

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

1.1 The table below sets out a summary of representations submitted by High Peak Borough Council to the independent examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of schedule 4B to the 1990 Act.

1.2 All representations are available to view in full on the Council's Consultation Portal at:

http://highpeak-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/high_peak/chapel_neighbourhood_plan/chapel_np

Summary of Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Hugh Barton	CP2	The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared with extensive research, local consultation and examination. It is a robust, well-reasoned document and should be brought into force as soon as possible, especially considering the delay to the Local Plan. In the meantime, it should be considered as a material consideration in planning applications.
Angela Gemmill Marine Management Organisation	CP3	Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. I can confirm that the MMO has no comments to submit in relation to this consultation. If you have any questions or need any further information please just let me know. More information on the role of the MMO can be found on our website www.gov.uk/mmo
Mr Steuart Neale	CP4	Please note that a surveyor from the builders/developers "Bloor Homes" was seen in the LGS 7 site, and questioned, whilst surveying the land that used to be known as the Target Field (Local Development Plan - ref. LGS 7), adjacent to Long Lane, Brookside Road, Longmeade Drive, Sycamore Road and Warmbrook Road. This parcel of land is identified in the much awaited/delayed Local Development Plan. The public consultation period is only just started, and I hope in the name of fairness and democracy, that the obvious developers rush to beat the approval and adoption of such a plan, by 13th November, will be stalled by the planners, of both Parish, and Borough, until a fair review, including the inspection by the appointed Examiner, has taken place. This plan

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>is much deliberated, and much delayed in publication, but nevertheless a well-intentioned response, by a considerable number of local residents, which, if ignored, by the result of tactical, and statutory delays in the adoption of this plan, would be tantamount to a snub to all of the areas residents.</p> <p>The area around Chapel, is already swamped by approved housing (in excess of 650), with little account taken of the effect on traffic, school spaces available, sewerage, drainage, services etc. So how many new homes can we expect to be added to the hundreds already being rushed through to development, ignoring the published wishes of the local community?</p>
Mr Malcolm Cochran	CP5	<p>A genuine thank you for providing this access to useful data. With pleasure at your stated aims, I say the following:</p> <p>1) If Greenfield is to be built upon, an equal area of Brown land should be made Park-like.</p> <p>2) Not everyone should expect to have "personal open space" - often later concreted over for the "other" car. Good quality homes should be built from converted Mills etc, as has been done elsewhere. Often car garaging is easy. Fairly wealthy people (nothing wrong with that!) who are retiring may accept such a building and contribute by spending locally. Less wealthy people could mix in.</p> <p>My main point is that, however hard you try, the tendency of small builders is unintentionally to produce a patchwork slum.</p>
Mr Daniel Sellers	CP6	<p>I fully agree with the Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan document, including all the policies contained.</p> <p>Employment Policy EP6 Site ES6: Bowden Hey Farm:</p> <p>I feel this site should be retained as a Green Wedge, separating Chapel village from the A6 bypass road.</p> <p>I especially support that new development should prioritise the re-use of brownfield land and should be sympathetic to its context & surroundings (both natural & built heritage).</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I support that 'development creep' should not be encouraged, nor should any developments that result in settlements merging.</p> <p>I also support that no planned development should extend into the Green Belt.</p> <p>I feel that development affecting the character & setting of the Peak District National Park should be refused planning permission.</p> <p>I feel the recent TV shows filmed in Chapel will draw more visitors in; it is important that these don't overwhelm or negatively affect the places they come to visit! I particularly support the following policies:</p> <p>Policy TC4: Use of redundant buildings.</p> <p>Policy TC6: High Quality Town Centre Design.</p> <p>Policy TC9: Regeneration of Chapel Market Place.</p> <p>I support the complete removal of traffic / parking from the Market Place. I feel this would greatly improve this part of the Conservation Area's character & appearance.</p>
<p>Philippa Bullen Equality and Human Rights Commission</p>	<p>CP7</p>	<p>The Commission does not have the resources to respond to all consultations, but will respond to consultations where it considers they raise issues of strategic importance.</p> <p>Local, parish and town councils and other public authorities, as well as organisations exercising public functions, have obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) in the Equality Act 2010 to consider the effect of their policies and decisions on people sharing particular protected characteristics. The PSED is an on-going legal requirement and must be complied with as part of the planning process. The Commission is the regulator for the PSED and the Planning Inspectorate is also subject to it. In essence, you must consider the potential for planning proposals to have an impact on equality for different groups of people.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>To assist, you will find our technical guidance at: www.equalityhumanrights.com Home . Publications . Guidance . Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty</p>
Cllr. Guy Martin	CP8	<p>Section 1: Housing</p> <p>I fully support this part of the NP which is the work of many of the residents of the Parish and it makes their wishes very clear under the terms of the Localism Act.</p> <p>Section 2: Employment</p> <p>I fully support this part of the NP which is the work of many of the residents of the Parish and it makes their wishes very clear under the terms of the Localism Act - there is a great need for more employment opportunities in the Parish, especially in the middle to higher salary scales.</p> <p>Section 3: Town Centre</p> <p>I generally support any regeneration of Chapel Town Centre, also with more needed improvements to parking.</p> <p>Section 4: Transport</p> <p>I support the details in this section.</p> <p>Section 5: Countryside</p> <p>The whole Parish is generally surrounded by beautiful countryside which needs protecting from the ever encroaching housing estates and especially those being proposed on the rising ground around the Town.</p>
Paul Tame	CP9	<p>Page 31, policy C1.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
National Farmers Union		<p>We support paragraph (b) on farm and rural diversification but would like to see the ability for farmers to convert vernacular farm buildings to residential use for offspring or other members of the family or rural workers being allowed. Many farm buildings in the Peak District can be converted to residential use where there is little demand for extra tourist accommodation, but there is a need for housing on the farm for the farmer's son or daughter.</p> <p>Page 32, policy C2.</p> <p>Some of the Local Green Spaces identified in the plan are very large in area and are protecting views. Local Green Space Designation can be used where it is not an extensive tract of land and it could be argued that several of the proposed sites in the plan come into the category of extensive tracts of land and are being designated as an extra protection against development rather than for their other values.</p> <p>Page 37, policy C3.</p> <p>The policy mentions sites designated as having particularly high wildlife potential by the Derbyshire Wildlife Trust. Is this an actual official designation? If not, we feel it should be removed from the local plan.</p> <p>Page 37, policy C5.</p> <p>I can understand policy C5 where the neglect has been overseen by the landowner but where damage has been carried out by vandals against the obvious will of the landowner why should the latter be penalised?</p>
Mr P Johnson	CP10	<p>Time after time the majority of High Peak Borough Council committee have demonstrated they are determined to build thousands of homes in our area to meet a housing demand that exists in the main outside of the High Peak - so why do any councillors feel obliged to encourage the development! There is a 'formula' but that doesn't equate at all to realistic local requirements.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>The good intent of the long awaited Neighbourhood Plan appears to now to be of no avail and way too late as thousands of houses will be built where ever developers like, in Chapel and the local area, in the beautiful green countryside at the edge of the National Park, to house people from the nearby cities and conurbations, who are themselves moving outwards to the countryside because of the enormous pressure of inward migration from other countries, i.e. 250,000 UK net increase per year. There is a huge difference between the massive local building programme now and that one of 25-30 years ago. The previous one in the 1980s was for a demand for housing from 'local people' - as there were many thousands of well paid positions all over the High Peak at large employers and factories etc. That state is more or less gone and the current developments are for people outside the area.</p> <p>Development of the ‘Target Wall’ field (South of Brookside Road)</p> <p>There are currently 815 new properties that either have already been approved for planning or are already being built around Chapel - to meet a demand for housing that exists in the main, outside of our area. The number of houses required to meet the High Peak Borough Council demand is 850 over 15 years. Chapel has been targeted with an excessive building programme and the overall demand has almost been met - but unfortunately Bloor Homes is surveying the Target Field for potential building! Hundreds of houses could be built on the field - totally destroying the natural habitat of the herons, buzzards, kestrels, owls, jackdaws and grouse that live there. The stream is already a brand new outlet for the surface water drainage of 180 new houses on Long Lane and any other new properties that might be built in the target field or station side of the railway. When it rains for three days solid in the winter, as it does here, it will be interesting to see the flooding from the volume of water draining off nearly 200 hundred houses and tarmac into a 5 ft wide stream! The council were warned!</p> <p>Planning permission is being sort to build on the Target Wall field (Local Green Space in the Plan) before the Neighbourhood Plan is fully adopted. The neighbourhood plan would be an obstacle in the planner’s way. Action has already been taken that will remove obstacles to their plans, i.e. uprooting and burning dozens of mature trees\bushes two years ago, digging huge drainage ditches to drain the natural marsh land that supports large amounts of wildlife, demolishing established public access to the field, i.e. ‘the bridge’.</p> <p>There will be one long sprawl of houses from Manchester to Buxton before long!</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
<p>Sally Maguire Natural England</p>	CP11	<p>Natural England previously made comments on the draft version of the Neighbourhood plan, January 30th 2014 ref 108296 . Our main concerns related to the Employment allocation ES2: A6 /Bowden Lane, owing to its close proximity to the Peak District National Park and possible impacts on its setting. We note that this site has been removed from the Neighbourhood plan. This now removes our previous concerns which relate to landscape impacts and soundness issues.</p> <p>Our previous comments highlighted the importance of the Dark Peak Nature Improvement Area (NIA) and the South West Peak National Character Area (NCA) and Dark Peak NCA profiles. Natural England advise that the plan could be much improved if it made reference to these assets.</p> <p>Natural England also made reference to the opportunities for Green Infrastructure to be incorporated into the Neighbourhood plan. Again we strongly suggest that our previous comments our taken on board.</p> <p>Habitat Regulations</p> <p>We previously made comments on the Habitat Regulations screening statement July 7th 2014 ref 122609. Please refer to this advice in relation the requirements under the Habitats Directive.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment / Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>We previously made comments on the Strategic Environmental Assessment / Sustainability Appraisal screening statement July 7th 2014 ref 122609. We then sent a follow up email to this July 8th 2014, please refer to this statement in relation the requirements of the SEA Directive.</p>
Mr John Kappes	CP12	<p>The fields adjacent to and including the Target Wall Field have been thoroughly surveyed during the course of the last few days. It is important that all areas identified as 'Local Green Spaces in the Countryside' are rigorously defended, I think that these areas should be extended as far as Ashbourne Lane, or at very least the Railway line. This area if developed would increase the size of Chapel-en-le-Frith by about another third, the road network would not support this along with schools, doctors, car parking and other associated services. Cllr Bisknell has</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		already stated that unemployment in Chapel is increasing, so employment opportunities for Chapel young people would be diminished. Given also that the house market in Chapel is 'slow' additional housing will not only exacerbate this but will also cause property values to fall considerably giving rise to situations that we would not wish to return to.
