

[REDACTED]

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 25 June 2026 21:40
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

[REDACTED]

Application Reference No. : HPK/2026/0079 Site Address: LAND ADJOINING CEMETERY HOUSE Cemetery Road
Glossop Derbyshire Comments by: ROBERT LEEN/a

From:

Quarry Hill
Cornhill
Aberdeenshire
BANFF
Aberdeenshire
AB45 2AS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Submission: Objection

Comments: I write in connection the retrospective planning application (HPK/2026/0079) on land adjacent to Cemetery Road, Glossop, Derbyshire. I would be grateful if the planers responsible for making a decision take into consideration my objections to it which I have listed below.

On the planning application, the question was asked ¿Has the work or change of use been completed?

If Yes, please state the date when the work or change of use was completed (date must be pre-application submission)

The response on the application is given as ¿29/09/2025¿

I disagree with this statement as work has been continuing past this date. Evidence to support this statement can be submitted which contradicts this statement in terms of date stamped photos and if the council contacted the building company responsible for the work and requested copies of work orders and purchase orders this would support my statement.

I note that in the drawings supporting the retrospective planning application they state ¿proposed hardstanding¿. The drawings are incorrect as the hardstanding has been constructed so as built plans should have been submitted not ¿proposed¿ since the hardstanding has been built. Why were the correct plans not submitted as part of the application?

Why could the owners not have submitted as built drawings as part of the applications? The drawings are clearly miss leading.

In relation to the drawings,

I note they would appear to be a disconnect between the drawings and the actual as built hard standing dimensions. I also note that there also appears to be little or no evidence of drainage in the hardstanding.

Why did the owner decide to apply for retrospective planning instead of applying for full planning permission before building. Retrospective planning is not designed to circumvent the planning process and the public's right to comment on planning matters.

In fact, the public can and do make valuable contributions to planning matters.

In relation to the hardstanding and the placement of wooden stables on them, may I enquire how the grey water produced from the stables will be removed from the hardstanding area.

There is a real risk that that unless there is adequate drainage on the hardstanding then this will result in localised flooding which has the potential to lead to subsidence and animal welfare issues if not dealt with correctly.

From the plans it is unclear how the public may access the right of way through the development (I refer to right of way access Glossop FP 111). Clearly the building work that has taken place already has restricted access to the right of way and will continue to do so if the planning approved is granted.

It was noted that the right of way Glossop FP 111 was not capable of being accessed by the public due to the construction work over the past several months.

Can the council and owners of the site guarantee access to the right of way and that users of the right of way will be allowed to use the right of way without interference from the business owners of the site even if it inconveniences them or interrupts the business from operating on the site.

There has been substantial building work on the site which also includes scraping of a large area of top soil in an area of the development which is now not accessible to the public as it is fenced off.

In relation to the use of the land, the land is classed as agricultural, on that basis it cannot be used for agricultural purposes if it's zoned off by a fence with no access for agricultural equipment.

I note with interest that the separating wall between the development and the cemetery as suffered extensive damage between visits to the cemetery.

Can the owners of the land confirm that they have no knowledge of the damage or that the damage was not caused as a result of the building work or contractors accessing the site. In terms of enclosure, it is unclear how horses will be contained in the event that they escape from their stabling area so that users of the cemetery are not affected?

In terms of the boundary wall who is responsible for the up keep of the wall ?

From an access perspective will the current owners be applying for retrospective planning permission for the road that will need to be constructed to access the development as the current track that is used to access the site does not support domestic and commercial vehicles that would be needed to access the development.

On this note, how will be the business and stables be supplied with feed and other equipment and services required to support animal welfare and how will the waste from the site be disposed of and kept prior to disposal.

There is a real risk that if animal waste is not disposed of correctly and within a reasonable time frame then this has the potential to adversely affect users of the cemetery notwithstanding any noise created by the horses during the day when funerals are taking place.

In terms of access to the site, it is unclear how vehicles will be able to access the site under the proposed plans.

The plans make no provision for any visibility splays at the proposed site entrance which would be required by drivers accessing and exiting the site as they would otherwise exist directly onto a busy road on a blind spot of the road.

Again, in relation to accessing the site from cemetery road there appears to be no provision for the disposal of surface water from the site and how this will be treated and the potential for this to lead to localised flooding at the entrance to the cemetery.

There is limited provision for surface water at the cemetery entrance currently.

In relation to the site, the plans make no provision for services.

How for example will the site be supplied with the large quantity of water required to support horses. Again, the plans make no provision for the supply of electricity to the site and the connection point to the grid to ensure electricity is supplied to the site to support the business and the horse's welfare.

There is insufficient parking at the cemetery as is, and when there are large funerals taking place mourners often park at the entrance to the cemetery. This has the potential to cause accidents at the entrance to the cemetery and access track leading to the stables.

The area sits within protected green belt land. Planning permission if granted would further erode green belt land around Glossop.

The Cemetery is a place for reflection and worship. People reflect on the loss friends and family at the cemetery in their own ways. This should be respected. There will be considerable noise generated from the stables which will severely impact people's use of the cemetery.

For the reasons outlined above, I do not believe that the interests of the public are best served by allowing retrospective planning to be granted for this application.

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>
