

[REDACTED]

From: Gary Mellor [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 August 2026 16:32
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: HPK/2026/0275 Planning Objection

[REDACTED]

From:
Gary Mellor
Otterwood
88 St Johns Road
Buxton
SK17 6TP

Subject: Formal Objection to Planning Application HPK/2026/0275 - 75 St Johns Road, Buxton

To:
Planning Department
High Peak Borough Council
PO Box 136
Buxton
SK17 1AQ

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Application Number: HPK/2026/0275

Proposed Development: Proposed use of dwelling (Use Class C3) as children's care home to accommodate up to a maximum of 3 children (Use Class C2)

Location: 75 St Johns Road, Buxton

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a local resident of 88 St Johns Road to formally lodge our strong objection to the above-referenced planning application. Having reviewed the submission, there are extensive, demonstrable material planning grounds upon which this application should be refused.

1. Procedural Issues: Notification Delay and Ownership Certification

As a preliminary matter, I must note that due to a severe postal delay, this consultation letter was only received 16 days ago. Consequently, this response should be accepted as valid and fully considered as of today's date.

Furthermore, local residents understand that the applicant listed (**Connected in Care Ltd**) is not the legal owner of the property. The Council must strictly verify that the correct **Ownership Certificate (Certificate B or C)** has been completed and that the actual landowner has been served the mandatory legal notice. If the certification is incorrect, the application is legally flawed.

2. Cumulative Impact and Over-Concentration of C2 Uses

St Johns Road is an established, quiet, family residential area. There is already an operating children's care home located approximately 100 yards further up the road.

Introducing a second C2 care facility in such close proximity will create an undue concentration of non-residential uses, fundamentally altering and degrading the residential character of the neighborhood. The existing facility has already generated an influx of congregating youths at night, attracting outside visitors and causing anti-social disturbance. Adding a second facility nearby will compound this issue, creating an unacceptable cumulative impact on local residents.

3. Severe Highway Safety Hazards (Reversing onto an A-Road)

St Johns Road is a busy, heavily trafficked A-road. The application states there is space for 4 vehicles, but it completely fails to account for the true operational reality of a C2 facility. Based on the existing home nearby, round-the-clock shift patterns, care workers, social workers, regulators, and ancillary staff (such as cooks and maintenance) mean far more than 4 vehicles will visit daily.

Crucially, the property features **no vehicular turning circle**. This means staff and professional visitors will be forced to reverse out of the driveway directly onto a major, busy A-road. Reversing onto a high-flow A-road presents a severe, unacceptable hazard to highway safety, pedestrian safety, and smooth traffic flow. The inevitable overspill of vehicles will also lead to pavement blocking, which has already been documented as a frequent issue at the existing home up the road.

4. Severe Impact on Residential Amenity (Semi-Detached Property)

Unlike the existing facility nearby, which occupies a detached dwelling, **75 St Johns Road is a semi-detached property**.

The shared party wall makes the property entirely unsuitable for a commercial C2 use. The immediate neighbor has already suffered significant noise and disturbance during the property's recent short-term holiday letting (Airbnb) use. A permanent care facility—with staff shift handovers at unsocial hours, commercial operational movements, and the unpredictable nature of a care environment—will cause continuous, structure-borne noise transmission through the party wall. This represents an unacceptable and irreversible loss of residential amenity to the adjoining family home.

For the reasons outlined above—specifically the severe highway safety risk of vehicles reversing onto an A-road, the cumulative impact of over-concentrating care facilities in a family area, and the unacceptable noise impact inherent to a semi-detached structure—I strongly urge the Planning Committee to refuse this application.

Yours faithfully,
Gary Mellor
Otterwood, 88 St Johns Road, Buxton

Sent from my iPad