intense in the level of illuminance and are a significant source of light pollution/nuisance at night.

We are very concerned that the lights at the rear of Unit C will illuminate the rear of our property and cause significant light pollution/nuisance to the rear bedrooms which would be a cause for disturbed sleep.

We strongly object to the external lights at the rear of Unit C and would look to have these lights removed from the proposals or alternative details put forward as to how the light levels will be prevented from causing light pollution/nuisance to the rear habitable rooms of 22B Buxton Road.