

Cookies on appeal a planning decision service

We use some essential cookies to make this service work.

We'd also like to use analytics cookies so we can understand how you use the service and make improvements.

[View cookies \(/cookies\)](/cookies)

Planning Inspectorate

Manage your appeals

Appeal 6006040

Interested party comments

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Inquiry
Appeal site	Glossopdale Community College Lower Site, Talbot Road, Glossop, SK13 7DR
Agent contact details	Richard Holliday richard.holliday@carterjonas.co.uk +447977914141
Local planning authority	High Peak
Application number	HPK/2024/0481

Interested party 1

Comments	110 more houses in Glossop will put even more strain on already stretched local services, amenities and infrastructure. The land would be better used to provide additional facilities to the local community - medical, educational, care, leisure etc. as proposed when the bid for levelling up funds was submitted and consequently rejected. The number of houses in the area has grown hugely in recent years whilst amenities have failed to keep pace. Please reject this proposal and use the land for something moreuseful to the existing population. Thank you. Read more
----------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 2

Comments	At the moment & over the next 2-3 years, within the Glossop town centre there are approximately 500-600 dwelling's being built on both green and brown field sites, with a potential to increase the population on average, by upto 1750-2200 people of varying ages and family make up. Whilst the local plan and at a national level there
----------	--

is a need to increase housing, the majority will be at a vast profit for the relevant companies with little in terms of social or affordable housing units, a key for the future for many families that are not able to access a home they can buy. This plan for 110 dwellings adds to that and will increase infrastructure pressures all over the small town from roads, to schools to GP access, as well as the countryside and nature itself. Why keep building unaffordable homes, even with a major road project on Mottram Moor, which will ultimately be jammed with traffic within days of it's opening.

My view is that anymore large house building projects in a relatively small area that will add to pressures, should be rolled over to anymore than 30 homes built every 2 years, with larger project of 100 or more at least 3-5 years so that the local infrastructure can be assessed & addressed by more schools built, more GPs, etc.

Thanks! [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 3

Comments

I reject this appeal and support the original decision to refuse planning permission.

Since that refusal there has been a significant increase in housing on Dinting Road and previously in Old Glossop resulting in increased traffic on Talbot, Fauvel and North Roads. Access for another 110+ vehicles would add considerably to congestion, especially on North Road.

The loss of potential recreation space very worrying.

An overwhelming majority of the site has never been built on and drainage has always been a problem. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 4

Comments

Added as a document

Supporting documents

[Sharon Youngson-Baines-REDACTED.pdf \(/published-document/9fb3cc14-ce6d-4260-87ea-7eae8444512e\)](#)

Interested party 5

Comments

Added as a document

Supporting documents

[James Weekes-REDACTED.pdf \(/published-document/f9a4ffe2-9086-4abf-81a4-8314e6e8a3c4\)](#)

Interested party 6

Comments

In relation to the former Glossopdale school site, we have numerous concerns pertaining to the following:

There is no detailed design code for the potential development and as a result, there is no clarity in relation to the height of buildings, the placement of buildings within the site, landscaping designs and detailed comments relating to natural buffers for existing peripheral houses. The land has natural disparity in relation to its inherent gradient and therefore, it is important to understand the specific heights of individual units, particularly on the perimeter. We would respectfully ask that restrictions are placed on any future permission so that buildings could not exceed 2 storeys in order to keep in with the character of the local landscape, and to avoid any conflict with the design of the houses in the immediate area.

There are significant inconsistencies in the ambiguous details circulated within the public domain and it is therefore, essential that the outline planning proposals provide clear parameters on the expected development so that concerned residents are able to understand the potential impact of the development.

There are fundamental drainage issues due to the topography of the site. The site is constantly waterlogged, with homeowners on the boundary experiencing material drainage issues within their grounds. Numerous homes are already built on culverts and additional housing will only add increasing strain on any drainage systems. Within the central Glossop area, this is the only site that could arguably be used for a non-residential purpose. Once residential houses are built on this site, there will be no other feasible opportunity to build a much needed medical/wellness centre, for example. As a town, Glossop has an exponentially increasing population with numerous ongoing developments, which will only add ever increasing strain onto local infrastructure. The local schools are already over-subscribed, particularly as funding cuts have resulted in a reduction in teachers, giving rise to disadvantageous 'mixed' classes. The influx of a material number of new houses, will mean that already over-subscribed schools will have to make even more accommodations to the detriment of existing pupils. It is probable that demands on resources will result in students requiring to journey outside of the locality in order to attend school, which would place a greater burden on the existing travel routes.

Within the former site there were a number of playing fields. On consideration of the existing population of Glossop, there are inadequate leisure facilities available, particularly for the younger demographic. Would it be possible for an element of the site to be restricted in order to enable replacement playing fields?

Whilst we understand the site will at some point need to be developed, we do have material concerns in relation to the design codes in particular and would be grateful if further clarity could be provided in this respect. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 7

Comments	At the time of submitting these comments, the public appeal portal does not provide access to the plans, grounds of appeal, statement of case, design documents or other materials necessary for interested parties to understand fully the development proposal and the case being advanced on appeal. It is unrealistic to adhere to your date of 3rd June 2026 in these circumstances. We have therefore been unable to make fully informed representations. We request that the Inspector take this into account and permit supplementary submissions once the relevant documents are made available. We are uncomfortable with the lack of information and transparency on the portal and also unconvinced with the suggestion that residents have been given all the information needed to make informed representations. David Quinn Glossopdale Site Residents Group. Read more
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 8

Comments	The construction of additional dwellings would place considerable pressure on local infrastructure and services. There are already significant residential developments either underway or approved within a short distance of the site , these being Old Glossop and the Dinting areas The local road network was established many decades ago and was designed to service a much smaller population The surrounding routes already experience high congestion and this will add further pressure to residential roads and streets Local schools already face capacity pressure , many children are already required to travel outside Glossop to access education There is a long standing concern regarding drainage and flooding on this site The development of housing would inevitably increase noise levels vehicle emissions air pollution ,and a main concern lost pollutin at night There is pressure on local services and amenities already for example health care including dents ,community facilities, social care , public transport and recreational facilities for both young and old .
----------	---

For these reasons I respectfully request that High Peak Borough Council refuse planning permission and view other proposed uses of the site or greatly reduce the scale of development [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 9

Comments

The Appeal Statement of case 2.16 and 2.17 provided by DCC/Carter Jonas makes it absolutely obvious that DCC has to sell the land in order to repay loans taken out to provide for the new school which was built in Hadfield, not Glossop. There can be no fair, logical argument, or sincere objections heard if there is absolutely no possible chance of DCC not winning the argument/appeal. The arguments put forward against the original application still stand. DCC or Carter Jonas have added nothing to their new appeal and as such until they address the faults in the original application the decision should remain the same.