Mr Ross Anthony The Theatres Trust	CP13	<p>Regarding Policy TM3: Development for Community Use, The Trust recommends the wording be amended to also protect existing community assets and facilities, as well as encourage new facilities. This would better reflect the wording of Policy CF 5 'Provision and Retention of Local Community Services and Facilities' in the High Peal Local Plan Submission and the guidance in item 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework. We would also encourage you to reconsider the term 'can only be to the benefit of the community as a whole' as residents of different age groups, socio-economic and cultural backgrounds will value cultural facilities, such as theatres, and quality of life in different ways. We therefore suggest the following alternative wording:</p> <p>Policy TM3: Development for Community Use</p> <p>Proposals for <u>new</u> community facilities, especially within existing settlement boundaries, will be encouraged <u>and proposals involving the loss of existing community assets and facilities will be resisted unless a suitable replacement is to be provided.</u></p> <p>Development which <u>should</u> enhance quality of life in Chapel-en-le-Frith. can only be to the benefit of the community as a whole.</p> <p>Regarding Policy TC3: Mixed Use in the Town Centre, it should be noted that some community facilities (dot point 5) are classed Sui Generis and this should therefore be listed along with the D1 and D2 uses.</p>
Mrs Diane Coley	CP14	The reduction in size of LGS7 Target Wall Field removes an area of high biodiversity which would be detrimental to the overall viability of the existing ecology. To increase this area to include the semi improved field adjacent to the proposed site would be highly desirable.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Steuart Neale	CP15	<p>With the recent publication of the Chapel Local Plan that has been proposed by local people, I would like to know what safeguards or plans that the two local Planning Authorities (Parish, and Borough) may consider for the identified "Local Green Space 7" Target Field off Long Lane, Grange Park Avenue, Brookside Road, & Warmbrook Road.</p> <p>When will the Local Authorities see sense, and turn-down a Development submission?</p> <p>I repeat, there are no more jobs for any new residents. The "affordable" housing isn't affordable to the local youngsters, the infrastructure isn't capable of taking more houses, and resultant cars, children at the local Schools, (no sixth form). There isn't a Swimming Pool for the larger Chapel area.</p> <p>Drainage is a problem on this site with springs from the hillside. Warmbrook could get more run-off and pollution. Access into this site is very restricted, from any direction.</p>
Mr Colin Thom	CP16	<p>I fully support the Plan. I am particularly encouraged by the identification of Local Green Spaces to protect the Town from excessive erosion of green land. I would urge the Council to expedite the approval of the Local Green Spaces in advance of the overall Plan to protect them from last ditch applications for residential development.</p>
Mr Ian Galloway	CP17	<p>Housing provision within Chapel and its surrounds is identified as +400, current housing under construction, with planning permissions (full or outline) is +800. Therefore full provision for housing is met with current sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Federal Mogul 2 Manchester Road / Crossings Road 3 Long Lane <p>The railway line to the south and the current built up area boundary should define the area of development. Brownfield and infill should be utilised wherever possible.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Industrial development</p> <p>More expansion of the employment site at Bowden Lane should be encouraged, sites at Town End should be developed when available, particularly into "beehive" units to encourage starter businesses and further medium size units to allow such businesses to expand, stay within the town and provide additional employment.</p> <p>Green Spaces</p> <p>Provision of green spaces is vital to the delivery of a well balanced plan that satisfies all parties. The development of the current linear footpaths is to be encouraged and the recognised special landscape areas should be maintained.</p> <p>Schooling</p> <p>Chapel Primary School, over-subscribed, current pupil numbers +400 giving large class sizes in excess of government average recommendations of circa 30 pupils. Urgent provision should be made to provide an additional school within the area, the situation can only be exacerbated with the current planned housing provision.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>Bus service too limited, areas covered poor. Road network too inadequate particularly the lack of a continuation of the Chapel by-pass to divert around Furness Vale / Newtown etc. Current housing planned and built and the "commute" from Chapel to Stockport, Manchester etc will continue to prove problematic unless adequate resource is made available by central government.</p>
Mr Malcolm Hoskins	CP18	There are already many houses built outside the boundaries of the built up area shown in the plan particularly on the opposite side of the road to existing built up areas eg on Eccles Road.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Policy H3 is too restrictive unless the built up area boundary is now redefined to include existing housing on or in close proximity to the boundary. If the boundary is not redefined and extended, restrictions on smaller sites and self build homes should be lifted on narrow strips of land adjacent to residential properties already built on this land which have already compromised the description of unspoilt, particularly where opposite or bordering nearby estates and built up roads. Such strips are of limited suitability for agriculture, and are more suitable for homes and economic growth. Allowing such small developments between existing properties would provide a wider choice of open market houses, thus contributing to meeting housing needs without the need for intrusive large scale developments and putting little strain on local services and infrastructure.</p>
Cllr Stewart Young	CP19	<p>A lot of hard work and time and money has gone into making this plan, using the views and aspirations of the residents of Chapel. It needs to be adopted now to make Chapel a place we want to live and care about.</p>
Mr Simon Hill	CP20	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All new housing will definitely affect traffic on Chapel's only main road. 2. Schools/doctors will have to be increased in size. 3. For all the new housing, where will the employment come from other than travelling to work at some distance which will increase traffic congestion. 4. Will crime be increased with the influx of social housing. 5. To build off Manchester Road is a disgrace. <p>It seems to me that High Peak Council may/will damage a special place like Chapel-en-le-Frith. Look what's happened, most/all planning applications have been approved with no thought/concerns to the people of Chapel. I could understand if there were no houses for sale and plenty of work opportunities but as far as I can see, this is not the case, so it must be the extra money coming in due to council tax because I can't see any benefit that the people of Chapel will see other than negative points I have said above.</p>
Mrs Heather Hammond	CP21	<p>I am a resident of Chapel en le Frith and have been for 19 years, What attracted me to the area as an "incomer" was the quiet, rural, countryside feel of the town with a small local community, good schools, minimal traffic and the historic centre of the town, initially no supermarket too apart from the small Co-op.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Over the years i have watched with dismay as all that attracted my family to the area has been slowly eroded away..... the whole feel of the town and surrounding area is changing beyond recognition and I truly believe at the detriment of the town as a whole.</p> <p>The schools are full to bursting, the roads are getting busier and busier, the GP surgeries surely cannot give adequate health care to an ever expanding local community and above all this the beautiful countryside and its wildlife is being lost forever.</p> <p>I am not alone in feeling like this, there is a growing unrest within the town and I for one wish to object to any further housing and building being considered. Chapel has had its fair share of new housing stock over recent years and i implore you, as representatives of the local community to stand your ground and not allow any further decimation of this beautiful area.</p>
<p>Mrs Brenda Wise Chinley Buxworth & Brownside Parish Council</p>	<p>CP22</p>	<p>Chinley, Buxworth & Brownside Parish Council fully supports the Local Green Spaces policy and, specifically, the designation of Spring Meadow, Whitehough (Map Ref 11), which adjoins our parish.</p> <p>This field forms an important open break and a countryside buffer between the former Dorma textile works (now being developed as a 'brownfield' site for 182 dwellings), the Peak Forest Tramway and Chinley & Whitehough conservation area. It is a tranquil area and a haven for wildlife, and is of great significance to local people. Quite apart from its visual and ecological importance, the land has historically been a well-used area of open space by local residents for walking to and from the Peak Forest Tramway and for exercising dogs, blackberry picking etc.</p> <p>The field is now under pressure for housing development. It is simply too important to be lost to development. The recent action of the landowners to fence off the land, only allowing public access along a very narrowly defined public footpath route, and to put up 'Private-Keep Out' signs, must not be allowed to detract from its important and special role as local green space.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Ms Jackie Hill	CP23	I would like to register my concerns re the number of new houses planned in Chapel-en-le-Frith. They will turn a small market town into a suburb for no good reason other than some people will make money.
Mr Andrew Barratt	CP24	<p>I would maintain that all the land below the railway line between Long Lane to Ashborne Lane is suitable for building. In fact a new road from the A6 across this area may not be remiss. I have read the comments so far with amazement, the ones that mention Grouse on the Target field uses every Nimby buzz word. This is poor quality grazing land, The Target field has a public footpath running up the middle, regularly used as a toilet for dogs, the field is covered with the stuff, Local Wildlife, with the amount of dog walkers there is little wildlife around, accept drunken teenage parties. For the last few years we have been trying to improve the drainage, overgrown areas removal of drinking dens, bottles and litter. The bridge had to be removed for public safety as neither Local Councils wanted ownership. I have been on this land for fifty years it is only what it has always been poor grazing land. I believe the new houses on Long lane have now all but sold, as there is a high demand from local people!!!</p> <p>This Neighbourhood plan seems to be more about what people do not want; rather than a vision for the future and what is actually needed.</p>
Mr Michael Briggs	CP25	We have too many houses, not enough jobs, school places, doctors, etc.
Mr John Lowe	CP26	The plan represents the many hours of work by volunteers who consulted widely providing each household with a survey form on which to record their views and preferences. The plan represents the views of the people of the parish and outlines the way they wish their community to develop. The need for housing has been recognised and reasonable, measured proposals have been put forward. I would urge everyone to support the plan and in doing so they will uphold local democracy.
