



Expression of Views

Application Number HPK/2026/0150

Playing Fields Fauvel Road Glossop

With regards to the covering letter from Richard Holliday of Carter Jonas dated 10th April 2026 which serves part of the above application.

The applicant describes the court as a redgra surfaced court. The court is not redgra surfaced.

The applicant describes the court surface and surrounding mesh fence as all in a poor condition and in need of replacement and refurbishment. This is just not true. The condition of the court surface is perfectly acceptable. On a small part of the court surface there is a coating of vegetation. This can easily be removed and once removed will reveal an undamaged surface beneath. The mesh fence is old but also in satisfactory condition. There is a small amount of damage to a tiny portion in the north east corner of the court. Here the top of the fence has been squashed down a little by youths climbing over it. The damage is hardly noticeable and in no way adversely affects the actual usage of the court. There are two additional access points which have been made into the court. One on the west side and a smaller one on the south side. I have lived directly opposite the court for the past 32 years and can confirm these portals have not changed in all that time. They do not adversely affect usage of the court and do not need to be altered. They are actually very useful in providing egress to retrieve balls.

The applicant states that the facilities appear to be under-utilised, seemingly either caused by or leading to the current poor state of repair. This is just not true. Living opposite the court I know full well how the court is used. The court is not under-utilised. It is used every day either by children, youths or families. The court is not in a poor state of repair. The court surface and surrounding mesh fence are in a perfectly satisfactory condition. The reason a small part of the court surface has a coating of vegetation has absolutely nothing to do with under-utilisation. It is solely down to Derbyshire County Council who used to periodically maintain the whole site and remove such vegetation from the court. For the past few years Derbyshire County Council have neglected to undertake these maintenance duties.

The applicant states the surfacing has reached the end of its functional and usable lifespan and now requires renewal to ensure the space remains safe, accessible, usable and fit for purpose. This is just not true. The surfacing has not reached the end of its functional and usable lifespan and will be able to continue to satisfy all the criteria mentioned without any need for modification.

The applicant states the fencing around the court has also deteriorated and requires replacement to restore secure and appropriate site boundaries and support active use of the court. This is just not true. I can attest the fencing has not substantially deteriorated in the 32 years I have lived opposite the court and I do not expect it will substantially deteriorate in the next 32 years. There will be no change to the active use of the court by unnecessarily replacing the fencing. It is perfectly fit for purpose as is and as previously mentioned, the additional long standing access points in the fencing are very useful for users of the court.

The applicant goes on to quote extracts from the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and the High Peak Local Plan (2016). Nothing in the extracts quoted would justify needlessly destroying a perfectly satisfactory court and replacing it with the same.

My attention though was drawn to paragraph 104 quoted from the National Planning Policy Framework. The applicant highlighted the policy that existing open, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be built on unless it meets one of the listed criteria, which includes the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location. I can only conclude that the true motive behind the planning application to renew the court is in some way to tick a box regarding the massive development proposed on the former Glossopdale Community College Lower Site. I would be very disappointed if Derbyshire County Council colluded in such an underhand exercise. The court on Fauvel Road already exists and is fit for purpose. It would be very ingenious to suggest any sporting facilities lost on the former Glossopdale Community College Lower Site was actually being replaced by the token exercise of unnecessarily rebuilding a court that already exists.

The applicant has repeatedly exaggerated the current state and usage of the court and I do not believe the assertion from the applicant that the overall appearance of the new court would remain largely unchanged. The court is part of a much appreciated site which the local community have always used for leisure. The site has majestic trees and is a natural oasis. It blends in beautifully with the character and heritage of the area. The court itself is wonderfully camouflaged by trees. So much so that you wouldn't know it was there. A replacement court with new fencing would stick out like a sore thumb.

I object to the application on grounds of policies and guidance. In no way does the unnecessary rebuilding of the court satisfy paragraph 104 of the National Planning Policy Framework. I also object to the application on grounds of design and visual impact. A replacement court with new fencing would have a negative impact on the aesthetics of the site.

One final comment I would make concerns the measures taken by Derbyshire County Council to notify the public of the planning application. Initially Derbyshire County Council only wrote to a small number of residents who live adjacent to the court. No public notices were displayed. The outcome of the planning application would be of interest to far more residents of Glossop than the small number living in the immediate vicinity of the court. Also a stipulation within the letter of notification I received stated that I had 21 days from the date on the letter to express my views. I found this rather galling as I did not receive my copy of this letter until 10 days after the date on the letter.

Eventually a single public notice was tied to a lamp post at the very top of Fauvel Road. The date on this notice was 14th July 2026 and I saw on the Derbyshire County Council website that the closing date for consultation had been adjusted to 21 days after this date. For information, residents who actively use the site gain access through one of five entrances (two on Fauvel Road, two on Norfolk Street and one on Lord Street). Residents using those entrances would be oblivious to a public notice at the very top of Fauvel Road. As a consultation on a planning application it should be appreciated that the number of responses the council will receive will not be an accurate indication as many who cherish the court as it is and would have liked to have expressed their views will have been totally unaware of the planning application.

John Jones
44 Fauvel Road
Glossop

Sent via email 3rd August 2026.