2.16 The replacement school has been built and occupied for a number of years, and the Appellant is obliged to reimburse the Department for Education for the loan used to fund the replacement school. The proceeds from the sale of the Site are ringfenced to repay this loan, and the Secretary of State approval for disposal of the appeal site is subject to the same requirement for the capital receipt to be used for funding the replacement school.

2.17 Evidence is provided as Appendix F to show that it is an essential funding requirement to use the capital receipts from the sale of the Site to repay the loan used to forward fund the replacement school.

David Quinn [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 10

Comments

This area is home to various species of animals which are regularly spotted on the site. This includes owls and bats amongst various other birds. Have relevant wildlife surveys been carried out and are the reports available to view? The central area of the site regularly floods and for the majority of the year this creates a natural pond which is rife with wildlife. There will undoubtedly be large numbers of animals displaced. With the large number of other local green spaces that have already been built on, plus other ongoing proposals, these animals will simply have

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 11

Comments

Design: Design Parameters are an area of concern – we need a DESIGN CODE. There is insufficient information to make any judgement on this scheme. We have requested a design code from Carter Jonas.

Height: The new revised plans do state NO higher than 2 storey properties on the development – Please can this be stated as a CONDITION and not just small print on a plan? We share the views of Nigel & Susan Sowerbutts detailed in the Public comments last year:

What is the potential height of proposed dwellings and in particular the ‘Feature Buildings’ and corner turners. Notoriously, such properties tend to be of an increased height and an alternative design, so as to create a ‘sense of place’. I would comment that generally what results is, actually, a building that stands at odds with the neighbouring properties and appears at odds with the character of the area.

As part of the parameters of the outline application, we respectfully request that dwelling heights are limited to 2 storeys. This would ensure the development accords with Local Plan policy EQ6.

We would also ask that the corner turners that are currently shown are removed and these are shown instead as single straightline blocks of built form. They have the potential to bring built form unacceptably close to existing dwellings and would result in overlooking and a sense of overdevelopment, they would have the effect of overshadowing neighbouring properties. Corner turner plots are not a feature in this locality and do not follow local vernacular, as such they should not be included, even at this Outline stage.

Given the Perimeter Plan has changed and net development area and where it borders – particularly with Talbot Rd – It is important that the revised plans are shared with all relevant detail.

In relation to the subject of height we feel that any loss of vista from Talbot Rd would be extremely detrimental to the local area and not just for immediate local residents but all Glossop residents. Talbot Rd is one of the only avenues across the town that provides a vista of surrounding hills therefore we feel this is a valuable town amenity and adds to the quality of the town for all Glossop residents. This was mentioned by councillor McKeown at appeal when he stated how he enjoys walking across to the Howard Park Baths.

Megan Atkinson in her HPBC Conservation comments also noted in her Assessment & Impact statement of 4 June 2025 important points that should be considered around soft landscaping along the northern edge of the development to maintain the verdant character and appearance of Howard Park Conservation Area which abuts this part of the development.

With the demolition of the college, this has inadvertently better revealed some wider views of the bell tower of the library (Grade II) to the south with a pleasing backdrop of the Peak District. It would be

suggested that consideration is given to creating a view of this looking south when designing the proposed layout as this would better reveal and enhance the designed prominence of this Listed Building (par.210 of NPPF).'

This naturally links in to comments above regarding height and we welcome the change to 2 stories properties. But again can this be a CONDITION?

Following on, in relation to street pattern, we again reiterate neighbours comments regarding terms of design parameters:

In order to reflect the street pattern of the surrounding area, density should actually decrease the further north one travels through the development site. Street patterns in the locality are fairly rigid and formal with high density closer to the town centre, i.e. in the south Travelling northwards, in particular along Fauvel Rd and Talbot Rd the street pattern is linear, single sided with spacious plots, the same should be reflected in any new development.

Equally it is important to acknowledge that the site sits between two Conservation Areas therefore design and material palette will be important details to consider, consult on and get right.

High Peak Conservation Officer, Megan Atkinson, has submitted comments on this and I hope Carter Jonas and others listen to these.

Density

In the March Case Report, Carter Jonas address reason 2 for refusal in Section 7 and have notably reduced the houses from 110 to 100 and if this can be confirmed as the new cap and not open to increase at a later date – this would also add peace of mind. PLEASE CAN THIS BECOME A CONDITION and not have potential to increase but be the maximum cap?

Point 7.5 of the same report is concerning as a Talbot Road resident – they have increased the net development area (NDA) slightly and moved it slightly East and taken it to the boundary edge of the Talbot Road entrance and to the east of the entrance – directly opposite The Firs & The Beeches – this is a very conflicting drawing on the Revised Site Plan as the Net Development Area overlaps with Green at the above mentioned boundary to Talbot Road – what exactly is this? Road, hard standing or landscaping – there are trees in existence there now which we would hope would be retained? Or does it denote actual properties – this is when lack of information is a problem and creates anxiety for residents. Again, we need more detail, latest drawings & DESIGN CODE.

Drainage

Just a comment – we are concerned for our neighbours and in general, we do not want a white elephant scheme similar to the one on Gamesley. What assurances are being made for this and DUE DILIGENCE being carried out to ensure that the Drainage does not fail this plan? Again, Nigel & Susan Sowerbutts made comments on this which should be noted and other residents have significant knowledge which I am sure they will publish too and could assist those who need to complete the Due Diligence.

DCC Flood Risk Management Team submitted Conditions that should be met with regard to the above on 28 August 2025 and we ask for these conditions to be met. The last thing we want is lack of DUE DILIGENCE on this site leading to detrimental damage to

existing residents and risking the stability of the new development – as was the case with the Gamesley Development which had to be demolished and re started and still is not complete!

Traffic

We are concerned – what’s the plan? Currently we can have serious queues at junction of Woodhead Rd and Norfolk St/Talbot Rd & Fauvel Rd Junction.

Admittedly this residential development does offer close proximity to the town so it is likely the residents in this location would have less need to drive their cars if able to walk to work, the train, or bus stop and school. However, undoubtedly there will be commuters and heavier traffic at school run times causing congestion.

Parking on Talbot Rd?

