

Miry Meadow – Representation to High Peak Borough Council

Planning Application HPK/2026/0141 Land at Miry Meadow, Chapel-en-le-Frith

Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council has considered the application for 24 dwellings at Miry Meadow.

We recognise from the outset that Pickford Meadow is an allocated housing site. Our concerns are therefore not about whether housing can ever be built on this land. They are about whether the application currently before us is consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan and whether the information submitted is sufficiently clear and accurate for a decision to be made.

Having gone through the Planning Statement, there are several matters we believe need answering before the application is determined.

1. Housing mix

Our biggest concern is the housing mix because the figures in the Planning Statement simply do not appear to reconcile.

The application is for 24 dwellings. However, Table 3.1 on printed page 5 lists 6 Type A, 3 Type A+, 4 apartments, 3 Type B, 2 Type C, 4 Type D, 2 Type E and 1 Type F. Those figures total 25 dwellings, not 24.

There is another problem. The same table identifies four one-bedroom apartments, three-, four- and five-bedroom houses, but does not identify any two-bedroom homes at all.

This is difficult to reconcile with paragraph 3.4, which says the development will contain a mix of two-, three-, four- and five-bedroom homes, or paragraph 5.12, which states that 37% of the proposed homes will have two bedrooms.

That 37% figure is then used to support the applicant's conclusion that the development is very closely aligned with Policy H3 and the 2022 Housing and Economic Land Needs Assessment.

We therefore ask HPBC to require a corrected dwelling schedule before determining the application and to clarify exactly what housing mix is actually being proposed.

Reference: Planning Statement, printed page 5, paragraphs 3.3–3.4 and Table 3.1; printed pages 11–12, paragraphs 5.11–5.12.

2. The Neighbourhood Plan requirement for smaller homes

This matters particularly because the site-specific requirements for Pickford Meadow say that the majority of homes should have one or two bedrooms, subject to viability and deliverability.

On the information currently contained in Table 3.1, only four properties are identified as one-bedroom homes and none are identified as two-bedroom homes.

Because the applicant's own figures contradict one another, we cannot see how it can presently be demonstrated that this important part of the Neighbourhood Plan has been met.

Once the housing schedule has been corrected, we ask HPBC to assess the actual proposed mix specifically against the Pickford Meadow requirement rather than relying solely upon the percentages quoted elsewhere in the Planning Statement.

Reference: Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement, Modification M9; Planning Statement, printed page 5 and printed pages 11–12.

3. Access and adoption

We also require clarification regarding access.

Paragraph 5.29 of the Planning Statement itself quotes the Neighbourhood Plan requirement: “Access should be via Miry Meadow Car Park, and the approach route leading to the site from Eccles Road should be made up and adopted.”

However, paragraph 3.6 confirms that Station Road is currently unadopted.

The applicant refers to having a right of way to use Station Road for all purposes. That may deal with the applicant's ability to use the road, but it does not appear to answer the separate requirement that the approach route should be made up and adopted.

We therefore ask HPBC to explain exactly how this requirement will be delivered, including what works are required, who is responsible for them and whether the Highway Authority is satisfied that the route can be adopted.

Reference: Planning Statement, printed page 6, paragraph 3.6 and printed page 15, paragraph 5.29.

4. Affordable housing

There are also questions surrounding the affordable housing.

The relevant Neighbourhood Plan modification states that applications for more than six homes should be accompanied by an affordable-housing strategy produced in consultation with an appropriate Registered Social Landlord and discussed and agreed with the Parish Council in advance of an application.

However, paragraph 5.19 of the Planning Statement states: “At this stage no Registered Social Landlord has been identified to deliver the affordable housing.” It also says that the mix of affordable homes will be agreed with HPBC during the application process.

We would therefore like clarification as to whether the affordable-housing strategy required by the Neighbourhood Plan has been produced and, if so, when it was discussed with the Parish Council and which Registered Social Landlord was involved. If this has not happened, we would like HPBC to explain how this requirement is now going to be addressed.

Reference: Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement, Modification M8; Planning Statement, printed page 13, paragraph 5.19.

5. What affordable housing will actually be delivered?

The applicant calculates that 20% affordable housing on a development of 24 properties equates to 4.8 dwellings. Four affordable homes are proposed on the site, with a financial contribution intended to make up the remaining 0.8 dwelling.

We would like the final details of this arrangement to be clear.

- What size will the four affordable properties be?
- What tenure will they have?
- Where will they be located?
- What is the value of the contribution for the remaining 0.8 dwelling?
- How has that figure been calculated?
- How will delivery of the affordable housing be secured?

Reference: Planning Statement, printed pages 12–13, paragraphs 5.17–5.19.

6. Heritage

The heritage assessment also needs clarification.

The site lies within the Chapel-en-le-Frith Conservation Area and within the setting of the Grade II* listed St Thomas Becket Church.

Paragraphs 5.22–5.24 say there will be no adverse impact, describe the impact upon the church as neutral, and conclude that there will be no harm to the significance of the heritage asset.