Mr Nigel Barratt	CP27	Map reference 7 -Target wall field and woodland adjacent to Warmbrook

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>In my view, looking at the neighbourhood plan, I feel that the above area is an ideal site for further expansion with its location right next to the village boundary. I feel that if built with consideration and sympathy with its natural surroundings, it will be an asset to the High Peak area. Also if planned correctly this could be an ideal chance to relieve the traffic congestion on the existing Highway infrastructure.</p>
<p>Mr Chris Sizeland CJK Packaging Ltd</p>	<p>CP28</p>	<p>EP5 - EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATION</p> <p>EP5 states that approx 9.44 hectares have been allocated. In fact the effective allocation is only 5.42 hectares. Also, vast areas of Employment Land have been lost to housing since the last Local Plan in 2005. They total 13.44 Hectares. The neighbourhood plan is therefore effectively proposing an extremely large net decrease in Employment land. This is being done whilst at the same time due to the chronic lack of employment land, thriving local companies are being forced to move out of the area to expand. In addition local people who want to set up businesses are having to do so out of the area, and commute to them. And businesses that would like to move into the area are unable to do so. It took our own company many years to buy premises in the area and then only by an extreme bit of good fortune. We are now finding it extremely difficult to expand.</p> <p>An ongoing problem is that because of the desirability of the area when any premises do become vacant there is a strong incentive for the owners to keep them intentionally empty and ignore all enquiries from companies and employers until such time as they can get planning permission for housing.</p> <p>At the moment because of the lack of jobs in the area many people have to commute each day to places such as Stockport, Manchester or Sheffield. With the additional houses being built in the area this is going to get even worse. To sum up we strongly feel that the Employment Allocations in the local plan are totally inadequate and need to be completely revisited before this part of the Neighbourhood Plan can be considered even partially adequate.</p>
<p>Christine Barratt</p>	<p>CP29</p>	<p>Map Reference number 7 - Target wall field and woodland adjacent to Warmbrook.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I feel that this land is becoming extremely difficult to be farmed properly due to trespassers especially during holiday periods i.e Summer holidays and Bank Holidays. Not only do they trespass people also let their dogs foul indiscriminately. There is also an undesirable element leaving contaminated litter i.e syringes and other drug paraphernalia on this site. With outlining these points I feel that this area would be ideal for the expansion of the housing in the area.</p>
Mr Mark Williamson	CP30	<p>The designation of the 'Target Wall and surrounding fields' as Local Green Space is not consistent with the facts. This whole tract of land was designated as White Land in the 1970s for the future development of Chapel. Some of the commenters on this subject appear to want to keep it as part of their back garden, to use as they wish. Such as allowing dogs to run around off leads to foul where they want, and drive any wildlife away to boot. A proper development on this tract of land could benefit Chapel greatly ie a relief road for Long Lane, cycle and walkways alongside the brook, possibly an Eco-Hotel, in fact the possibilities are many and varied. The one sure thing is that if Chapel has housing imposed on it from above, aka Manchester Road, there will be no benefits for the town whatsoever. So wake up and smell the coffee all you NIMBYs.</p> <p>If the NIMBYs that are the driving force behind Chapel Vision and the Neighbourhood Plan have their way Chapel will just be a dormitory town with very few amenities and even less employment opportunities for the young people of the area, who will never be able to afford to buy property in the town. Basically Chapel will become Closed for Business. It is the council's responsibility to plan for the future prosperity of the town and not just represent the views of those who have their bit of the High Peak but don't want anybody else around to share it .</p>
Mr Peter Hemmings	CP31	<p>I write to register my complete approval of the above plan. Local volunteers have spent many hours of their time compiling a very complete and comprehensive plan for the town and the surrounding beautiful countryside in accordance with the requirements of the planning regulations and in answer to the majority of interested residents.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I am particularly keen to register my total support for the Local Green Spaces put forward by groups of residents. HPBC must understand that many Chapel residents are sick and tired of their wonderful surrounding landscapes being built on and spoilt forever and a result of weak control by the Borough Council, biased Government Planning Regulations in favour of builders and landowners, and powerful, money grabbing so-called developers who care not a jot for the environment or the wishes of the local population.</p> <p>There are already over 800 houses either being built or with planning permission in the parish which is far in excess of both the housing requirements and the infrastructure of the town's facilities. No more houses should be built on our precious green field areas and HPBC must adopt the Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan in full.</p>
Mrs Ros Holmes	CP32	<p>Chapel-en-le-Frith has been spoilt by greedy, money-grabbing people that have no interest in the essence of a Market Town. It has lost it's quaint, traditional feel. The roads are clogged with traffic, this will only get much worse when the planned houses are finished. The schools are full to bursting with our children sitting in large sized classes. Getting an appointment at the doctor's surgery, within a week, is becoming more difficult, unless it's an 'emergency'. Green fields are being lost to housing estates. I've lived in Chapel for 25 years and despair at how it has been spoilt and contains to be spoilt by greedy, money-grabbing people. Please, let there be no more building in Chapel and it's surrounding villages.</p>
Mr Robert Heath	CP33	<p>Having viewed the neighbourhood plan, and read some of the comments I feel compelled to put forward a case for the Warmbrook land. This site is ideally situated on the village boundary, making it a natural choice for extending the village. This field is currently left to pasture for cattle, which is not ideal due to the inconsiderate way in which the area is used. Dog owners allowing their dogs the free range of the grazing pasture, defecating anywhere they wish, not picking up after their dogs, and in turn putting the cattle at risk of disease. Also we do have considerable trouble with an undesirable element of the community, both dealing and taking illegal substances. Leaving syringes lying about, which is a health hazard to both animals and people alike. The cries and objections from the nature loving community of which I am one, are truly misleading. Any wildlife on the Warmbrook site, is under more threat from the current misuse by the people who are up in arms trying to save this land from development. Indeed if</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>there was any grouse or other wild fowl nesting on Warmbrook, they would not stand a chance of successfully fledging young with dogs running freely on their nesting area. These objections are only from the more fortunate people in society, who have been lucky enough to purchase their homes in this High Peak village. These people who are only holding Chapel, back and choking the life blood out of this community. If developed in a sympathetic manner, taking into consideration the natural beauty of the surrounding area, this could be an opportunity to build a Blue Riband housing development that the High Peak Council could be rightly proud of.</p>
Mr Robert Heath	CP34	<p>I would like to express my views on the proposed Target field and Warmbrook site for expansion. My family and I have a long association with Chapel-en-le-Frith which we are all rightly proud of. So I speak with a genuine concern when it comes to such an important issue as the future of this High Peak Town. With the ever growing need for housing, Chapel cannot, and should not, be excused from this moral dilemma of housing for all. It is indeed a vital part of the continuing success of any community, and if ignored, could be to the detriment of the town's life in the years to come. As the historic capital of the High Peak District, it is imperative that any expansion should benefit not only Chapel-en-le-Frith but all the surrounding community in the High Peak District. That being the case we need to look forward to the future and the future of our children. Houses are needed in this community if there is to be any future. The Warmbrook site is situated on the boundary of the town, and is ideally situated for a natural progression of the housing stock. This area is of little use as pasture and cannot be mistaken for a wildlife reserve. This area, if not developed, will not only deteriorate, but will become a blot on the landscape. We as a custodians of our own destiny must ensure that the future of Chapel-en-le-Frith is secured for generations to come.</p>
Mr Clive Fletcher English Heritage (East Midlands)	CP35	<p>It is clear that the plan has been formulated with the intention of conserving the special qualities of Chapel-en-le-Frith that are valued by its residents. The desire to introduce new employment and housing is understandable, as is the desire to protect its countryside setting. Where the plan could still be strengthened is in its policies regarding the historic environment.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>The brief history and description of the settlement at the beginning gives us a useful outline understanding of the place, but the subsequent vision is a little ambiguous about the vision for the historic environment - the many interesting buildings, spaces and other assets that make Chapel-en-le-Frith so distinctive. The desire to enhance is welcomed, but the need to protect should also be stated.</p> <p>Similarly, this needs to run as a consistent thread through its policies. This has been broadly achieved in Policy EP2: Design of Employment Sites, but is at best ambiguous in TC2: New Retail Development in Chapel-en-le-Frith Town Centre, which states that retail development (including new build) will be granted planning permission. The worst case scenario in this instance is that a proposal for a large development requiring the demolition of historic buildings would be deemed acceptable under this policy, providing it was in one of the use classes specified. We therefore advise that the appropriate caveats are applied to the wording, or an overarching historic environment policy written which would provide such protection, or ideally both.</p> <p>The proposed housing allocation at Pickford Meadow is within the designated conservation area and within the setting of St Thomas's Church, which is listed at grade II*. The green space on the opposite side of Church Lane is a part of the former green open setting of this church to the north, and development of it may harm this setting and therefore the significance of the church.</p> <p>The desirability of protecting the setting of listed buildings is accorded special regard in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. We therefore advise (if it has not already been done) that an assessment of the contribution that Pickford Meadow makes to the setting (and therefore significance) of St Thomas's church and the significance of the conservation area should be made before considering this allocation.</p> <p>Having weighed any impacts against harm (in accordance with the NPPF), should you then wish to proceed with the allocation we would advise that the policy H10 is amended to require any impacts on the setting of the church caused by development to be mitigated.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Ms Julie Wood	CP36	<p>I would like to support the land off Warmbrook being allocated for planning for housing. Of all the sites highlighted Warmbrook stands out as if my knowledge is correct it was previously designated as white land for the expansion of Chapel. It could support a new access route to Long Lane which is desperately needed, which could be connected to existing infrastructure with minimal disruption. The site would create a beautiful area for housing and open spaces and I believe would attract people to come to the area and enhance Chapel. At the moment the ground seems to be used for a place that dog walkers go so that their dogs can foul the area and they don't need to clean it up - you only have to visit the site to see this. It's also evident that its used by probably the younger generation to "hang about" as I've often seen beer cans and empty bottles as well as hyperdermic needles littering the area.</p> <p>I often use Long Lane by car and have stopped at that site many times, where I've seen such as the above, and thought what a waste of land to be used like that and what a beautiful place it would be to live.</p> <p>The ground immediately around the brook could be parkland and would create and enhance a beautiful area, and I believe would attract middle-upper class earners to the area, bringing money into Chapel. I myself am a Company Director and would definitely consider buying a house on that site. I don't believe this land / site should be given green space status. It's the "favourite" site to enhance Chapel and bring money into the area by creating a beautiful (and possibly "more-executive") housing site - which Chapel is short of in my opinion.</p>