Will the development be low density enough to provide sufficient car spaces – at least 2 per property, to limit the necessity for residents to find street parking around the perimeter of the development – the existing residents parking on the surrounding roads already causes congestion – there must be sufficient vehicle accommodation on the site – again, would like to see this as a **CONDITION**. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 12

Comments

RE. PLANNING APPLICATION HPK/2024/0481
GLOSSOPDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE LOWER SITE. TALBOT ROAD GLOSSOP
We wish to register our concern over the appeal against the refusal of Planning Permission for the above site.
Having knowledge of the site since 1944 when No 16 Fauvel Rd belonged to my Grandparents [who had the house built new in 1928], I am aware of the frequent flooding and waterlogging of this whole area especially the fact that when the then Glossop Grammar School was proposed in the mid-1950s the authority was told about the state of the ground. Many of the residents at that time stated that it flooded.
I have the original geologists’ report on the land that states the requirement for massive amounts of drainage and that it was still subject to flooding from above Talbot Road, apart from within the site.
Despite any drainage work undertaken for the building of the school site the whole area was always prone to flooding from outside the site to the north and to the east.
There are seemingly still unmapped large drains from before the early 1860’s installed by the then landowner, Lord Howard ,and until the school closed water from above the site was still running straight through the buildings and out to the playing fields. The 1950’s Redgra area collects rainfall, and this creates standing water particularly in the south of the site and this runs into Spire Hollin properties. The Redgra area was installed due to the waterlogged grass football fields the school used on the site prior to the new build1959 school.
The whole site, when it was nothing but fields prior to 1860, was

drained from the east and eventually exited through Lord Howard's Estate Offices [Spire Hollin House] and still does although, since 1924 it has been private property.

Those drains now carry far more water than before the housing was built in the 1920's and 1930's and some sections remain, and have become broken catchment areas. No 28 Fauvel Road has a huge pipe that was unmapped and unknown to the householder until it flooded recently and has cost a great deal of money and inconvenience. That water comes from the fields on the opposite side of Fauvel Road and under the road surface to the site in question. Any construction work on the site would have the immediate problem of flooding which will then further affect existing properties surrounding the site.

Having lived in Nos 12 and 22 Fauvel Road and had family in Nos 14 and 16, I have seen flooding at all those properties over the past 79 years.

The permission for the development of the site was previously refused and the reasons for that refusal do not seem to have been addressed in this appeal, particularly with respect to the loss of playing field land. Glossop is already an area struggling to cope with an increased population and this has a detrimental effect on traffic, amenities and facilities.

Talbot road is used by many people to avoid traffic congestion in the centre of Glossop and increased traffic from this site will be bound to create hazards. In addition to residents' vehicles, entering and leaving the site during the day, delivery vehicles will only increase the problem. Presumably 100 plus households will include many children – where are the schools that will be able to accept this increase in numbers?

On the only plan that we have seen, many of the proposed houses were very close to existing properties' rear boundaries – and many of these were 2 storey properties – that would impinge on the privacy of the houses already there.

Very limited information has been made available to local residents on the style of housing – whether it is in keeping with the surrounding houses -and the density and height of the housing. This has increased our concern over what will be built on the site.

We feel that Glossop needs more facilities for the people of the area, and that this site could be put to much better use. Recreational and sports facilities, medical centres, suitable accommodation for the elderly – thus freeing up housing for families, even another school is what is needed more than just houses.

We hope you take account of our concerns over the proposed development.

Mike and Mari Brown,

 [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 13

Comments

I am a resident living directly adjacent to the site and therefore one of the most affected by the proposed development. I accept that housing on this site is now likely, and I am not objecting to the

principle of residential use. My comments relate to ensuring that any development is kept to the scale applied for, is in keeping with the established character of the area, and does not harm the amenity of existing residents.

My points are directly linked to the reasons High Peak Borough Council gave when refusing the application, which remain unresolved in the appeal.

1. Refusal Reason 1 – Loss of playing fields (Sport England objection)

HPBC refused the application because the proposal would result in the loss of playing field land, and the applicant failed to demonstrate compliance with Sport England's Playing Fields Policy. The refusal states:

"Insufficient information... to demonstrate how the development would accord with policy exception 4 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy."

Sport England has confirmed in writing that they will not be attending the inquiry and have not withdrawn their objection. No new evidence has been submitted to address this issue.

This reinforces the need for strict control over the scale and layout of any development so that the loss of open space is not compounded by an overly dense or poorly designed scheme.

2. Refusal Reason 2 – Failure to demonstrate high quality design or acceptable amenity

HPBC also refused the application because:

"Insufficient information has been provided... to demonstrate how it can achieve both high quality design and acceptable amenity standards... for up to 110 dwellings."

This is directly relevant to my concerns.

My amenity based requests (fully aligned with this refusal reason):

- The number of dwellings must not exceed "up to 110". The applicant has not demonstrated that even 110 can be delivered without harming amenity. Any increase would worsen this.
- Homes must not be built up to the boundary. The indicative plan shows houses extremely close to existing gardens, particularly on Fauvel Road, where the total separation appears to be around 25m, including both gardens. This would cause overlooking, loss of privacy, and an overbearing relationship, contrary to Local Plan policies S1, S5, H1, H2 and EQ6.
- Meaningful landscape buffers must be secured. The Carter Jonas leaflet refers to "strong landscape buffers", but these are not shown consistently around the perimeter. A continuous planted buffer is essential to protect existing residents.
- Materials and design must reflect the character of the area. Surrounding streets are characterised by stone and Accrington brick, traditional rooflines, and generous spacing. No evidence has been provided to show that the proposed development will respect this. These issues go to the heart of the Council's refusal and remain unaddressed.

3. Refusal Reason 3 – Unsustainable and contrary to the NPPF

HPBC concluded that the proposal was:

"Unsustainable and does not conform with the provisions of the

National Planning Policy Framework.”

A key reason for this is that all matters except access are reserved, meaning the final layout, heights, materials, and boundary treatments could change significantly.

To avoid an unsustainable or harmful scheme emerging at reserved matters stage, I request that the Inspector imposes clear, enforceable conditions, including:

- Maximum of 110 dwellings
- Minimum separation distances to prevent overlooking
- Height limits on perimeter plots
- A design code requiring materials sympathetic to the area
- A continuous landscape buffer around the site
- Retention of existing mature trees and a long term management plan

These conditions are necessary to ensure the development is sustainable and policy compliant.

I am not opposing housing on this site. I am simply asking that any development:

- does not exceed the scale applied for,
- respects the character of this historic and attractive area, and
- protects the privacy and amenity of existing residents.