However, paragraph 6.7 subsequently says that the benefits of providing 24 homes outweigh the harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and St Thomas Becket Church.

We would like a clear answer as to which position is being advanced. Is the applicant saying that there is no heritage harm, or is it accepting that there is harm but arguing that the benefits of the development outweigh it?

We also ask that HPBC's Conservation Officer's assessment is clearly recorded before the application is determined.

Reference: Planning Statement, printed page 14, paragraphs 5.22–5.24 and printed page 18, paragraph 6.7.

7. Flooding and drainage

Flooding was one of the concerns raised locally during consultation and the Planning Statement itself acknowledges that the site has a medium risk of surface-water flooding, particularly around the existing pond.

The proposed solution includes raised floor levels, permeable paving, water butts and underground attenuation tanks.

We are not suggesting that these measures cannot work. We do, however, want reassurance from the appropriate technical authority rather than relying solely upon the applicant's assessment.

- Has the Lead Local Flood Authority accepted the proposed drainage strategy?
- Who will own and maintain the drainage and attenuation infrastructure once the development is completed?
- What happens to surface water if the drainage system is overwhelmed during a storm exceeding its design capacity?

Reference: Planning Statement, printed page 4, paragraph 2.10 and printed page 16, paragraphs 5.34–5.37.

8. Protected trees

The Planning Statement confirms that the site is covered by a site-wide Tree Preservation Order.

It says that most existing trees will be retained but that a number will need to be removed either because of their condition or because they are necessary to facilitate the development. Sixty-two replacement trees are proposed.

Before a decision is taken, we would like to know exactly how many protected trees are being removed, their condition and category, and whether HPBC's Arboricultural Officer is satisfied with both their removal and the protection arrangements for the trees being retained.

We would also like confirmation that the proposed replacement trees are appropriate in terms of species, size, location and long-term management. Planting new trees is welcome, but it should not automatically be regarded as equivalent to retaining established protected trees.

Reference: Planning Statement, printed page 6, paragraph 3.8 and printed page 15, paragraphs 5.32–5.33.

9. Biodiversity Net Gain

The applicant says that the development will achieve the statutory minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain, but paragraph 7.8 says this will be achieved through an off-site contribution.

We would like HPBC to make clear what biodiversity improvements will actually be delivered within Miry Meadow and what will be provided elsewhere.

In particular, we would like to know where any off-site biodiversity provision will be located, how much is required and how it will be legally secured and maintained.

We would also ask that replacement tree planting and Biodiversity Net Gain are treated as separate matters rather than being presented as the same environmental benefit.

Reference: Planning Statement, printed page 21, paragraph 7.8.

10. Future development of the northern paddock

The application does not include the paddock immediately to the north. However, paragraph 3.7 makes clear that the layout has deliberately been designed to provide vehicular access into that land for potential future development.

Paragraph 5.16 similarly says that the road layout ensures that future development of the remainder of the housing allocation will not be prejudiced.

We therefore think it is reasonable to ask whether the proposed access arrangements have been assessed solely on the basis of the 24 homes currently proposed, or whether they have also been tested against the additional traffic which could arise if the northern paddock is developed in future.

We are not suggesting that future development is inevitable. We simply want to understand whether an access deliberately designed to facilitate further development has been assessed with that possibility in mind.

Reference: Planning Statement, printed page 6, paragraph 3.7 and printed page 12, paragraph 5.16.

11. S106 and recreation contributions

The Planning Statement gives an indicative contribution of £30,575.05 towards play, outdoor sport, parks and gardens and allotments.

However, the applicant also acknowledges that this calculation relates to the previous proposal for 23 homes and will therefore need updating for the current 24-home application.

We ask HPBC to provide the updated calculation and, importantly, to identify where these contributions are intended to be spent and which local facilities are expected to benefit.

Reference: Planning Statement, printed page 13, paragraph 5.20 and Table 5.1; printed page 21, paragraph 7.7.

12. Technical consultees

Finally, we recognise that the application is supported by a substantial number of specialist reports covering highways, drainage, ecology, trees, heritage and other matters.

Those reports represent the applicant's evidence. Before the application is determined, we would like to know what the relevant independent technical consultees have concluded.

In particular, we ask that any outstanding concerns or requests for further information from highways, drainage, conservation, ecology and arboricultural officers are resolved before a decision is taken.

Reference: Planning Statement, supporting documents and technical reports.

Parish Council position

The Parish Council is not objecting to the principle of housing development on Pickford Meadow.

However, there are currently significant questions about the information submitted with this particular application, most notably the contradictory housing figures.

A Planning Statement for a 24-dwelling application currently contains a dwelling schedule which totals 25 properties, apparently contains no two-bedroom properties, while elsewhere stating that 37% of the development will consist of two-bedroom homes.

That needs correcting.

We therefore ask High Peak Borough Council not to determine the application until the matters identified above have been properly addressed and sufficient information is available to demonstrate whether the proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan policies and the site-specific requirements of the Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan.

Until those matters have been resolved, the Parish Council's representation should be recorded as a holding objection.