Mrs Sonia Holt	CP37	<p>The need for new housing in the area</p> <p>(a) Building is already taking place at Ferodo site and Long Lane. Permission has already been granted for 104 with a vehicular entrance onto Manchester Road and pedestrian onto Crossings Road.</p> <p>(b) There are still empty housing appts. at Miry Meadows (after 4 years).</p> <p>(c) Homes for sale around the town.</p> <p>Facilities</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>(a) Roads. Much traffic still has to pass through the town despite the by-pass. Some of this is local because many families have 2 cars but shops and businesses have to be serviced.</p> <p>(b) Schools are over-crowded now.</p> <p>(c) Surgeries are full.</p> <p>(d) Trains and buses are full especially at rush hour - see South Station approach cluttered with cars when a train is due. That will be worse when the Long Lane development is finished.</p> <p>Landowners are objecting to protection for greenfield sites. No-one else is objecting to this. We want them, we need them. I do not know who these landowners are but I bet they do not live in Chapel.</p>
Mrs Janet Bean	CP38	<p>Proposed Local Green Spaces: Map Ref T7 - Target wall field and woodland adjacent to Warmbrook</p> <p>This land has been designated as 'white land' for many many years now, I find it very interesting that people are wanting to 'claim' these fields as public green areas for their own personal use - to let their dogs roam freely and local teenagers use it for drugs and drinking missions - not my vision of a beautiful clean green landscape!</p> <p>In the past I have spent time on these fields picking up the litter, repairing the damage to fences caused by locals, removing the blockages in the brook so that the cattle can access the supposedly clean and free flowing water. The people whom are wanting to keep the area a 'greenbelt' don't mention how much household junk is thrown over the fence onto the fields and do these people come and help to clear any of the rubbish/mess up - NO never ever, but they like to complain about what an eye sore it is.</p> <p>As for the Wildlife aspect on these fields - forget it, Joe public, cats and dogs all played their part in destroying this many years before the "Chapel Visioners" even came about!</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Chapel needs more housing with properly developed walkways, + a link road to relieve Long Lane and the Warmbrook fields are more suited for this than any housing projects at the top end of Chapel. The comments by people supporting the green belt say that the owners are just money grabbing need to think again, this will give Chapel township the opportunity for businesses to expand and should embrace the opportunity of continued growth and income.</p>
Mr Paul Barratt	CP39	<p>Warmbrook land</p> <p>The land has been used by people taking drugs and leaving needles, tin cans, bottles and general rubbish which has consistently been cleared by the owners. The fields are of poor quality agriculture land and I do not agree with them being included in the open/green spaces plan.</p> <p>If the land is developed there could be a walk way along the brook with picnic areas and cycle paths for all to enjoy. With reference to access the narrow long lane can be widened from the brook bridge to the railway bridge and a link road and cycle path onto Long Lane for better access to the school, leisure centre and train station so people can cycle to these places and not use their cars.</p> <p>There is clearly a need for more homes in Chapel as all the new development on marsh green site have all been sold mainly to local people.</p>
Mr Grant Lowe Williamson	CP40	<p>Green Spaces- Target Field and Warmbrook</p> <p>I find it hard to believe that this area which has been ear-marked for development for most of my life is still not able to reach it's full potential of providing housing and communal living. The green grazing pastures that this used to be has been destroyed long ago by the neighbouring community making it unfit for safe and sustainable animal husbandry, through pets running about freely, fouling the land and waterway, littering the afore-mentioned</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>with household waste and debris, which the Council has done little to deter or stop. I despair at those who think they have a right to trespass on other people's property and am in utter disbelief at the claims of wildlife and natural habitat concerns, it has been ravaged and destroyed by it's human neighbours.</p> <p>With sensible and friendly development, this could become highly desirable and eco-friendly environment for whole of Chapel to enjoy. Thoughtful road planning helping to relieve Chapel's traffic congestion. Making the waterway an attraction to entice natural wildlife and flora back to the area.</p>
<p>Ms Naomi Doughty Environment Agency</p>	<p>CP41</p>	<p>The Environment Agency has reviewed the Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan (Examination Version) and we're satisfied that there are no environmental constraints within our remit that impact upon the proposed housing and employment land allocations.</p> <p>We ask to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and of future progress with the Plan.</p>
<p>Mrs Jean Bailey</p>	<p>CP42</p>	<p>People who come into Chapel shop outside of the area and generally work outside of the area, if they work at all! We do not have the facilities: shops, parking, road and transport networks, schools or doctors to cope with any more house building.</p> <p>It seems to me that the only people in support of building on the Target Field and Warmbrook are the owners of the land and their friends. People have walked their dogs on this land for as long as I can remember. My children played in these fields. Does it never occur to those complaining about litter etc</p> <p>that this problem only arose when people moved into new housing developments in the area, people with no understanding of, or respect for the green spaces around them!</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>There are many existing houses in Chapel that have been up for sale for many months, even years. Supposed affordable Housing at Mirey Meadow which appears to be all sold is unoccupied! This would seem to indicate a housing surplus, not the need for more development!</p>
<p>Mr Chris Sizeland CJK Packaging Ltd</p>	<p>CP43</p>	<p>Employment Policy EP7: Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>1 The Chapel Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was compiled by Chapel Vision (CV) who consisted of local members of the public and parish councillors.</p> <p>2 We submitted a proposal to CV that the Old Mill Tip at Bridgeholme Industrial Estate (BIE) be classified as employment land in the NP in order to safeguard the future of our Company and Employees, and also allow modest expansion and the resulting employment growth.</p> <p>3 We made a presentation to the CV members that was extremely well received and supported by them, and they included it in the NP.</p> <p>4 However when the consultation version was published last December, not only had the proposal been removed from the NP, the rest of the Industrial Estate had been reduced in size, and extremely onerous conditions had been put on any future development on the main BIE site.</p> <p>5 Therefore local members of the public were unable to comment on a proposal that was likely to have a very high level of support from them.</p> <p>6 The Old Mill Tip is ostensibly classified as being in the Green Belt (GB), though nobody seems to know why. Historically it within the curtilage and effectively part of the main industrial estate.</p> <p>7 We took the necessary measures to ensure that it would be included in the High Peak Borough Council Landscape Impact Assessment review.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>8 The result of this LIA review was that throughout the HPLP area various new pieces of land were proposed to be added to the GB, and some taken out.</p> <p>9 However, the Old Mill Tip had not been included in the review, so once again members of the public were excluded from commenting at a consultation stage (in this case the HPLP consultation stage).</p> <p>10 On contacting HPBC officers we were advised that they had been instructed not to include the land in the LIA review.</p> <p>11 The LIA review is conducted by independent consultants who can scrutinise all proposals and come to reasoned decision without bias or pressure from vested interests.</p> <p>12 After the intervention of our local MP, a second LIA was commissioned that included the Old Tip. The Independent consultants' recommendation was that the Old Tip should definitely be employment land and part of the industrial estate, and not part of the GB.</p> <p>13 A copy of the independent consultants report can be found on the Council's web-site.</p> <p>14 Their findings are on page 13 of the report.</p> <p>15 By the time this second LIA review was published the consultation stages were finished leaving only the current submission stage for any comments.</p> <p>16 To sum up we respectfully ask that the Mill Tip be reinstated as employment land in the NP, and that the recommendations of the independent LIA review are implemented. That the onerous conditions on the main industrial estate in the NP be replaced by the conditions in the LIA review, and that the reduction in size of the main BIE site be reversed.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Mark Mullett	CP44	<p>The plan allows for new houses to be built, it's not a NIMBY plan, it suggests several brown field sites. However I see little need for any building until there is demand for what's built. I drive through Chapel daily and I see the amount of 'For Sale' signs, we have plenty of housing for all income brackets. There is simply no need for new housing a few resources or jobs to support anyone that moved into them. The HPBC website is covered with pictures of our countryside, if we continue to build needless, unwanted housing then it should be updated to desolate tarmac.</p>
Ms Anne Holloway	CP45	<p>I have no financial interest in the development of the greenfield sites surrounding Chapel. My primary concern is for the existing resident's quality of life - something which we are all entitled to have valued above the need for profit. Chapel is a small market town, it does not have the infrastructure to support the level of housing that the land owners and developers are planning. Doctors, Dentists and Schools are over subscribed and traffic is reaching saturation point.</p> <p>Latest figures for growth demonstrate that the council have wildly over estimated the housing need in this area. If the houses are not occupied by local people, by this I mean currently residing in the High Peak, then they should not be built. Where there is a local need, then brown field sites have to be the priority.</p> <p>I wholeheartedly support the Neighbourhood Plan. The people of Chapel Vision have done an amazing job in the face of pressure from the land owners and developers who saw the chance to build just because we had no plan in place to stop such opportunism.</p>
Ms Rachael Bust The Coal Authority	CP46	<p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas to ensure that it is built safely and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing.</p> <p>The Chapel-en-le-Frith parish area lies outside of the current defined surface coal resource. Therefore none of the allocated sites raise any issues relating to mineral sterilisation of coal resources.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>According to the Coal Authority Development High Risk Area Plans for High Peak, there are mine entries and unrecorded historic coal workings mining legacy risks from past coal mining activity within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for future development, however none of these coincide with the areas of mining legacy, therefore no consideration as to the risks to surface stability needs to be considered in detail.</p> <p>The Coal Authority wishes the Parish Council every success with the examination of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Mr Hobson	CP47	<p>Allowing more houses to be built in Chapel serves no purpose other than lining the pockets of greedy land owners. It frustrates me hugely that the very strong public feeling against more housing developments seems to have so far been swept aside as if local residents opinions really don't matter. It is quite obvious that there are plenty of houses on the market in all price brackets, We don't need more!</p> <p>There are not the facilities in Chapel to support any more increase in population. One small petrol station, and schools, dentists and doctors that are full! Anyone with an ounce of logic would see how crazy the idea of more houses is. We are very lucky to live in such a beautiful part of the country, and it will be a sad day if more of it gets covered in horrible yellow brick Monopoly style houses. If more housing must be built only brownfield sites should be considered and it should meet the social/affordable housing demand that exists. Well done to all involved for the time and effort put in to the neighbourhood plan.</p>
Mr Richard Weedon	CP48	Support.