These requests are reasonable, proportionate, and directly linked to the unresolved refusal reasons already identified by High Peak Borough Council. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 14

Comments

My objections are described in the attached document "Objections to Appeal Statement of Case.pdf", with supporting evidence and context in the attached "Flood Report.pdf". [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

[Flood Report Redacted.pdf \(/published-document/6b4bb975-1927-4650-8edf-198c6d935e40\)](#)
[Objections to Appeal Statement of Case - Redacted..pdf \(/published-document/3df39715-af28-423a-9eb6-b692cede630b\)](#)

Interested party 15

Comments

Please accept this as a public comment on the consultation for the Glossopdale Community College site on

Talbot Road.

I reside at 60, North Road.

My comments echo that of my partner.

The gardens along North Road routinely become marshy and flooded during high rainfall periods, with

significant amounts of water flowing off the former college site. I fear that this will be exacerbated by

development on the site as removal of vegetation for replacement by asphalt and grass will diminish the

absorption of the surface water. The recently disseminated flood plan from Carter Jonas only highlights this

risk, showing flood areas around the border of, and stretching across, the site. From the windows overlooking

the site, we can see that the site is routinely flooded whenever there is more than a light shower. The only

reason, I suspect that it isn't being used for local children and young people to play football, rather than as a

site for local dog walkers, is that it is marsh. There may be a significant risk, like at the site at Gamesley, and

the site at Dinting Arches, that houses built would either sink, or lead to surrounding houses being flooded.

I also have to note that local roads and North Road in particular are routinely adversely affected by breaks in,

and damage to, the aging Victorian water infrastructure of the town. It is increasingly common that our water

supply disappears, or the road becomes a river tributary when some problem with the pipes emerges, as was

seen only last week (Wednesday 26th May, 2026). It seems unlikely that this infrastructure will support

additional demands that the development will place upon it.

North Road is, in addition, increasingly serving as a bypass route for traffic, and at peak times becomes

unsustainably busy, causing frustration to both the road users and the local residents. This is only made worse

by the sheer number of parked vehicles which cause obstructions. This can only get worse with the addition of

100+ households' motor vehicles to the local roads, many of whom will have to be commuting to Manchester

or Sheffield, rather than working in Glossop itself.

It seems terribly sad that, when there are numerous housing developments across Glossop at the moment,

adding several hundreds of houses to the town and surrounding areas, that this represents both a loss of a

green area which is conducive to the health and wellbeing of local residents. At best, it seems, this could be properly and well used to create leisure space for the local community. Playing fields, or play equipment, for example, perhaps combined with the planting of trees to promote soil stability and reduce the flooding element.

Yours sincerely,

Sharon Youngson-Baines [Read more](#)

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 16

Comments

I live on North Road.

The gardens along North Road routinely become marshy and flooded during high rainfall periods, with significant amounts of water flowing off the former college site. I fear that this will be exacerbated by development on the site as removal of vegetation for replacement by asphalt and grass will diminish the absorption of the surface water.

The recently disseminated flood plan from Carter Jonas only highlights this risk, showing flood areas around the border of, and stretching across, the site. From the windows overlooking the site, we can see that the site is routinely flooded whenever there is more than a light shower. The only reason, I suspect that it isn't being used for local children and young people to play football, rather than as a site for local dog walkers, is that it is marsh. There may be a significant risk, like at the site at Gamesley, and the site at Dinting Arches, that houses built would either sink, or lead to surrounding houses being flooded.

I also have to note that local roads and North Road in particular are routinely adversely affected by breaks in, and damage to, the aging Victorian water infrastructure of the town. It is increasingly common that our water supply disappears, or the road becomes a river tributary when some problem with the pipes emerges, as was seen only last week (Wednesday 26th May, 2026). It seems unlikely that this infrastructure will support additional demands that the development will place upon it.

North Road is, in addition, increasingly serving as a bypass route for traffic, and at peak times becomes unsustainably busy, causing frustration to both the road users and the local residents. This is only made worse by the sheer number of parked vehicles which cause obstructions. This can only get worse with the addition of 100+ households' motor vehicles to the local roads, many of whom will have to be commuting to Manchester or

Sheffield, rather than working in Glossop itself.

It seems terribly sad that, when there are numerous housing developments across Glossop at the moment, adding several hundreds of houses to the town and surrounding areas, that this represents both a loss of a green area which is conducive to the health and wellbeing of local residents. At best, it seems, this could be properly and well used to create leisure space for the local community. Playing fields, or play equipment, for example, perhaps combined with the planting of trees to promote soil stability and reduce the flooding risk. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 17

Comments

I OBJECT to the Appeal Statement of Case document. I wish to OBJECT to the aforementioned application on the grounds of:

1. Currency of document
2. Damage and flood risk
3. Loss of playing field land
4. Insufficient detail to demonstrate high quality design and acceptable amenity standards

Currency of Document

The document is not current and does not reflect the considerable housing developments in the area. Moreover, it does not embrace the developments that have been approved and not yet developed since the document was published. Strategic infrastructure and delivery of necessary, health, education and community facilities are already impacted detrimentally by these developments.

Drainage and Flood Risk

The Carter Jonas Map of Flooding Area on the site is concerning as my property is situated at the site's lowest point. The land slopes and was the site of a former lake. The background to the issues of flooding here are well rehearsed and supported by a plethora of compelling evidence gathered from Fauvel Road, North Road and Spire Hollin residents. These issues have been reported on numerous occasion to Engineering, Procurement and Environmental Officers at Derbyshire County Council who have been unsuccessful in addressing and resolving the issues over the last four decades. Concreting and tarmacing over large area of the site will increase the water flow rate due to the reduced absorption and retention capabilities of the ground. The absence of adequate draining assessment within the application and the intensification of use by the development will exacerbate existing pressure on the local draining network.

Loss of Playing Field Land

Insufficient information has been provided which clearly demonstrates how the development accords with policy exception 4 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy in relation to the provision of specific details of the replacement playing field. Accordingly the

proposal would not accord with policies S1, S5, H1 and CF4 of the Adopted Local Plan, the exceptions of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy or paragraph 104 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Insufficient Detail Provided to Demonstrate High Quality Design and Acceptable Amenity Standards

The applicant has not amended the proposal to address the above point. Accordingly, the proposal would not constitute a sustainable form of development contrary to policies S1, S5, H1, H2 and EQ6 of the Adopted Local Plan, the High Peak Design Guidance 2018 and Residential Guidance 2005 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Thankyou for the opportunity to share my views. I would be grateful if my objections are taken into consideration when deciding this appeal.

