
From: Peter McCabe [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 November 2025 12:11
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: HPK/2025/0427

We live at Heath Farm where our back garden backs onto the 3 back gardens of detached houses of the proposed development.

Having resided in Glossop for the last 25 years with the last 12 years at our current property which we purchased from Ian Craggs and his then partner Sally Turner.

The proposed site is partially bound by the a fence belonging to us forming part of our boundary.

This site has previously had planning applied for to use as a holiday lodge development under application HPK/2021/0222 which was duly rejected because the site comprised of valley slopes of pastureland fields along the lane, exhibiting feature characteristic of semi-rural landscape. These characteristics remain as a reason for the new application.

The inspector for HPK/2021/0222 was of an opinion there would be conflict with the plan and would not be sensitive to the surroundings and would adversely effect the character and appearance of the landscape and feel the new application would be even more harmful.

The overall impact on the landscape would both damaging visually and characteristically.

The proposal equally falls short of the aims of policies EQ2 and EQ6 of the HPLP in that the landscape is neither protected or enhanced and would urge the current landscape be respected and protected as it is. It equally fails Policy E7 of the HPLP conflicting the protection of the countryside and landscape.

All the reasons for declining HPK/2021/0222 remain in place even more so for HPK/2025/0427 as for the previous failed application the lane had to cope with holiday traffic which would be sporadic and not for 9 dwellings with 2 or more cars per dwelling. Currently the lane copes with 6 houses causing at times vehicles to reverse to allow for passing. Add another possible 18 daily comings and goings on the lanes will cause utter chaos and undoubted safety issues.

As stated in our objection to HPK/2025/0301 since the building of the North Road development we have been flooded twice with no previous history of flooding prior to the North Road development.

The approval of either HPK/2025/0301 or HPK/2025/0427 will only increase the chances of further flooding significantly.

DCC Flood risk have rightly objected to HPK/2025/0301 requiring more evidence the proposed site can discharge its own surface water. Given the North Road development has failed in this area I struggle to see how either HPK/2025/0301 or HPK/2025/0427 can provide certain evidence of this.

The access lane being only single car width and used frequently by ramblers living on The Heath and beyond increasing the traffic is an accident waiting to happen. Coupled with the access from Cemetery Road becoming more congested is all pointing to significantly increased risk.

There is a continual declining of planning permission for holidays cottages, different dwellings applied for under HPK/2018/0468 followed by HPK/2019/2045 followed by HPK/2021/0222 to be now dealing with HPK/2025/0301 and HPK/2025/0427.

All the reasons for rejecting previous applications remain in place if not even more so with the ever changing global climate changes.

The consideration for these to be approved means damaging countryside, landscape, and ecology all characteristics vital in our collective plight to try and protect the planet.

Whilst potentially damaging all the above we introduce flood risk, road hazards, pedestrian risks, wildlife damage to name but a few.

The whole potential development does nothing but harm to firstly the immediate location and equally important to the community of Glossop which already struggles with current infrastructure.

The deeds of our property relating to our boundaries needs to be maintained and kept in keeping with the area.

The back gardens of the 3 detached houses that back onto our back garden enjoying an elevated position means we would completely lose all the privacy currently enjoyed in our back garden rendering our back garden only usable accepting a complete lack of privacy.

Given the number of failed previous applications and working with the High Peak Local Plan of 2016 I fail to see when we are constantly advised that local councils have little / no money why we continue to allow planning application in many different forms for use of the same land when the reasons for rejection remain intact.

Surely this goes against government policy of spending money wisely. To prevent further applications being made surely a rule needs to be in place that is hard and fast protecting this piece of landscape.

It is green belt boundary falling within the open countryside and in Proximity of 2 protected areas. With all this factual evidence how can a 10% net biodiversity gain be achieved.

Any jobs created during any building are being created regardless with the various building projects currently being carried out in non green belt areas of Glossop whilst not HPK/2025/0427 does not impact on current employment HPK/2025/0301 certainly does.

This application goes completely against government policy of spending wisely, protecting communities and protecting the environment.

The proposal to develop greenfield countryside in a gross invading into the countryside causing significant damage to the area which previous declined applications support.

It should not be granted PIP consent and equally as has happened previously should be declined in maintaining the best interests of the local community.