
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 26 November 2025 15:05
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : HPK/2025/0427 Site Address: Land to the South of The Heath Glossop Derbyshire SK13 7EJ Comments by: Margaret Anne Talbot

From:

Heath Barn
The Heath
Glossop
Glossop
Derbyshire
SK13 7QF

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Submission: Objection

Comments: I am a long-term Glossop resident, having lived and worked in Glossop since 1991 and at my current address on The Heath since 2000.

Firstly, in terms of process, I am concerned that the formal list of consultees is not complete. There are 7 properties on The Heath of which only 4 have been consulted. Barnside, Heath Farm Cottage and Heath Cottage are not listed as consultees despite the proposed development clearly having an impact on their properties in terms of access, flood risk and drainage.

Secondly, in relation to process, I strongly feel that this development should not be considered via the PIP route and instead be considered, by means of a full planning application, alongside the adjacent proposal HPK/2025/0301 and the smaller adjacent proposal for 7 houses. This, as the proposal states, totals 101 properties. It is extremely disingenuous to suggest that there would be no cumulative impact on flood risk, drainage, highways and biodiversity. This is particularly so as the land proposed in HPK/2025/0427 is open countryside, has never been developed, save a previous small menage, and is now grassland. I am particularly concerned that the proposed development will increase the flood risk both to our immediate properties and to Glossop as a whole when considering the cumulative effect of the proposal HPK/2025/0301. There are a number of areas in Glossop that have suffered frequent flooding over a number of years and are deemed high risk - including Old Glossop just below this proposed development. It is noted that the adjacent Taylor Wimpey development, approved on appeal in 2013, was only approved once a survey of the reservoir had been completed and concerns about flood risk and drainage from the Environmental Officer had been met.

In terms of the site for this proposed development, this site is not currently included in the local plan. The site is within open countryside. It will be clearly visible from a public right of way (PROW) and is in proximity to two tree protected areas. I would strongly suggest that the development will have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the countryside. I would urge that the application be deferred until the local plan is published in Autumn 2026.

I would not consider this site a suitable sustainable location for housing development. This proposed development is not well connected in terms of access to amenities or services. It is not within walking or cycling distance of a wide

range of services. Whilst there will be proximity to the previous North Road development, the North Road development contains no amenities or services. The nearest shops are 1.6km away down a very steep main road with poor (and at times no) pavement. From my experience of living in the immediate area for over 25 years, this is not walkable with young children, shopping, the elderly or those with any mobility issues. There is one bus - with the stop 650m down a steep hill. This offers 2 services a day around lunchtime so is unsuitable for workers or school children. The nearest local primary schools are a similar distance and the nearest doctors surgery is further. This development would undoubtedly lock residents into car dependency and increase traffic congestion within Glossop.

I would also strongly advise that the access lane connecting the 7 properties on the Heath is not suitable for additional vehicular traffic. The failed application HPK/2018/0468 to build four dwellings on land adjacent to The Heath was refused in part because DCC Highways stated the 'access track is not ideally suited to serve further residential development given its limited width, lack of segregated pedestrian facilities, lack of drainage and lighting'. The revised application HPK/2019/0245 to build only three dwellings was approved 'subject to all access being via Hawthorne Drive with a permanent physical barrier to prevent vehicular access to The Heath'. Despite this, the development has caused a detrimental increase in traffic on the access lane due to delivery drivers frequently using the pedestrian access for their deliveries blocking the lane for residents and compromising safety. To be clear, the lane access is narrow, has no pavement and is unlit with a blind bend. It is a public right of way (FP 110) and provides pedestrian access to Glossop North End Community Club, Glossop Cemetery and the open countryside beyond. It is enjoyed by dogwalkers, ramblers and families. Additionally the access lane is also newly surfaced and it would be vital that any proposed development had adequate drainage and didn't cause flooding to this newly surfaced lane and adjacent properties.

In relation to landscape, character and appearance it is noted that a previous application for development of this site was refused by both the High Peak Planning Committee and on appeal (APP/H1033/W/23/3320701) on the grounds of visual impact. Whilst it is accepted that the previous proposal was for holiday lodges rather than permanent homes, I do not accept that the visual impact of this proposed development is substantially changed. I do not accept that the overall landscape effects of the development upon the site and its immediate context would not result in significant impact on landscape character. The appeal noted that the site exhibits features characteristics of a semi-rural landscape type and contributes positively to the wider appearance of the area. The site would be clearly visible from The Heath PROW. There would also be a significant visual impact from the properties adjacent to the site on Hawthorn Drive, The Mews and Heath Farm. In terms of our own property, Heath Barn, there would be adverse visual impact from the first floor of our property. Moreover, we would have very significant concerns in relation to the 2 proposed properties adjacent to the boundary of our garden and their ability to directly overlook our garden due to the raised topography of the site.

The proposal states that quality landscaping shall provide environmental benefits to assist in the eventual delivery of a 10% net gain in biodiversity and that a suitable biodiversity scheme, whether through on-site or off-site mitigation and compensation could alleviate any ecological harm. Currently the site supports barn owls, jays, lapwings, pheasants, bats, toads as well as many smaller species. It has a number of protected trees. Once these habitats are lost, they cannot be replaced. It is vital that any development 'if it goes ahead' - protects the current habitats and enhances biodiversity. I am concerned that if the development proceeds it will not achieve the 10% net biodiversity gain promised. I would find it unacceptable for this to be achieved via use of compensation. It will be vital that there is a comprehensive ecological report for the development and that recommendations are implemented in full. I would also wish the development, if it progresses, to have appropriate screening in keeping with the nature of the area in the form of hedgerows or traditional stone walls rather than wooden fencing.

I also do not consider this proposal aligns with current infrastructure in the area in terms of schools, GPs or dentists. Currently our secondary school children and six formers often have to attend out of area schools and colleges due to insufficient places within Glossop, already causing a drain to local Council's resources. We have no local NHS dentist and oversubscribed GP practices. We have poor leisure amenities for the population with 1 small leisure centre and

an old Victorian swimming pool. We do not have a permanently open police station. This proposal, which should be considered with HPK/2025/0301, creating a total of potentially 101 new homes, would undoubtedly put a strain on current infrastructure and Glossop's already significant congestion.

In summary, I object to the proposed development. In terms of process, I believe the list of formal consultees is not complete. I believe the proposal should not be 'fast-tracked' via the PIP route but should be considered alongside HPK/2025/0301 by means of a formal planning application as the 2 proposals will undoubtedly have a cumulative effect in terms of highways, flooding, drainage, biodiversity and infrastructure. I object that the proposed development is being considered without the site being in the local plan and that it includes open countryside land that has never been developed. It will have a significant adverse impact of the character and appearance of the countryside and unacceptable visual impact from the adjacent PROW and adjacent properties. I strongly dispute that the site is in an accessible location - it categorically is not within walking and cycling distance of a wide range of services and amenities for all but the most fit.

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>