Dr Beverley Carter [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 18

Comments

I object to the appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the following reasons, including possible damage to our property.

We have no information on exactly what would be built on the site e.g. the design of the buildings, height, materials used, and how close they would be to the existing homes around the perimeter.

Will there be a SUDS area, how large will it be, and will it have the capacity to cope with the extra drainage into an already marshy area? The school buildings were restricted to the higher-lying land adjacent to Talbot Road. The land downhill from there, towards Spire Hollin and Fauvel Road, was used as playing fields. It has never been built on and frequently floods, overflowing into the neighbouring gardens. I am concerned that the extra run-off from any development will make the flooding worse and cause damage to our property.

I therefore support the refusal of planning permission for this site.
[Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 19

Comments

I am concerned about the planning proposal for the Glossopdale School site for a number of reasons, namely:

- a lack of clear and concise detail within the planning proposal, that provides clarity on areas including specifics on proposed building numbers, height, parking, locations etc, which I believe does not fulfil the legal requirements of the planning process

- the area is designated playing fields, therefore to build housing on this site would go against its agreed designation which is not in line with the legal requirements for the application

- access concerns relating to both the build and the resulting homes - there is a lack of detail in the plans, but also a lack of access that would cause serious traffic and road issues for local residents
- the area is currently home to a wide range of birds and animals, including owls and bats, and the destruction of this site would seriously destroy the natural environment and habitat - this includes a large natural pond with nesting birds each year
- there are already huge issues for local residents in the wider area regarding traffic, parking, access to dentists / doctors / schools, and there is no additional infrastructure being put in place to resolve this despite the additional (and many) houses already being built [Read more](#)

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 20

Comments	Subject: Concerns Regarding Proposed Development at Talbot Road, Glossop Dear I am writing in response to the ongoing appeal concerning the proposed development at Talbot Road, Glossop. As a resident of 18A Spire Hollin, located at the southern edge of the proposed site, I have several concerns and observations regarding the plan. While the initial plan appeared to be thoughtfully designed, it lacks details on the types of properties being proposed and the number of units proposed has 3 variations. The significant elevation change from the Talbot Road entrance to the lowest point of the site nearest Spire Hollin raises concerns about privacy. If the new properties are similar to typical new estates which usually are townhouses- releasing the highest yield from the smallest footprint, this could compromise the privacy of existing homes at lower elevations, including mine. I have actively sought to maintain privacy by proposing to DCC on a numerous occasions that I wanted to purchase a strip of land across the rear of my property and have indications that other residents would be interested in this as well in the name of privacy. When we moved into Spire Hollin, we were informed by the DCC of a French drain running across the rear of 18 Spire Hollin, which manages natural water runoff from the Talbot Road site. This drain feeds into a system that passes diagonally beneath 18A and into a sump and pumping system on the property of number 20 (where the pipes diameter reduces significantly), eventually connecting to the sewer system on Spire Hollin. This drainage system has proven inadequate during heavy or prolonged rainfall, and with the development reducing the site's natural water absorption capacity, there is a risk of increased stress on this already substandard system. This could potentially cause damage to properties at 18, 18A, and 20 Spire Hollin. Therefore, a separate proposal to address this issue should be considered- It has been raised at every opportunity, with no satisfactory answer in place as to how this will be mitigated.
----------	--

Another major concern is the infrastructure in Glossop, particularly the capacity of local schools. Using ONS data, 100 new family homes could introduce approximately 200 additional children needing school placements.

The existing local school facilities, including the former dual-site school you are developing, were already insufficient before the previous development on North/Cemetery Road and now the new Dinting Vale, and the proposal on Dinting Road will exacerbate the situation, and whilst any surveys quoted or referenced state that there is enough educational infrastructure in place, it is widely known in Glossop (I'm sure the LA have this documented as well) that we already have children who have not been eating at school as they didn't have the time due to the canteen being under sized for the volume of children. To remedy this the school has had to introduce a longer lunch with the last sitting going in at 13:30- How is this acceptable now, let alone with new houses being built. What is the legal standpoint of this cruelty to the children who's education will suffer as a result of it. This site would be better purposed for the replacement and expansion of a new school to address all of these issues, and the fact that the original planning was so poor, there should be someone held accountable for the number(s) that the school got built to accommodate! Glossop pupils are being sent to distant schools, such as those in New Mills (9.5 miles away) and Chapel-en-le-Frith (12 miles away). What plans are in place to accommodate this influx of students?

Moreover, the national shortage of Dental/Doctor practices is a pressing issue. Building new homes without addressing this problem will only worsen the situation, contributing to the ongoing crisis in Glossop. I am currently waiting 4 weeks to get my appointment at my doctors surgery, and have to take my daughter to a dental practice in the Hope Valley.

The local road network is another significant concern. Commuters frequently describe it as inadequate and not fit for purpose. The planned bypass, which seems to be a minor improvement at best, will likely concentrate traffic further into Glossop. The additional 200+ cars from the proposed development and the associated increase in delivery vehicles will exacerbate an already failing system. What measures will be taken to manage this increased traffic burden once the development is complete and the developers have moved on? The Talbot road/Fauval Road/ Woodhead road junction is already chaos- how will this be mitigated?

Your points on "Appeal Statement of Case"

2.10- The cemetery road playing fields are over subscribed already.

5.3b- There is a fantastic case to build a new educational facility there- You refuse to accept that there is a problem.

5.3.3d- The New school site might be newer, but it is certainly not "better or equivalent" in terms of child welfare and as proven is not big enough now, before additional students.

6.32- The new school has been plagued by problems since opening. Before repayments are made, should there not be an audit to determine if it is fit for purpose ? DCC and National government should be held accountable for the planning and building as well as securing the 'best value when disposing' of the former school site.

7.3- A firm number is needed of the housing types, and split.

7.11- Communication is and has been lacking since the start of the process. Residents are only able to object and have opinions what information is presented.

7.22 HPK/2024/0496 and HPK/2025/0427 planning applications I assume are being used to show that previous applications have gone through with minimal details.
I don't see the relevance of this as these were only for a small number of dwellings (5 and up to 9) not 100 as projected with this proposal. There's a significant number of older historical properties in the area and I'd like to know the conditions on materials to be used and types of properties before committing one way or the other- How can planning let this pass through without this in place. Transparency is the best practice, not hiding it away. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 21

Comments

This proposed application should not go ahead and be rejected for a number of reasons. Firstly, based on the recommendations from Sports England, approving this application will result in the loss of the playing field which will have a damaging impact on local residents. There is a considerable link between mental wellbeing and exercise and this proposed development will significantly impact Glossop's wellbeing. Many residents used the space recreationally for sports and fitness and should this be reopened for public use, many residents including myself would benefit from this both mentally and physically.

