
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 21 May 2025 21:05
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : HPK/2025/0126 Site Address: Land Adjacent 39 Bankbottom Hadfield Glossop
Derbyshire Comments by: Martyn March-Cousins

From:

39
Bankbottom
Hadfield
Glossop
Derbyshire
SK13 1BY

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: Objection to Planning Application HPK/2025/0126

Site: Land Adjacent to 39 Bankbottom, Hadfield, Glossop

Submitted by: Resident of 39 Bankbottom

1. Impact on Residential Amenity

High Peak Local Plan Policy EQ6 | NPPF Paragraph 130(f)

The proposed development would result in a significant loss of amenity to my home at 39 Bankbottom, which immediately adjoins the application site. Specifically:

- The proposed dwelling would cause a loss of privacy through potential overlooking into my garden.
- It would introduce an overbearing presence by building directly up to my boundary, creating a sense of enclosure.
- The new structure would overshadow parts of my garden, especially in the afternoons and during winter months, reducing natural light.

These impacts are contrary to Policy EQ6, which requires development to respect the amenity of existing residents, and NPPF Paragraph 130(f), which seeks a high standard of amenity for all users.

2. Traffic, Access and Highway Safety

High Peak Local Plan Policies EQ6 & CF6 | NPPF Paragraphs 110 and 111

I note that Derbyshire County Council has not objected to the application on highways grounds. However, with respect, the council officers do not live here and do not experience the daily parking challenges faced by residents.

On this short section of Bankbottom, there are 23 houses but only 16 on-street parking spaces (assuming ideal and considerate parking). Many homes have more than one vehicle, and parking is already oversubscribed. Residents often resort to parking fully or partially on kerbs or on nearby streets, having a knock-on impact on other residents.

The proposed dwelling provides no off-street parking. If the existing dropped kerb is reinstated as pavement, as the council recommends, that removes two additional parking spaces. This means that two additional vehicles from the new property, plus the loss of two existing spaces, would worsen an already unsustainable situation.

I can provide photographs demonstrating how parking currently overflows onto kerbs and side roads due to the parking oversubscription. The cumulative impact clearly exceeds what the Highway Authority has described as a "slight" increase.

Under Policy CF6 and NPPF Paragraph 111, developments should be refused where cumulative highway impacts are severe. I believe this threshold has been met.

3. Design and Character of the Area

High Peak Local Plan Policy EQ6 | NPPF Paragraph 134

The street is defined by uniform terraced housing, with consistent rooflines, form, and materials. The proposed detached dwelling would break this pattern and appear visually incongruous. While its roofline may align with one adjacent property, the overall design and form do not reflect the area's character.

Moreover, the proposed use of metal cladding is inappropriate. It introduces a material that does not appear anywhere on this part of the street, where stone dominates. This stark contrast would be visually jarring and out of character.

Policy EQ6 requires developments to respect the townscape, materials, and form of their surroundings. The proposal does not achieve this, and under NPPF Paragraph 134, poor design is a valid reason for refusal.

4. Landscape and Visual Openness

High Peak Local Plan Policy EQ6 & EQ8 | NPPF Paragraph 174

Although the site does not contain vegetation or protected trees, its current undeveloped state provides a sense of openness between built forms. The proposed infill would close this visual gap, creating a more cramped appearance. This subtle contribution to the character of the street should not be undervalued.

Policy EQ8 encourages the preservation of green infrastructure and visual openness, even in informal spaces. The development undermines this objective.

5. Construction on Shared Boundary / Drainage & Access Obstruction

High Peak Local Plan Policy EQ6 | NPPF Paragraphs 130 and 154

The proposed dwelling would be built directly against a party wall boundary shared with my home. There is no information in the application regarding how drainage will be handled, and some drainage appears to be shared with my property.

Given the boundary location and proposed bathrooms, a downpipe would have to run down the side wall in the narrow alleyway. This alleyway is a public right of way and is the only access I have for removing bins. A pipe or any projection would block this route. The path is already very tight when moving bins through it.

Policy EQ6 requires that development avoid obstructing access or compromising neighbour amenity. NPPF Paragraph 154(b) also requires developments to reduce vulnerability and avoid drainage-related impacts. The current proposal fails to meet either.

6. Replacement of Boundary Fence Without Details

High Peak Local Plan Policy EQ6

The proposal suggests the removal and replacement of the boundary fence between my property and the application site. Half of this fence was newly installed less than a month ago at my own expense.