Mr Chris Sizeland	CP49	EP4 - NEW EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT SITES (Sites ES4 and ES5)

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
CJK Packaging Ltd		<p>Given the chronic lack of employment land in the area, it would be sensible for these sites to extend northwards slightly up to the logical and natural boundary with the A6 bypass. Aesthetically this would put them on a similar maximum elevation line to the adjoining already developed Peakdale Molecular site. These sites are carried over as allocations from the previous 2005 Local Plan but because of their odd shapes do not appear to have been viable to develop during the intervening period. The suggested amendment would make them a regular shape and is likely to now make development viable. This would be a very easy and relatively painless way of providing desperately needed extra local employment land that can actually be delivered.</p>
Mr Jeffrey Barratt	CP50	<p>If you are in support of drug use, fly tipping, dog fouling and degrading the Chapel area then you will be the ones that will be supporting the non development of the " Target Field and Warmbrook Sites". In my eyes this land lends itself perfectly for development and if done so considerably and in line with the local area at present it would create a up market housing area with beautiful sites. With making the most of the brook instead of it being polluted and misused.</p>
Mr Alan Theyer	CP51	<p>ES5 Bowden Hey Road</p> <p>I strongly oppose development of this site that would eventually encroach onto the historical High Peak Tramway and also destroy yet another unique public footpath. Footpath 75 To Bowden Hall.</p> <p>Whole Plan</p> <p>Before any further building development is considered i would ask the planning authorities to have a look at previous developments. Far from the artists impressions submitted to the council before development. Garages if provided are invariably turned into another room. Car parking spaces off road are usually taken up by a caravan or trailer. And all this traffic is put onto the public road grass verge or footpath. Most of the side roads are already congested. On Bowden Lane we again failed to receive a collection of litter bins for four weeks because of vehicles obstructing access. Where is all the additional traffic going to park !</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
D J Saxby	CP52	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
C L Saxby	CP53	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Elizabeth McCormick	CP54	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Glynne McCormick	CP55	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Christopher McCormick	CP56	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs Christine Clements	CP57	<p>If additional housing were to be built where would the occupants work? We no longer have the volume of jobs at Federal Mogul and an influx of newcomers would make it even more difficult for our youngsters to find employment. People who live locally are already looking for work in an ever shrinking market.</p> <p>There is also the inevitable contraction of the public services, could our schools cope with more pupils at a time when staff numbers may be cut? The local authority has had its funding cut. An influx of additional residents would mean that services such as for children, the disabled and elderly would have to be stretched even further. It is already impossible to find an NHS dentist in the area. Is the same going to happen to Doctors?</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>We need to preserve the character of Chapel en le Frith for future generations and protect our countryside for the enjoyment of others. The rural location attracts visitors to the area.</p>
Mrs Mary Williamson	CP58	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Fred Williamson	CP59	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Paul Barratt	CP60	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs Janet Bean	CP61	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Chris Bean	CP62	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Stuart Williamson	CP63	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Christine Barratt	CP64	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Mr Mark Williamson	CP65	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs Jacqueline Williamson	CP66	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
L Smart	CP67	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr J P Togel	CP68	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs Gillian Pearson	CP69	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr P Hobson	CP70	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
K Goodwin	CP71	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Mr Phil Barratt	CP72	<p>Warmbrook and Target Field</p> <p>Many of you have commented about the local Wildlife being a keen nature enthusiast myself and spending most of my spare time out in the beautiful countryside I fear for the safety of the wildlife on this designated site. With polluted grounds and natural springs, the inconsideration of local dog owners allowing their dogs to run riot and foul uncontrollably across the land and the local youths using the grounds for their filthy habits and leaving their paraphernalia is yet another hazard for birds and other creatures of the land. With a development on this site it would not only tidy the area up but could also</p> <p>provide a safer environment for people and wildlife alike.</p>
Mr Phil Barratt	CP73	<p>Warmbrook and Target Field</p> <p>Many of you have commented about the local Wildlife being a keen nature enthusiast myself and spending most of my spare time out in the beautiful countryside I fear for the safety of the wildlife on this designated site. With polluted grounds and natural springs, the inconsideration of local dog owners allowing their dogs to run riot and foul uncontrollably across the land and the local youths using the grounds for their filthy habits and leaving their paraphernalia is yet another hazard for birds and other creatures of the land. With a development on this site it would not only tidy the area up but could also provide a safer environment for people and wildlife alike.</p>
S Hackney	CP74	I support the plan in its current form. Although I think that the 813 houses already approved is excessive and will have a detrimental affect on the local area, putting undue pressure on local services i.e. schools, doctors, dentists, leisure facilities. The plan for building further houses should be structured and in line with what local people require not as it is currently as a free for all allowing a mass influx of people into a area with already limited facilities.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I have read other comments by several people which are just direct copies of each other stating that more than the 454 houses should be built but obviously they have not fully read the plan which states 813 houses have now received planning permission at October 2013.</p> <p>Policy C2: Local Green Spaces</p> <p>I would actually like to see the local green spaces extended to give a green buffer around the town, especially the target wall and woodland adjacent to warmbrook to include all the fields up to Long Lane and in the opposite direction to the main road. We could then extend the warmbrook trail and enhance the current public right of way through the target wall field to Ashbourne Road with additional signage from the town centre so easier for walkers to find and use these routes. This would mean working with the current land owners / executors of the will of the green spaces allowing for fencing and hedging to be installed to separate the public and livestock and the path to be improved to allow easier access on foot or by cycle i.e like the cinder track to Combs. In fact the trail could be extended on the south side of the brook right up to the path to the train station by the rail bridge at Martinside. This would prevent any unrestricted access into the fields and associated dog fouling, dogs running wild which seems to be such a theme in other comments. It was such a pity that the target wall was demolished and is still left in a pile on the adjacent farm road (could it be reinstated after all this time, providing a local tourist attraction).</p> <p>We could potentially plant more trees in green field areas if this would be possible in conjunction with land owners allowing the town to live up to its name of "Chapel in the forest" and adding a theme. Potentially in time this could be a pull for tourists with the correct planning i.e an enhancement to current mountain bike and walking trails, cyclocross courses, rope courses through the trees and even being educational for the local schools.</p>
Mrs P Thomson	CP75	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Ms Wendy Mahar	CP76	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Ms Kirsty Thetford	CP77	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Peter Walker	CP78	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
J G Ellison	CP79	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
H Williams	CP80	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
J Williams	CP81	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Ms Julie Holmes	CP82	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr G J Collyer	CP83	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Miss Rebecca Barratt	CP84	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs Elizabeth Barratt	CP85	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
M Thompson	CP86	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
S Thompson	CP87	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Stewart Hobson	CP88	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs Jackie Hobson	CP89	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Liam Partington	CP90	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Ms Chantel Thetford	CP91	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Ian Birchenough	CP92	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Mark Byatte	CP93	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs Patricia Byatte	CP94	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Robin Longden	CP95	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs J Longden	CP96	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Nicholas Hall	CP97	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Mrs Janet Hall	CP98	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr John Kappes	CP99	<p>Whole Plan and Target Wall Field and adjacent fields</p> <p>Having read all comments to date especially those opposing the Neighbourhood Plan it should be remembered that this Plan has been developed by Local People for Local People and by referendum. Some have resorted to 'name calling', allegedly some of these representations are not by people living in Chapel Parish. The areas in question are part of the character of Chapel-en-le-Frith, and whilst it is accepted that there is a need for more housing the number planned for at present is 850+, to increase the size Chapel-en-le-Frith by as much again would be too much, there are already 2,500 houses here this 850+ gives an additional 34%, another similar quantity as opponents of the plan would give an overall increase of 68%. With regard to comments about condition of the fields, cattle have grazed there for many, many years, I have been a frequent user of these fields for running, walking and winter activities, I have never seen 'household rubbish' or hypodermic needles at any time nor are there any Police records relating to this. Any more housebuilding could result in a fall in house prices and some peoples houses falling into negative equity, paying a higher mortgage than their property is worth. Our green pleasant countryside is a worthy legacy for our children and their children, money only lasts until it is spent.</p>
Mr Dave Bennett High Peak Access Group	CP100	<p>Consultation Statement</p> <p>Policy H1- Removal of reference to Accessible homes.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>It is disappointing that a reference to the provision of accessible homes has been removed from the overall policy statement. The National Planning Policy Framework refers to achieving sustainable development through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Requiring good design. 2 Promoting healthy communities. 3 create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and also : <p>To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should:</p> <p>plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities).</p> <p>To remove an overall reference to providing accessible homes seems to go against the principles referred to in the NPPF and not to recognise the increasing need for lifetime homes.</p> <p>Policy H9: Design Criteria Streets for all</p> <p>Streets should be designed in a way that encourages low vehicle speeds and allows the streets to function as social spaces. There needs to be recognition of the use of appropriate tactile paving, dropped kerbs and other aids to assist disabled people with visual impairments or wheelchair users.</p> <p>Policy TC10: Car Parking Reserved Sites</p> <p>Parking spaces will be of a size and standard that meet relevant guidance as set out in the County Parking Standards. There should be reference here to the provision of accessible parking spaces to assist disabled people.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>POLICY C4: Walking, Footpaths and Public Rights of Way</p> <p>Footpaths and rights of way should be protected from development. In any new developments, provision should be made to extend the routes for walkers and cyclists, including, where possible, routes linking into the countryside network as well as into the town and to accommodate people of all ages and abilities, including those with push chairs and wheel chairs. Reference should be made here to visually impaired people and disabled people in general.</p>
<p>Ms Sarah Stansfield Oldham Council</p>	CP101	<p>Thank you for contacting Oldham Council on the Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan Examination document. We have no comments to make on the Plan, however, the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan is of interest to us and we would be grateful if we could be kept informed of future stages of the Plan. We would also like to be kept informed of any future High Peak Borough Council consultations.</p>
<p>Mr Chris Sizeland CJK Packaging Ltd</p>	CP102	<p>I would like the opportunity to address the inspector on the following subjects:</p> <p>1 EP4/5 - NEW EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT SITES (Sites ES4 and ES5)</p> <p>2 EP5 - EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATION - General</p> <p>3 EP7: BRIDGEHOLME INDUSTRIAL ESTATE</p>
<p>Cllr Audrey Bramah</p>	CP103	<p>I fully support with modification the plan for Bridgeholme Ind. Estate to expand onto the Old Tip Site. This derelict piece of land is in need of 'tidying up' and will become an asset to industry if included.</p>