Secondly, due to the limited information submitted, there isn't enough evidence to demonstrate this application supports the local plan. The application notes up to 110 houses which would massively overdevelop this site. There is minimal information regarding the quality and size of the properties. Glossop's demographics shows it has a slightly older population than the national average, the proposed development gives no indication of catering or supporting these residents and instead looks to promote the interests of others outside of Glossop.

Notably, the flood assessment does highlight the medium/ high risk of pluvial flooding. As we have seen elsewhere in Glossop, this can cause significant distress and affects on residents when due to new developments springs and water ways over fill causing roads to become impassible and shut whilst urgent works have to be undertaken. This has never been more evident than in the last week due to overdevelopment in the region Talbot Road's mains burst causing huge disruption. Any new pressure and thus development should not impact current residents way of life as will inevitably happen.

Finally, but greatly considerable, the overwhelming traffic burden in and around this site can easily mean one trip out of Glossop can take over 30 minutes just to get out of the town. The risk to the road conditions are getting increasingly worse with numerous developments and increased road usage in the area. Services such as mental health support and emergency medical support is non existent. If we want doctor or dentist appointments, they just don't

exist resulting in many having to go out of area for these basic necessities. For these many reasons, I kindly ask the inspector to consider the already stretched services and thus burden on peoples lives, and request them to consider the damaging effect this development will have. There is a population of approximately 33,000, is a development of up to 110 houses worth severely impacting the quality of life of 33,000 people? [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 22

Comments

I do NOT support this appeal against the local authority's planning decision.

There has been a continued absence of real information in relation to the plans of what is to be built - no heights, design codes, material specifications, promises of the houses being in keeping with the area.

When the outline planning was submitted we corresponded with the developer and asked questions and raised our concerns. We were promised a response but to date we have heard nothing at all.

We have issues with drainage already and the new site being developed will only serve to make this worse and our next door neighbours (20 Spire Hollin) will only suffer even more.

Our local infrastructure is already suffering and is over capacity. No one can get doctors or dentist appointments in a timely manner (my elderly parents often wait weeks and this has resulted in a few hospital stays due to symptoms/illnesses worsening whilst waiting) the traffic is horrendous and getting to hospital appointments and out of Glossop is a full day trip at times, this will only be made worse by more cars and people flooding our town.

Our schools are overrun and where the statistics come from on this is beyond me. Glossop secondary school age children are fighting for places and many are sent to New Mills & Chapel schools. The 'new' Glossopdale site is still not fit for purpose despite all the money overspent on it - why this was not thought out before the demolition on Talbot Rd I have no idea. Lunch times at Glossopdale are a child welfare issue with numerous children not eating at school due to the time it takes to queue for lunch and there being next to nothing left for the later lunch times. the last lunch sitting being 13:30 - 14:00 when school finishes at 15:10 so they are barely back into lessons before it is home time!

There are various developments already approved and ongoing in the Glossop area so we are yet to see the impact of these - so if we are already experiencing issues this is only set to get worse.

Turning to the Carter Jonas appeal statement of case that has been submitted:

2.10 - the Community Club on Cemetery Road is not for the public

and school access has to be approved. This is over subscribed already and this could not cope with additional children. The Community Club is a wonderful facility but only offers football so for the children who are not interested in football this does not offer them any facility outside of the schools.

5.3b - why is there no realistic prospect of the former educational used resuming. There are other local schools or independent facilities that may be able to take over the site and use as a facility.

5.3d - the new provision is neither equivalent or better!

6.5b - where is the proposal for the replacement that will be equivalent or better?

7.3 - can we have clarification as to the number of houses that are actually being proposed? I have seen numerous number quoted.

7.11 - we have not been reconsulted? So the 'voluntary' reconsultation has not taken place - this is especially disappointing due to the lack of response to our original enquiries and this would have shown good faith on the behalf of the developer. Derbyshire Council seem to have passed this over to the developer so that blame can be diverted.

7.22 - both of these refer to much smaller developments so these seen irrelevant

8.11 - the under delivery I would suggest is due to unrealistic targets being set - ones that the Glossop infrastructure simply cannot support.

I would be interested to see the 2025/26 figure given that we currently have numerous housing developments ongoing and also some more already approved. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 23

Comments	I do not support the appeal against this planning decision. All my objections against the application remain. Namely: Traffic. The huge increase of vehicles from the proposed development would increase the risk of accidents at the poorly sighted junction of Talbot Road and North Road and also the complex junction of Talbot Road, Fauvel Road and Woodhead Road. Flood Risk: The site of the development includes the course of a stream and has always presented drainage issues. Impact of Appearance: The development is sited between two conservation areas and the proposed housing would not be in keeping with those areas. Loss of Privacy: Proposed housing would overlook surrounding
----------	--

properties with a resultant loss of privacy.

Local services: There is currently not capacity at local GPs, Dentists and Schools to absorb the massive number of new residents.

Loss of opportunity: This large council owned site close to the town centre would be the ideal location for a much needed new leisure centre with space for all weather pitches and adequate parking. There is no need to make a hasty decision and use the site for housing. A new leisure centre would be of benefit and improve the health of all residents in Glossop. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 24

Comments

Whilst we accept the principle of residential development at the Former Glossopdale School site, we would like to make the following comments on the outline residential application.

Our concerns match those of Nigel & Susan Sowerbutts that you will find online in detail relating to robust genuine planning matters – namely:

- Scale of Development – we support the cap of development at 100 units but ask for the security of this being written in the Description of Development and ask the Inspector to insist on this.
- Design Parameters – A Design Code has not been provided.

Height - It is muted on the revised parameter plan that the maximum height will be restricted to 2 storeys – again we would welcome this by condition, if this appeal is allowed.

Character of the area – Feature Buildings and Corner turners often stand out negatively and disrupts an area’s character – we are in the Peak District and this site is nestled between 2 conservation areas with an uninterrupted vista along the road from which the town’s resident’s benefit on foot and by road. We should encourage the protection and enhancement of this historic part of Glossop – once it has gone it will be gone forever and this would be devastating!