No details have been provided regarding the new fence's design, materials, height, or ownership. There has been no attempt to consult me or gain agreement, despite the likelihood of shared boundary responsibilities.

Policy EQ6 requires clear demonstration of respect for existing boundaries and neighbour amenity. Replacing a new, structurally sound fence without transparency is unjustified.

7. Structural Risk to Adjacent Property

High Peak Local Plan Policy EQ6 | Party Wall etc. Act 1996 (contextual reference)

My house was built around 1900 and may have shallow, non-reinforced foundations. The proposed works will require ground excavation and possibly piling very close to my house.

No Construction Method Statement has been submitted, nor has there been any assessment of potential structural risk. There is genuine concern that these works could cause vibration, cracking, or settlement.

While the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 governs these issues post-approval, Policy EQ6 requires the council to assess construction-related risks at the planning stage, especially where neighbouring amenity may be harmed.

8. Access Constraints During Construction

High Peak Local Plan Policy EQ6 | NPPF Paragraph 110

The alley at the side of my property is just 750mm wide. It is unclear how scaffolding or contractor access will be safely managed during the build. These narrow alleys cannot accommodate equipment or waste removal without completely blocking my access.

There is no Construction Management Plan (CMP), no logistics proposal, and no mitigation offered. This lack of planning directly contradicts Policy EQ6 and NPPF Paragraph 110.

9. Inaccurate Tree Information and Loss of Mature Tree

High Peak Local Plan Policy EQ9 | NPPF Paragraph 174

The application states there are no trees within 12 metres of the site. This is factually inaccurate. A mature tree still exists within that distance and may be impacted by construction works; yet, no arboricultural assessment has been provided.

Also of significance, until a few months ago a large, mature cherry blossom tree stood within my land, near the boundary of the application site. This tree contributed positively to the visual amenity of the area, provided seasonal interest, and offered natural screening between properties. Its roots grew mainly under the proposed development site, and the tree was lost shortly after its roots were disturbed, without my knowledge or consent, by works carried out by the previous tenants (it is unknown what involvement the land owner had in this matter).

Had this tree still been present, it is likely it would have been a material constraint on development and a consideration in the assessment of visual impact, privacy, and character. Its removal shortly before the submission of this application appears to have materially altered the site context and reduced the natural screening between properties.

Under Local Plan Policy EQ9, existing trees should be retained wherever possible, and under NPPF Paragraph 174, developments should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. The circumstances surrounding this tree's loss and the inaccurate claims about existing trees cast doubt on the application's thoroughness and environmental regard.

10. Practical Construction Challenges and Lack of Timeline

High Peak Local Plan Policy EQ6 | NPPF Paragraph 185(b)

The tightness of the site raises serious concerns about construction logistics. Heavy machinery, scaffolding, skips, and materials will likely obstruct pavements and further reduce available parking. There is no CMP, no working hours, no phasing, and no estimated duration provided.

Without this information, neighbours have no protection from indefinite or uncontrolled disruption. Additionally, I work from home and the construction will have a significant impact on this.

EQ6 and NPPF 185(b) both require the impact on neighbour quality of life to be fully considered. This application does not.

11. Party Wall Implications

The dwelling will be built on a party wall boundary, which will trigger obligations under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996. There is no reference to this in the application, nor any apparent awareness of the need for formal notices or engagement.

This adds complexity and reinforces the need for more robust planning oversight. While I appreciate it is not a reason for refusal in itself, it requires caution and stronger control.

> If the Council Is Minded to Approve

Should the council choose to approve the application despite these objections, I request the following conditions be imposed:

- Boundary Treatment Condition: Full details of proposed fencing or walls to be submitted and agreed with neighbours before any work begins.

- Construction Management Plan: A CMP to be submitted covering hours, access, waste, construction parking, deliveries, scaffolding, and bin access.

- Drainage Plan: Details of rainwater goods and drainage to be approved to prevent discharge or obstruction to adjoining properties or access ways.

- Party Wall Act Informative: An advisory note to remind the applicant of their responsibilities under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996.

Conclusion

I strongly object to the proposed development on the grounds of its unacceptable impact on residential amenity, design quality, access, construction feasibility, and local infrastructure. It is contrary to Policies EQ6, EQ8, EQ9 and CF6 of the High Peak Local Plan and relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

I respectfully urge the Council to refuse planning permission.

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>