<p>Mr Richard Purser Federal Mogul</p>	CP104	<p>Federal-Mogul supports the Vision Statement and objectives and Section 1 Housing of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) subject to an additional housing allocation at land at Stodhart Farm, Hayfield Road, Chapel-en-le-Frith. The allocation will provide an alternative, viable, developable and deliverable site for additional housing within the plan period. In brief the additional housing allocation provides the following attributes:</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>(1) Approximately 50% of the site area is already within the existing settlement boundary of Chapel.</p> <p>(2) None of the land is situated within the designated Green Belt situated to the north of the site beyond the A6 bypass corridor.</p> <p>(3) None of the land is designated in the emerging NP Policy C1 as 'Areas of Landscape identified by local people as being of particularly special'.</p> <p>(4) The site is a sustainable location for housing forming a direct relationship with the built-up area of Chapel, and access to its services and facilities.</p> <p>(5) The site is accessible from an existing main road frontage, proximate to bus routes and within walking and cycling distance to the town centre and employment opportunities within Chapel.</p> <p>(6) The site is capable of providing around 60-70 units.</p> <p>(7) The site is capable of providing family housing and affordable housing in accordance with emerging Policy H6.</p> <p>(8) The site is in a single ownership (presently tenanted), and is considered capable of development and deliverable within the plan period to 2028.</p> <p>The land is a discrete parcel bounded tightly by the offices of Federal-Mogul to south, Hayfield Road to the east with homes beyond, the elevated (embankment) A6 bypass to the north and railway corridor to the west. Removal of the land parcel from open countryside into the defined built-up area of Chapel would not, in our view, harm any objective for protection through Green Belt or other designation of open land to west, north or further to the east beyond the clearly defined boundaries of the site. Development would also include any necessary buffer to the railway and A6 corridors for amenity, which would become landscaped to further strengthen this new urban edge.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>The allocation of a further 70 homes within Chapel and the Neighbourhood Plan area will provide a means to robustly defend unplanned development elsewhere on the edge of Chapel or open countryside that would, in comparison to the loss of this discrete parcel of land, cause greater harm to the attributes of the countryside.</p> <p>Policy C1</p> <p>To support the proposed Housing Allocation it becomes necessary to remove, and thus to object to, the proposed allocation of approximately 50% of the proposed housing site allocation as a Special Landscape Area; or in our view 'open countryside'.</p>
<p>Mr Graham Broome Highways Agency</p>	CP105	<p>It is the role of the Agency to maintain and safeguard the future operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), and to act as a delivery partner to national economic growth. The Agency notes that the Plan has been prepared by the Parish Council in order to ensure that the local population have a stronger influence over the way change and development takes place over the coming years. The Agency welcomes the Council's commitment to ensuring that the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan accord with the High Peak Borough Council's developing Local Plan, as required. It notes that the Neighbourhood Plan area for the Parish Council is a significant distance from the Strategic Road Network (SRN). With this said, the Agency does not consider that the Parish Council's plans for a minimum of 454 new homes to be delivered across the Plan period will have any significant impact upon the operation of the M1 or A628 as the nearest SRN in the area.</p>
<p>Mr Nicholas Ratcliffe</p>	CP106	<p>EP7: Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>The site has a peculiar cut out in the proposed green belt area which includes the proposed area to be developed: why is this? I do not suggest that 'dark forces' are at work; this may simply be an oversight. The land is of poor quality, a former tip with visible evidence of prior buildings. A fence line is established to the rear of existing buildings towards the tram line/test track in which is encompassed the area in question! Surely a straight line to the green belt would make common sense rather than an arbitrary cut out.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>The land between the viaduct and the site is a flood plain, with a flood defence system built in, highly unlikely to be a future target for expansion for dwellings. There would appear to be little or no detrimental effect to the surrounding environs by allowing a limited industrial development. I also feel that the green belt should be protected, with sensible modification. There is a possibility of further jobs being created, certainly present jobs retained.</p> <p>All that said, I would think the best way forward is for the owner to apply for the necessary planning permission and let that be the arbiter.</p>
Angela Rowbotham	CP107	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>I do not see any reason why this company cannot be allowed to expand. This site has been much improved. This site is now a pleasure to walk through.</p>
Ms Charlotte Gill	CP108	<p>Area 7 - Target wall field and Warmbrook</p> <p>I would like to see Warmbrook developed because I think it would make a nice, attractive development with footpaths, cycle paths, open space for the public as well as housing. Landscaped, attractive spaces with walk ways and much needed infrastructure can only improve the town for all to enjoy. Due to recent housing developments, Long Lane would be better with a relief road due to new housing there and Warmbrook is the only site to provide it.</p> <p>Warmbrook is poor grazing ground that dog walkers use, allowing their dogs to roam and foul without picking up, it is not currently an attractive space. Youths use it for parties, drinking and drugs too. A development of this site would be a positive step forward.</p>
Rebecca Gill	CP109	<p>Area 7 - Target wall field and Warmbrook</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Previously highlighted as an area for expansion of Chapel, Warmbrook is a natural progression for a quality housing development which would enhance the area. Landscaped, attractive spaces with sympathetic walk ways and much needed infrastructure can only bring prosperity to the town. The land will only deteriorate further if it is not developed; dog walkers persistently use it as waste land to let their dogs run loose, foul without picking up and without consideration for the livestock at risk of disease from this.</p> <p>Over the years this land has proved ever more popular with youngsters with no where to go; gathering for parties, littering the land with cans and hypodermic needles, again putting animals and people at risk. It is becoming more difficult to farm this already poor grazing land and it will only continue to deteriorate further.</p>
Samantha Barratt	CP110	<p>Area 7 - Target wall field and Warmbrook</p> <p>I support Warmbrook being put forward as part of the plan because as a resident in the area for many years I have seen this land deteriorate to what it was when I was a young girl. I regularly walk around the area and see teenagers partying / camping on the land and making a mess, leaving litter everywhere - the landowners have to clear up after them which is not acceptable. Dog walkers make such a mess not picking up their mess that development is the only way forward. I feel this area would make an attractive development which could possibly have the bridge restored with paths and walks around the area.</p>
Joyce Hall	CP111	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>I would like to support the application to build on the piece of land known as Mill Tip. There is a severe shortage of industrial land and no alternative site can be offered in Chapel as houses or supermarkets are priority. This piece of land does not warrant green belt status.</p>
Hayley Gould	CP112	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>This land is not really green belt. There should be no reason why the company can not expand onto it.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Peter Soden	CP113	<p>The government has clearly stated its intention to give local people more say in local development through the mechanism of Neighbourhood Plans. Residents of Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish have prepared a sound Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish in line with the wishes of 1000 local people who responded to Chapel Vision surveys. High Peak Borough Council should recognise this and start to give due weight to the Neighbourhood Plan and its policies immediately.</p> <p>I particularly wish to express support for the proposed Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Special Landscape Area and all of the Proposed Local Green Spaces. The responses to this current phase of the consultation include a number of comments from supporters related to the consortium wishing to develop on the Target Wall Field. Please note the evidence supplied with the Neighbourhood Plan, which shows that over 200 local people petitioned and commented in support of designating that specific area as a Local Green Space (LGS7).</p>
Mr Joseph Sizeland	CP114	<p>Bridgeholme Ind Estate</p> <p>Bridgeholme Ind Estate needs to be expanded due to allow for reasonable employment growth. I am employed here and I cannot see any reason why we cannot expand onto the tip heap. Why was this taken out of the neighbourhood plan? Everybody I speak to supports this even more now considering that the amount of people in Chapel-en-le-Frith is growing rapidly and employment is needed.</p>
Mrs Elaine Smith	CP115	<p>Section 5</p> <p>I want to give my support to the Areas of Special Landscape and in particular the Target Field Map Ref. 7. The land beyond the Warmbrook Stream is an important and natural boundary for which no development should take place. This area provides a wealth of wildlife habitat and enjoyment opportunities for residents & visitors. We are seeing huge numbers of existing housing up for sale because of the over development which is currently taking place and Chapel is losing it's appeal for rural living.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>The loss of the green fields on Long Lane is appalling. The visual eyesore that will be phase 2 of the current Seddons development is a terrible loss to local residents and users of Long Lane/Station Road, this includes myself as I walk my dog along this route meeting other resident dog walkers, all of us objected to this development but to no avail. Any further encroachment onto open countryside should be stopped and the land shown as special areas protected.</p>
Mr Roger Smith	CP116	<p>SECTION 5: COUNTRYSIDE</p> <p>I give my strong support to the extension of the special landscape area as identified in figure 3. This needs to be implemented without delay. My property lies within the special landscape area to the south of the railway on Long Lane. We have a number of nesting owls, sparrow hawks and have supported breeding wild geese, waterfowl, buzzards, as well as a large population of smaller birds. Development approved on Long Lane will have an effect, potentially on the owl population, and I believe that extension of the built up area around Chapel will have a considerable affect on the viability of the remaining countryside within a large surrounding area.</p> <p>To the south of Chapel-en-le-Frith Warmbrook provides a significant visual boundary with a corridor of woodland either side of the stream. The land above Warmbrook rises sharply, and provides a significant visual benefit for existing residents of Chapel-en-le-Frith. The land additionally has significant</p> <p>benefit when viewing Chapel-en-le-Frith from the Countryside beyond in providing a clear definition of development, and preserving the valuable quality beyond the town centre. Eric Pickles has stressed in the last few weeks the need for local authorities to preserve countryside and not allow housing development in open countryside. The ministers comments must be respected.</p> <p>SECTION 1: HOUSING</p> <p>I support the principles of controlled housing levels, but with modification. I do not support the disproportionate number of smaller homes. There appears no justification that housing which is of poor space standards should be constructed with no provision for larger homes. This significantly downgrades the mix of housing. The current</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>number of vacant or “for sale” properties indicates a current oversupply of housing. There can be no justification under any circumstances for uncontrolled additional development, and as well as stating a minimum figure a maximum figure needs to be defined – and with the current level of approvals that figure is now achieved. Development should now be restricted to the small infill developments, or exceptionally on redundant brown field sites. There is no prospect of increased employment matching the numbers of new housing. Chapel-en-le-Frith is likely to have a declining long term employment position as planning approvals for mineral extraction in the national park are worked out. Commuting to Manchester or Stockport has poor links. Frequently the rail service is unable to fit returning passengers onto the train. Traffic Flow on the A6 has improved during the recent recession, but this is an indication of reduced employment prospects. Winter travel problems on routes to Glossop, Macclesfield, Chesterfield etc are a considerable impediment to supporting the concept of Chapel-en-le-Frith as a commuter town. Currently there are no sixth form opportunities for school children in Chapel-en-le-Frith, doctors surgeries are stretched, there is no local Accident and Emergency, and this is further compounded by consultation to move A&E from Stockport to Wythenshaw.</p> <p>For all these reasons no further larger housing developments should be considered, and particularly to the South of Chapel-en-le-Frith.</p>
Mrs S Johnson	CP117	<p>POLICY H1</p> <p>If 813 homes have received planning permission as stated in Appendix 2, which comfortably exceeds the minimum target of 454 homes provided by the Borough Council, then in my opinion no further planning permission should be granted for any further development. This huge percentage increase in housing in the area is NOT supported by an equivalent percentage increase in infrastructure. I value education and children deserve to be educated in schools that are not overcrowded so the next generation of Chapel High School graduates can also pursue promising careers. I value health provision</p> <p>for all and have concerns about the extra workloads placed on GP surgeries and the safe management of patients.</p> <p>POLICY C2</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I support the designation of Local Green Spaces and in particular I support LGS 7 Warmbrook and Target Fields. The Wardell Armstrong Landscape Impact Assessment commissioned by HPBC in January 2014 appears to be a comprehensive independent document which studied the landscape surrounding Chapel-en-le-Frith, the Target and Warmbrook Fields appear to be clearly marked as an area that could NOT accommodate development in landscape terms. The Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan supporting</p> <p>documentation for LGS 7 clearly details the criteria and reasons for protection with photographic evidence of the beautiful area with public footpaths and wildlife. A newspaper article and photographs show the historic Target Wall and its fate. Also noted is the fact that in March 2014 200 people signed a petition stating that this site is special to local people and supporting its designation as an LGS.</p> <p>POLICY C5</p> <p>I support the Protection of Local Valued Areas with a view to the outcome of future planning applications.</p>