Site Access – With all matters reserved except for access on the outline plan, it is concerning that the Access has changed since the public consultation leaflet was issued prior to August 2024 and does not match with the statement in Adrian Martin’s DCC letter of 17 February 2025. Clarity is needed on exactly what the rationale for changing them is, what each one is for – i.e. an emergency vehicle access point was given previously, and this is no longer indicated. Some Transparency and explanation as to these matters is paramount in order for us to be able to understand and comment.

Net Development Area – this has increased and moved to the East – Why? How can NDA overlap green buffer? The NDA indicated as the main entrance boundary makes sense in that it must represent road – but what is the NEW NDA overlapping the green buffer and existing trees, directly in line with The Beeches bungalow drive? Is this an emergency vehicle exit or is it building? The existing school entrance sited opposite high hedgerow between The Firs & The Beeches has now been removed on the new plan and this NDA in a road shaped design has been moved to the right of it (in front of said driveway) – it is imperative that this is made clear and sufficient information

provided to residents.

We strongly agree that a Design Code should be prepared and the parameter plan amended as noted above and condition that this should be submitted and approved before any advance of a Reserved Matters application so that sufficient guidance is set to control the Reserved Matters application down the line and to enable the stronger chance of delivering a development that is relevant and appropriate to this historic part of town. Again, support the wording given in the Sowerbutts comments for the Conditions referenced above.

- Drainage – Also we support neighbours extensive comments on the level of work required in preparation for any development on this site.

- Sports Field – we welcome Sports England's comments and note that the loss of playing fields has not been demonstrated. The school served the community during school for pupils but outside of school hours for residents and given the drive we should have for our community's wellbeing, fitness and mental health we should be factoring in replacement sports/recreational areas, like Shirebrook Park and Simmondley and other residential developments have. There is mention of an aspiration in the Carter Jonas report for pedestrian access to Fauvel Road so that the recreational area maybe reached more easily – if the future of this land on Fauvel Road can be secured for recreational use as a condition, this would be great given that it has historically been afforded to the locals for the use of recreation and consistently used by it's neighbours for: Dog walking, Bike Riding for young kids learning how to ride and having a safe area to play, football – residents have mowed the area themselves and put football nets on and had matches, rugby training, cadets training etc.etc. It would become an even more important piece of recreational ground and serve the new residents if the appeal for 100 dwellings is won.

Finally, whilst I know we are asked to refrain from anecdotal points but I have also heard Ben Haywood is interested in hearing some. Like all the Residents, I personally would like to see more amenities & services provided in the town, but NOT at this site specifically – but preferably on sites within the town centre that can be repurposed and renovated or on brownfield sites that are linked to existing commercial/retail/business – e.g. on the sites neighbouring Tesco and like the leisure facilities popping up in places like Woolley Bridge (new Padel Facility) – not sited in a landlock of existing traditional residential homes sandwiched between 2 conservation areas with traffic issues in the direction of Aldi & Lidl already and creating a prospect of a constant flow of traffic in the opposite direction also, to reach amenities that can only be accessed on one of the four roads surrounding it – potentially for daily hours extending beyond normal town centre times and bringing a commercial environment to the heart of a quiet residential community and sanctuary.

Given that I believe there are circa 7 Housing Developments in planning/progress across the town currently, it seems short-sighted that these can continue to function and go ahead without the need to cross reference each other, add up the cumulative impact of the increased head count and therefore calculate required nursery, junior school, senior school, dentist, and doctor places etc. to ensure that infrastructure and amenity needs are considered in conjunction, and where these additional facility requirements and traffic solutions may need to be implemented.

I am concerned that in the 8 years that this particular application has drifted, there have been many more developments drawn up and

commenced. If we are not careful and thoughtful, this beautiful historic site surrounded by an eclectic mix of houses of varying ages, with generously spaced roads and gardens, Howard Park to the west side with Rueben's Retreat & the Victorian Baths (Conservation Area) and our coveted Cricket Club, Library and Church to the south and the Bandstand, Village Green/playing fields and Old Glossop (another Conservation Area) to the East - it will have amenities forced upon it that are traditionally Class E and would be better located in a place of, or mixed in with, other planned developments alongside other Class E locations - e.g. the site identified alongside Tesco for example - already an area of community and commercial use and that would lend itself to Leisure facilities and local services being in tandem, far more than in this Conservation sandwich filling. The type of building that are now used for leisure and medical centres and services do not fit the Design Code which is sought for this site, and it is unnecessary to give up this plot to a use that is not fitting when there are other development site options in more appropriate brownfield sites locally. It is respectfully requested that the Inspector considers these points and attaches conditions to the outline plan so that Reserved Matters addresses the points raised above. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents

[Revised Parameter Plan April 2026 LDA Design.pdf \(/published-document/3b894ff1-a5a4-4c29-a52a-256d552b98e0\)](#)
[Email to Carter Jonas on 1 June 2026 - Parameter Plan ACCESS.docx \(/published-document/42cb5c51-bcf9-424f-b823-5bbda030d243\)](#)
[Public Consultation Leatlet.pdf \(/published-document/a4998cf8-9acc-4e61-95f5-5da87d49d4b4\)](#)
[Revised Boundry LDA Design April 2026.pdf \(/published-document/d23a908a-33dc-4f7c-a8c1-64b9c7fa9fed\)](#)
[Ingham Final Residents Response.docx \(/published-document/096897d1-b182-434e-9178-b5798c789dbb\)](#)
[Highways Letter.pdf \(/published-document/f11c447f-2f94-438a-97de-e3ce5e0e85c8\)](#)

Interested party 25

Comments

- .My concerns about the development of this land are
- . Loss of privacy due to potential closeness of new buildings to existing properties
- . Availability of schools, doctors, dentist etc
- . Drainage - the land has a long history of flooding/drainage problems
- . Traffic - increasing , adding to Glossop's already crippling traffic problems.

