
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 January 2026 16:07
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Views concerning planning application HPK/2025/0431
Attachments: Glossop Planning Letter Development at Cemetery Road.docx

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Applicant Number HPK/2025/0431 Land to the South West of Wimberry Hill Farm, Cemetery Road, Glossop.

I have attached the duplicate letter highlighting concerns and views to previous planning application HPK/2025/0431 as the applicant's name is the same and must be associated. Giving the location please refer to the points raised in the attached letter and the following summary:

Traffic & Parking - any new housing at this location will increase traffic congestion to a road (Cemetery Road) which is already dangerous due to the width in parts. Any additional turning points will add further dangers to road users on Cemetery Road.

Environment - This land is currently home to numerous wildlife. Increased risk of flooding to existing properties based on the depression of the land which falls to the existing properties.

Green Space - this is genuine green space. There are existing brownfield spaces that must be explored for building houses before any green space is considered, if at all.

Infrastructure - There is no consideration outside of the plan to improve the existing public services and road network in Glossop. The existing road infrastructure cannot cope with the current volume of traffic, therefore adding to this without a plan to improve is ridiculous. Furthermore, surrounding roads were not originally designed to carry the volume of traffic from existing road users, therefore, adding more traffic will increase risk of accidents and congestion.

Neighbour Consultations - it states in the consultation of planning letter that a 'considerable number' of neighbour consultations have been undertaken. This is not true. I am aware of one public consultation that took place which I attended and no answers were provided, just usual property developer/house builder waffle with no substance. This is very poor from the council to think this is adequate.

Please consider all of the above and points highlighted in the attached.

Your faithfully,

Kevin Walpole
Owner
Glengarraf
Kingsmoor Fields
Glossop
SK13 7QD

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Application Number HPK/2025/0301

Applicants Name: BDW Trading Ltd

Location: Land to the west of Cemetery Road, Glossop

Proposed Development: Application for Outline Planning Permission for up to 85 dwellings, public open space, and associated works.

I am fully aware of the target to deliver 1.5 million new homes over the term of this government and this proposal feels like it is looking to take advantage of this policy in hope that schemes will be pushed through just to try and get close to the ambitious target.

Your letter states that 'in view of the considerable number of neighbour consultations undertaken, it is not possible to respond to individual points raised'. The consultations undertaken seem to have been just a 'tick box' exercise required as part of the planning process from the landowner/developer. I state this because to my knowledge no responses or feedback have been provided to anyone that attended or took the time to write the created wimberryhill@haveyoursay.co.uk Therefore, I would challenge the point in your consultation on planning application regarding considerable number of neighbour consultations, this is not true and those that did happen were not meaningful and offered no answers to points raised.

Please read and consider the following points:

1. **Site not Allocated in Local Plan** – the proposal lies outside of the current Local Plan and is not identified as a strategic housing site. There has been no meaningful public consultation on adding it to the supply pipeline via a plan-led process.
2. **Misleading use of Brownfield Classification** - the site is being portrayed as previously developed land (brownfield), largely due to the presence of long-established local businesses. The proposal includes a significant greenfield element which can only be accessed by demolishing a functioning garden centre and evicting multiple active local employers, thus removing employment from the area.
3. **Premature Evictions Indicate Predetermination** – existing businesses occupying the site have been served notice to vacate by September 2025, well in advance of any planning approval. This means landowners and developers have reason to believe the planning permission is already assured, regardless of the formal process.
4. **Widespread Local Perception of a 'Done Deal'** – there is strong evidence from numerous Glossop residents that this development is already approved. This can only undermine confidence in the fairness of the decision-making process.
5. **Disproportionate Housing Burden on Glossop** – Glossop continues to absorb a disproportionate share of the borough's housing growth, seemingly used to meet borough-wide obligations without appropriate investment in local infrastructure (roads, healthcare, schools). This raises further questions of fairness and spatial policy compliance, for example, evidence of a proper infrastructure assessment being undertaken.
6. **Over Development** – there are no local amenities close to the proposed development, therefore, residents will have to drive to reach any amenities – better infrastructure required to cope with 85 dwellings.
7. **Design not Compatible** – when you drive down Woodhead Road from the Peak District National Park to enter Glossop, this development is the first thing you will see. New Housing cannot be in view when entering Glossop from the National Park.

8. **Traffic Safety** – Cemetery Road is narrow and when walking down certain parts the traffic is too close to pedestrians, especially when 2 cars are passing from both directions – infrastructure improvements required.
9. The existing greenfield space in this proposal is already occupied by thriving wildlife. There is a known resident owl, a variety of different breeds of birds, a colony of bats that can be seen flying every evening around dusk and a small pond in the bottom corner which would need a survey. Until recently the field (green space) was also used for horses, but I can only assume these were removed by the landowner to support the planning process.
10. **True brownfield sites** - in Glossop there are other brownfield spaces available that could be used for housing, and it would not have meant closing existing long established local businesses that serve the local community. Clarification is required from High Peak Borough Council on how it determines a brownfield site, and how it applies to mixed-use or partially greenfield sites.
11. **Greyfield site** – one consideration maybe that the developer is trying to class this as a greyfield site. However, a greyfield site refers to land that is underused and unsightly, typically found in a Green Belt designation. There is an existing garden centre and horse-riding school on this site (2 x trading businesses), so this cannot meet the greyfield term. For example, there are no old garages, unused car parking or outdated building, they are all in use and NOT underutilised.
12. **Congestion** - before any more houses are built or planned to be built in Glossop, the road infrastructure needs to be improved. Most days (including weekends) at peak times, Glossop is gridlocked.

Yours Faithfully

Kevin Walpole
Glengarrif
Woodhead Road
Glossop
SK13 7QD