Mrs Ruth George	CP118	<p>As a resident of Chapel Parish, I support the Neighbourhood Plan as having been drawn up by local residents in the spirit of localism, following extensive consultation with almost 1,000 people in the Parish to best fit with both the wishes of local people and the local and national policies with which the Plan needs to comply.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p> <p>H1</p> <p>I fully support the numbers of new homes allocated within Policy H1, but wish to see the Town Centre sites identified as being for Accessible Homes, as they are referred to in Policy H6. There is already extant permission for 857 new homes within Chapel Parish, most of which are on greenfield sites outside the built-up area boundary and are not as sustainable as those within the Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for a further 42 homes, making a total of 899. There are currently 3,600 households within the Parish, so this represents</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>an increase in the number of homes of 25%. As most of those with permission are for 3 and 4 bedroom properties, the increase in population is likely to be even more than 25%. There has been no strategic planning for this level of increase in population. Local services such as the main GP surgery are already struggling to cope with demand from the existing population and infrastructure, including roads, town centre parking, drainage and electricity are almost at capacity already.</p> <p>The rapid and high rate of growth may have been acceptable if it was part of a long-term and sustainable strategy on which there had been consultation with local people, and plans were in place to improve infrastructure as development increased. Further development could also change the character of Chapel-en-le-Frith as a small market town, endangering the tourist appeal that the Parish Council and others are seeking to develop. The Borough Council allocated 400 homes to Chapel Parish as a target for the duration of the Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan has exceeded this target by over 10%, allocating the most sustainable sites. There is no need for any further sites to be allocated, especially in Chapel Parish which has already taken the largest proportion of new development.</p> <p>The Town Centre sites are ideal locations for accessible homes adjacent to the centre of the town and should be allocated specifically for them.</p> <p>H4</p> <p>I support the policy that larger developments should demonstrate how they meet the needs of current and future households in the NP area. Most homes which have been given permission are 3 or 4 bedroom homes, yet as the SHMA of April 2014 points out at page 152, an appropriate mix of housing for High Peak as a whole would be: 10% - 1 bedroom flats; 45% - 2 bedroom properties; 30% - 3 bedroom properties; 10% - 4 bedroom properties.</p> <p>H6</p> <p>I support the affordable housing requirement to enable more affordable homes to be built in Chapel. In Chapel, the greenfield site on Long Lane has been bought and developed with 50% affordable housing, showing that this is viable on greenfield sites.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>C2</p> <p>Hundreds of local people expressed their views about the local green spaces in and around the town that were special to them and much work has been undertaken to document the varying reasons for this. As my comments on H1 showed, there is no requirement for any additional land for housing other than that designated in this Plan, and therefore no reason why the Local Green Spaces proposed should not be given protection from development.</p>
Mr D Madden	CP119	<p>H1 and C1</p> <p>The proposed Special Landscape Area appears to cover the entirety of parish land falling outside the currently defined built up area boundary. In the case of properties along the north side of Manchester Road this is inappropriate, since a large proportion of the properties, moving west from Crossings Road, currently have land incorporated into their gardens that are within the proposed SLA. This leaves open the possibility that excessive constraints could be placed on land which currently forms part of the domestic curtilage of those properties, so the SLA boundary should be redefined to exclude those areas of land that are part of domestic curtilages. Likewise, since the built up area boundary as currently defined does not reflect the extent of the domestic curtilages in this area, this anomaly should be removed by the revision of the built up area boundary to include those areas of land that are incorporated within domestic curtilages.</p> <p>The plan limits the nomination of suitable sites essentially to those that have already received planning permission, based on the assertion that this meets the minimum need associated with Chapel Parish. This limitation is justified on the basis of the lack of availability of suitable sites. However, the Plan does not consider all sites that may be suitable and it is not clear from the evidence base how the sites that have been considered were chosen. Suitable sustainable sites have previously been notified to both Chapel Vision and HPBC during the consultation periods on their respective plans including, inter alia, the domestic curtilages on Manchester Road. These sites would be meet the NPPF definition of sustainability and are readily deliverable, but nothing of this appears within the evidence base, and the reasons for their exclusion are not clear.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Martin Duncan	CP120	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>Very keen to see a local business and employer allowed to grow their business by expanding into the old tip site.</p>
Dr Andrew Bartholomew	CP121	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan should cover the same plan period as the emerging Local Plan which proposes to run from 2011 to 2031.</p> <p>Various policies in the plan have not been supported by an up to date, robust evidence base and in the main is made up of unsupported opinion.</p> <p>The changes proposed to overall housing requirements in the High Peak Local Plan are not reflected in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. Given the Government's priority to boost the supply of new homes, the Neighbourhood Plan needs to increase the housing allocations in order to conform with the emerging plan before it can proceed further. We contend that for the Plan to conform to the basic conditions, further consultation should have taken place based on up to date evidence.</p> <p>Given the ongoing failure of the High Peak Local Plan to identify sufficient sites to meet its overall objectively assessed housing need, additional sites urgently need to be identified throughout the High Peak area, including the Chapel Parish area to meet the full identified need. There are a number of sites in sustainable locations that should be included within the plan to make up the overall shortfall throughout the plan area but no attempt has been made to identify any additional sites. Land at 141 Manchester Road should be allocated for residential development.</p> <p>Policy H2 requires any scheme for more than 6 houses to have a design brief "agreed with Chapel Parish Council prior to being submitted as part of any application". The element of pre-approval should be removed from this policy to ensure that the plan is not overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Policy H3. As currently drafted, this policy lacks any definition and is open to wide subjectivity to try and determine what is meant by eg "high quality".</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Policy H4. The Draft Local Plan Policy H4 is less prescriptive in terms of the mix of housing required than the Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan policy should be amended to reflect the wording of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy H6 is still unnecessarily complicated and prescriptive.</p> <p>Policy H7. The element of pre-approval should be removed from this policy to ensure that the plan is not overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Policy H8. The policy sets out a long list of ‘Forgotten Elements’ that need to be integrated into an overall scheme. This is considered unclear and their inclusion in this policy is over prescriptive.</p> <p>Policy H9. In general the policy is poorly worded and includes elements which are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Policy C1. The effect of the proposed policy would be to categorise all land outside the existing settlement boundaries that is not currently within the Peak National Park as either a “Special Landscape Area” or “Areas of landscape identified by local people as being particularly special”. This would not meet the requirement to be in in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy C2. The policy appears to seek to prevent development other than on previously developed land within the settlement boundary and should be deleted. If the policy is not deleted, we object also to the proposed allocation of Area 24. As a private garden it ‘serves’ only the residents of 141 Manchester Road and cannot be considered to be ‘demonstrably special’ or ‘hold particular local significance’.</p>
Mrs Pat Soden	CP122	<p>I wish to support the Neighbourhood Plan. In particular I wish to support the Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>Chapel Vision members have tried hard to consider the views of local people in preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and it has become clear that the majority of residents wish to protect the remaining countryside of Chapel Parish. Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Special Landscape Area in the plan is important to local people and to visitors</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>because of the beautiful views and lovely walks it provides. The Special Landscape Area is also important for wildlife species living there. Many of these cannot be relegated to small patches of land nor can they be moved. They need large areas of land where they live now with additional buffer zones to protect them.</p> <p>A kind of madness has descended on Chapel Parish as, in feverish haste and abetted by poor government policies and almost no support for protection of our countryside from High Peak Borough Council, landowners and developers prepare plans for development of more of our beautiful countryside. You can only build on countryside once but our children, our grandchildren, local people, visitors and wildlife can enjoy this countryside into the future if it is protected.</p>
Deni Scrafton	CP123	<p>My wife and I are relatively new to the peak district having lived here for just 14 years so you are getting an outsiders view. The big draw for us in Chapel was the views, tranquility of this small town and the friendliness of the people. In the context of the Target field and grazing land from this field to Long Lane, an added bonus has been the wide variety of wild life. There are no suitable roads leading to these sites, access and egress would be via Warmbrook and Thornbrook Roads already difficult to pass due to resident parking and narrowness of these roads. Warmbrook Road is also home to Chapel Infants School. During our time here we have witnessed this as a place for children to play safely, explore nature and generally have fun. Needless to say we support the field being kept as a green space.</p>
Mrs Sulenta Gunter	CP124	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The infrastructure is not there to support all these new families and homes. 2. There are a lot of empty houses already available with no jobs for the new incomers in the area. 3. The schools in Chapel are over full with too large class sizes. 4. The doctors' and dentist surgeries are not able to cope with the number of patients already. 5. Develop brown field sites first. 6. We will lose our tourist industry if the High Peak villages become inner city suburbs. 7. We have paid a premium in house prices to live in the Peak District National Park area and Greenfield development will spoil our enjoyment of that area.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
<p>Ms Sarah Smith</p> <p>Kirklees Metropolitan Council</p>	<p>CP125</p>	<p>Section 2: Employment, Tourism and Community Land Development Employment Policy EP6:</p> <p>No reference to site ES2. It is missing.</p> <p>Section 3: Town Centre Policy TC1: Extent of Chapel-en-le Firth Town Centre</p> <p>Reference made to a map on page 28. There is no map on page 28.</p> <p>Section 3: Town Centre Policy TC7: Small Local Shops</p> <p>No justification for the definition of a small shop in Dove Holes and other settlements. Why is there a size difference?</p> <p>Please continue to keep Kirklees Council informed of the progress of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p>
<p>Mr John Fleming</p> <p>Gladman Developments Ltd</p>	<p>CP126</p>	<p>Gladman consider that the Neighbourhood Plan at present in its publicised form fails to comply with paragraphs 16 & 184 of the Framework as well as failing to meet a number of the basic conditions. We consider that it may be more appropriate to delay work on the document until the emerging High Peak Local Plan has been tested at Examination.</p> <p>The draft Neighbourhood Plan policies do not appear to be supported by national or local policy requirements, are not justified by up to date evidence, lack clarity or appear to replicate national guidance and local policy requirements. Furthermore a number of these policies seek to go over and above of what is required as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>Gladman note that it would be useful to provide an illustration of the proposed housing allocations through a Neighbourhood Plan proposals map, this could also provide employment land allocations and constraints which affect Chapel-en-le-Frith parish.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Gladman are concerned that the Neighbourhood Plan in its current form is not sufficiently growth oriented and would effectively act to restrict growth, limiting development within the built form of the village. The Neighbourhood Plan although it allows for a number of units that have been permitted, fails to meet a number of basic conditions required for Neighbourhood Plans. Specifically the Neighbourhood Plan fails to have regard with an up to date Local Plan, in</p> <p>addition the Special Landscape Area and the Local Green Spaces which have been identified seem to restrict and constrain the potential for sustainable development proposals.</p>
Mr Robert Ford	CP127	<p>Bridgholme Mill Industrial Estate</p> <p>This old mill tip will be improved by the addition of a warehouse, will create jobs and will be part of the continued improvement of the estate.</p>
Ms Rosie Harding	CP128	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>I am in full support to the development of this piece of land in the corner of the estate. Thereby opposing the plan that it should remain "Green Belt" which it clearly is not the case given the existence of other industrial units on the site. For this reason I believe it should go ahead and also for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It has already improved the area. 2. It has improved the drainage of the site. 3. It is not interfering with the public footpath. 4. It will increase the opportunity for extra local employment. 5. It has the approval of the residents in the Mill and also that of our local MP Andrew Bingham.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Jill Healey	CP129	I am in full support of the Chapel Neighbourhood Plan as it stands. I strongly object to the erosion of the green fields in and around the town.
Mr John Kappes Protect High Peak	CP130	I have read in detail all comments and feel completely mystified why 21 people have submitted identical word for word, copied and pasted, documents. I doubt the integrity of their statements and wonder who the author is?