It is difficult to express appropriate and considered comments on this development due to lack of information being provided. I believe documents which we should have access to are not available! [Read more](#)

Interested party 26

Comments	We oppose the outline plan due to a total lack of clarity and information which caused the application to be refused on 12/9/25 and no new information has been provided to date. If this land has to be developed for housing the following points should be considered by the inspector. Green infrastructure to be of adequate proportion to perimeter for all neighbouring residents with no gaps as on existing plan dated 04/03/26 these properties 16,18,20,22,36,38,40,42,44 & 46 Fauvel Rd must also have green infrastructure at their perimeter & this should not reduce the area of green infrastructure already on the plan. The development cap of 33 dwellings or less per hectare should not be increased. The planned dwellings should not exceed 6m in height at eaves level due to the topography of the site. The structure, facades and materials used should be in accordance with the surrounding properties which are of high quality and any additional dwellings should be of similar quality and consideration for existing properties should be taken into account. Many properties in this area have suffered with flooding/drainage issues to their rear gardens so a site survey with regard to this and subsequent plan of action to alleviate this problem should be in place prior to commencement of any works to prevent future flooding issues as a result of this development. In summary if this land is to be developed for housing hopefully all the comments from residents affected by the development are seriously considered. Read more
----------	---

Interested party 27

Comments	We would like to make the following additional comments on the basis of the Appellant’s SOC & the updated Parameters Plan. We support the cap of development at 100 units; this must be written in to the Description of Development & we would ask the Inspector to ensure this. Another area of concern is the potential height of proposed dwellings & in particular Feature Buildings & corner turners. Should the Inspector be minded to allow the appeal we respectfully request that dwelling heights are limited to 2 storeys by condition. This would ensure the development accords with Local Plan policy EQ6. In order to reflect the street pattern of the surrounding area, density should decrease the further north one travels through the development site. Street patterns in the locality are fairly rigid and formal with high density closer to the town centre, i.e. in the south.
----------	---

Travelling northwards, the street pattern is linear, single sided, spacious plots, the same should be reflected in any new development.

Reason for Refusal 2 relates to insufficient information being provided to demonstrate how the scheme can achieve both high quality design & acceptable amenity standards. This still stands. It is understood that the application was made in outline & therefore detailed design matters are to be dealt with at the RM stage, however this site is sandwiched between 2 Conservation Areas in a verdant part of Glossop, this area has not been subjected to large scale residential development to date & as such appears as a pocket of Victorian charm in the town. The LPA has in the past sought to prepare a Development Brief for this site, whilst not adopted this does provide context & should be considered as a material consideration.

With regard to the revised Parameters Plan, we remain concerned & unclear why the entire extent of the site of features a green buffer between the proposed Residential Development Area (RDA) & the existing dwellings bar those on 2 sections of Fauvel Road. If a buffer & offset is relevant & applicable to the north, west and south, why is the same not required to the east? A 6m buffer is apparent between the rear of North Road properties & the edge of the RDA, but no such buffer is afforded to all Fauvel Road properties.

We request that the Parameters Plan is amended to show a green buffer, commensurate with that shown on the western boundary, is reflected along the eastern boundary. In particular the section to the rear of numbers 36-42 Fauvel Rd which have much smaller rear gardens. Ensuring that development contributes positively to the relationship with adjacent buildings, & does not result in visual intrusion, overlooking & an overbearing effect are key requirements of Local Plan policy EQ6.

If the Inspector is minded to allow the appeal, we respectfully request the Parameter Plan is amended as above & we request that a condition is attached to any such permission to require a Design Code to be prepared, submitted & approved by the LPA in advance of a RM application. This would ensure that sufficient guidance is set to control the RM application in due course & to deliver a scheme that is appropriate in this location.

A Design Code would be relevant in accordance with Local Plan policies:

- S1.
- S5 –.
- EQ6 –.

Such a condition could be worded as follows:

No application for RM shall be submitted until a comprehensive Design Code for the site has been submitted to & approved in writing by the LPA.

The Design Code shall be prepared generally in accordance with the principles set out in the Parameter Plan [Drawing Reference] & shall include details regarding:

- The layout of streets, blocks, & movement networks;
- Single-sided roads with spacious plots;
- Density to reduce to the north;
- Tree-lined roads;
- Building typologies, heights, massing, & scale parameters;
- Architectural detailing & the palette of external materials;
- Victorian Villa style elevations & roof pitches;

- Public realm, hard/soft landscaping, & boundary treatments, including buffers to surrounding dwellings;
- Parking strategies, refuse storage, & cycle integration;
- SuDS integration.

All subsequent RM applications shall be in accordance with the approved Design Code."

We remain concerned regarding drainage. The topography of the site varies significantly with an overall drop in gradient north to south. Spire Hollin sits at a lower level, during periods of heavy rainfall both North Road & Fauvel Road, act as channels for the flow of water, this water then collects & pools naturally at the lowest points. Properties & gardens on Spire Hollin are already affected by flooding due to run off from the old school grounds as well as the downhill flow previously mentioned. This will only be exacerbated by increased hardstanding areas.

This is noted on the Constraints Plan & the submitted FRA notes that Surface Water flooding risk is medium-high. It is respectfully requested that a condition is included to ensure that appropriate land drains are installed along the full extent of the eastern & western boundaries of the site with Fauvel Road & North Road to ensure that surface water can appropriately drain & avoid pooling at the bottom of gardens.

Setting these principles & parameters at this stage is good practice and ensures the RM application addresses these issues.

We support the LPA in the Reason for Refusal 1 & remain of the opinion that the appellant has not demonstrated that the loss of playing field land has been addressed via re-provision elsewhere with an alternative facility of equal or better quality. Insufficient information has been submitted with the proposal to clearly demonstrate how the development would accord with policy exception 4 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy in relation to the provision of specific details of the replacement playing field. The appellant has failed to address this reason for refusal & has not undertaken an open space or playing field assessment to justify this outright loss. The submission of an Agronomy Report as an attempt to demonstrate how difficult it would be to provide playing pitches does not equate to a playing pitch or open space assessment. The appellant has failed to consider the playing pitch needs of the Authority & has not justified the loss.

The proposal would not accord with policies S1, S5, H1 and CF4 of the Adopted Local Plan, the exceptions of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy or paragraph 104 of the NPPF.

It is respectfully requested that the Inspector dismiss the appeal for the same reasons as the LPA refused the outline planning application. There has been no material change to circumstances & the appellant has not provided any further justification for the scheme.

In the event that the Inspector is minded to allow the appeal, we respectfully request that the Parameters Plan is amended to provide a green buffer between the proposed RDA and the rear of properties on Fauvel Road, of equal proportion to that shown on the western boundary. In addition, to a condition requiring a Design Code, as set out within this submission to ensure the proposal is in accordance with Local Plan Policies S1, S5 and EQ6, the High Peak Design Guidance 2018 and Residential Guidance 2005 SPD and the NPPF.

We reserve the right as residents to attend the Planning Inquiry in due course and speak in objection to the appeal and ensure our comments are heard.

We append our full response as a supporting document. [Read more](#)

Supporting documents	Response to the Appeal.docx (/published-document/7ea4d706-f6e0-4a7b-a97a-8236509502a5)
-----------------------------	--
