
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 January 2026 12:08
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HPK/2025/0431 Site Address: LAND TO THE SOUTH WEST OF WIMBERRY HILL FARM Cemetery Road Glossop Derbyshire 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 relation to process, I strongly feel that this development should not be considered by delegated authority and instead be considered alongside the adjacent proposal HPK/2025/0301. The application recognises the cumulative effect of the 2 proposals and notes that the Phase 2 development (HPK/2025/0431) couldn't progress without the approval of Phase 1 (HPK/2025/0301) due to issues of access. Thus, they should be considered together by the Development Control Committee.

Secondly, having reviewed the documentation attached to the application, I am concerned that the Landscape and Visual Appraisal Report makes no reference to the residential properties of The Heath, particularly our property Heath Barn, and The Mews and Heath Farm. Each of these properties, whilst private, will suffer significant visual impact for at least 15 years. In respect of our own property, we would be extremely concerned with regard our privacy due to 2 properties potentially overlooking our house and garden, especially if they were to be 2.5 stories. I request that the Landscape and Visual Impact report is rectified to include the properties of The Heath before it is considered.

The Flood Risk Authority has put in an objection to HPK/2025/0301. I am particularly concerned that the proposed development (HPK/2025/0431) 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.

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 three public rights 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.

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. I would suggest that the site also has recreational value, footpaths 109, 110 and 178 being frequent walking routes to access the surrounding peak district and local cemetery.

The proposal aims to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity. Currently the site supports barn owls, jays, lapwings, pheasants, bats, toads and newts. 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 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. The nearest shops, leisure centre, doctors and dentists 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. This development would undoubtedly lock residents into car dependency and increase traffic congestion within Glossop.

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 and HPK/2025/0427 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 proposal should be considered alongside HPK/2025/0301 as the 2 proposals will undoubtedly have a cumulative effect in terms of highways, flooding, drainage, biodiversity and infrastructure. I object that the application has been submitted without a complete Landscape and Visual Impact report and request that this is rectified before the application is considered. 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. I strongly dispute that the site is in an accessible location as 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>