Mrs Gillian Pearson	CP131	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the "off street" cobbled section of the market place would have been a more sustainable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
S Thornhill	CP132	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the "off street" cobbled section of the market place would have been a more sustainable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Elizabeth McCormick	CP133	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the "off street" cobbled section of the market place would have been a more sustainable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
D Hell	CP134	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the "off street" cobbled section of the market place would have been a more sustainable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs Julie Heath	CP135	<p>Target Fields and Warnbrook site</p> <p>I would like to express my concerns about the plan to build houses on the Ferodo industrial site, which after the many years of industrial use, must be heavily contaminated. This will cost financially not only in the short term, but in the years to come. Building houses on a site that should really be used to build further commercial units to encourage business to this area, bringing prosperity to this market town. Then to leave a perfectly suitable site like Warnbrook which abuts onto the village boundary to grow fallow, on the pretext that it has significant wild life interest is at the very least absurd!!</p> <p>When are we going to wake up to interests of the future generations of this market town? Shall we just sit back and watch whilst the financial interests of the favoured few grow, and the rest of the community fails to grow. I think not.</p> <p>To all the powers that be, don't let the promise of a few votes at Election Day sway you in your choice to build a prosperous and welcoming Chapel-en-le-Frith.</p>
Mr Sydney Booth	CP136	<p>Bridgholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>Taking into consideration the vast improvements already done it could be taken for granted any expansion would be in good taste and create further employment.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs B Webster	CP137	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>This estate is much improved, this will create more jobs without any detriment to anybody else. This is only a piece of waste land.</p>
Mr Trevor Brocklehurst	CP138	<p>Bridgholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>I am a resident at Chapel-en-le-Frith of many years standing and regularly walk through the local countryside. Over the past few years I have observed and whole-heartedly approve the renovation that has been undertaken to the industrial units at Bridgeholm Mill the most recent of which being to resurface the parking areas and drives which must be greatly appreciated by the residents in the apartments alongside.</p> <p>I am given to understand that the owners of the premises now wish to extend the warehouse and are having difficulties obtaining the required approval. I cannot understand why there should be any resistance to such development. The proposed extension would cause no visual detriment, access and services are already in place so any development can only serve to improve local employment prospects surely a bonus in an area where so much new housing is being allowed and yet more proposed.</p> <p>In conclusion I can only say that I am somewhat confused that there has been any opposition to the proposal. Yet again it would seem the local authorities have a very poor grasp of what is actually best for the community.</p>
Mr P Johnson	CP139	<p>There are currently 833 houses for sale within 5 miles of Chapel and 115 for rent. More than enough to meet any housing demand now or in the future in the Parish (Rightmove 12/11/2014). Look on Jobsite for a job - you'll struggle to spot a vacancy that is actually exists in this area!</p>
Mr Robert Thomas	CP140	<p>I strongly support the local plan with some minor modifications. For me personally, as a resident of Chapel, the plan is an attempt to preserve our environment and outline a way forward. In doing so it takes into account the massive increase in housing/population that has already been approved. Reading the comments left by main</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>detractors of the plan, including the 43 identical ones which all seem to be pushing for the development of more housing estates, I struggle to understand where this drive for more housing is coming from. We live in a beautiful part of the country and its beauty is not in its housing estates but in the countryside and the wildlife it supports.</p> <p>My understanding is that over the last 18 months approval has been given for 813 new homes in Chapel. Using the High Peak figure of 2.3 people per household then 813 new properties represents an additional 1909 people moving into Chapel-en-le-Frith. Where are these people going to work? – I am not aware of any new large influx of industry into Chapel and hence no need for this volume of housing to meet the local population requirements. Can our existing Schools, Doctors and Dentists etc cope with this already approved increased demand? – I seriously doubt it. 813 new households gives (using the national average of 2 cars per household) a total of 1626 additional cars in Chapel. Our roads are already struggling to cope and it seems madness to suggest adding yet more housing estates.</p> <p>I do support the need for more employment in Chapel.</p> <p>Taking account of the above I support the whole plan and in particular section 5 on countryside, which restricts housing development beyond the defined built up area boundary as shown on figure 3 of the plan.</p>
Dr Andrew Bartholomew	CP141	<p>We strongly object to any of the land at 141 Manchester Road being designated as Local Green Space in the Neighbourhood Plan and formally request that the land is removed from proposed Local Green Space 24 for the following reasons.</p> <p>A) All of the land associated with 141 Manchester Road is and always has been private domestic garden.</p> <p>B) The Plan gives invalid reasons for protection of LGS24.</p> <p>Land at 141 Manchester Road that has been proposed as Local Green Space does not conform with any criteria for such designation and must be removed from proposed LGS24.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Edwina Currie Jones	CP142	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>There is a growing lack of land for industrial development in the area, whether for small or bigger businesses, and precious little for future expansion of successful enterprises. Yes, we need houses, but the people in them need jobs, and the more they have to commute outside the area, the heavier the damage to the environment we are trying to protect.</p> <p>A proposal has been made that the land at the south east (bottom right) of the industrial estate should be re-zoned for industry. This is the Old Mill Tip and virtually everyone supports this being designated as Employment land. It means that the operators on the Bridgeholme estate can expand at low cost</p> <p>and efficiently, and those working there can expect to retain their jobs and perhaps see others joining them.</p> <p>It is of the utmost importance that local councils work with employers to secure development on the doorstep. Otherwise Chapel will eventually become a dormitory town, its residents will spend hours each day in their cars to get to work, and the town will lose all its remarkable mixed character.</p>
Mr Trevor Peach	CP143	<p>We support the plan and the protection of the green spaces. There has been enough building in the area and we have already lost enough green fields. Agricultural land is precious and needs to be retained to feed future generations, and to protect the wildlife it supports. There is more than enough traffic on our roads already. Our schools are full and further expansion of them may have a detrimental effect on the standard of education. We cannot keep building on our small island.</p>
Mr Keith Cox	CP144	<p>All Local Green Spaces</p> <p>I oppose any development of all Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Brownfield / Industrial unused land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I support development of these lands, however some land must be reserved for future commercial development.
Rachel Sheldon	CP145	<p>Area 7 - Target wall field and Warmbrook</p> <p>As a property owner in Chapel and having viewed the neighbourhood plan I would like to support the development of Warmbrook. I believe the site has previously been designated for development and is ideally situated on the village boundary for this. The land is obviously of poor quality for livestock and is currently used by people to let their dogs use it as a toilet without picking it up. A sympathetic housing development on this land would not only remove this problem but would enhance the area by providing much needed housing for local people. I feel it is the responsibility of the council to plan for the future of Chapel and a development in this area is an ideal opportunity.</p>
Miss Rosie Ingham	CP146	<p>The approval of nearly 1000 new homes is astounding and we need a plan in place that not only states the minimum number of houses that need to be built, but also the maximum allowed. Expanding the town and allowing for affordable homes in keeping with the area is a natural progression, but planning approval needs to be based on what our infrastructure and job market can cope with - and an actual need! If building is to be allowed, why should this be focused on providing houses, rather than building to attract new and allowing existing businesses to expand (we know why people are interested in building 100's of houses or course, but this doesn't always tally with the requirements of the general population).</p>
Mrs Isla Harrop	CP147	<p>I cannot believe the levels that some people stoop to to try and justify the ridiculous plans to build all over Chapel- drug taking on the target field?! Hmmm, questionable. Sledging and dog walking may be but 'wasteland'? If a green field with natural beauty is classed as 'waste land' then some people may want to consider relocation ... It frustrates me hugely that the very strong public feeling against more housing developments seems to have so far been swept aside as if local residents opinions really don't matter. It is quite obvious that there are plenty of houses on the market in all price brackets, We don't need more!</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>There are not the facilities in Chapel to support any more increase in population. One small petrol station, and schools, dentists and doctors that are full! We are very lucky to live in such a beautiful part of the country, and it will be a sad day if more of it gets covered in horrible yellow brick Monopoly style houses. If more housing must be built only brownfield sites should be considered and it should meet the social/affordable housing demand that exists. Well done to all involved for the time and effort put in to the neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p>Hourigan Connolly on behalf of Innovation Forge Limited</p>	<p>CP148</p>	<p>Preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan should be suspended until the High Peak Local Plan is adopted. We consider that the Plan fails to meet criterion d and e of the basic conditions because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It would not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development by failing to meet housing needs in the area where such needs have yet to be established in an adopted Development Plan. ● It is not in general conformity with the High Peak Local Plan adopted in 2005 which itself is time expired and out of date. ● It is not in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the Submission Version of the High Peak Local Plan which has yet to be found sound. <p>Objection to Policy H1 since it indicates that the former Dorma factory site has the potential to deliver 182 dwellings, this is misleading because part of the site is within the Chinley, Buxworth and Brownside Parish Boundary.</p> <p>The wording of Policy H2 should be amended to exclude a need for Housing Site Design Briefs for sites already benefiting from planning permission.</p> <p>Policy H5 should be amended to remove any reference to development densities. Greater emphasis should be placed on innovation in design that also respects local character.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Objection to Policy H6. The proposed affordable housing requirement on either greenfield or brownfield sites is inappropriate and not in general conformity with the Submission Version of the Local Plan which itself may be found unsound.</p> <p>Policy C1. We suggest that the former Dorma factory site and Spring Meadow should be removed from the proposed extension to the Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>Policy C2. We suggest that Spring Meadow (site 11) should not be allocated for Local Green Space.</p>
<p>Knights on behalf of High Peak Land Limited</p>	<p>CP149</p>	<p>Policy H1 has implications for housing delivery in the Central Sub Area, and there is a danger that the plan could be adopted in accordance with an out of date local plan. The adoption of the neighbourhood plan should be delayed until the outcome of the examination of the High Peak Local Plan is known.</p> <p>Given that the Development Management Procedure Order already requires the submission of a design and access statement, policy H2 is not considered to be necessary or justified and should be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Policy H6. The requirement for 50% affordable housing on greenfield sites would conflict with strategic policy H5 of the submitted High Peak Borough Local Plan, which requires affordable housing provision of 30% on sites of 25 units or more.</p> <p>Policy H7 is considered to be onerous and unnecessary and should be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Policy TM2 states that development for the use of land for small touring and/or camping sites will be supported - a definition of “small” should be defined more clearly.</p> <p>Policy C1 identifies a proposed special landscape area that appears to surround the town and seeks to include all land outside the town boundary that does not fall within the Peak District National Park. This would rule out any new housing around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the event that additional housing land around Chapel-en-le-Frith</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>has to be found as a result of the submitted High Peak Local Plan being found to be unsound at examination. The proposed designation is not supported by any substantial or compelling evidence. If the policy remains as it is, then the plan fails to meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Policy C2 seeks to identify and allocate 21 areas of local green space, however no proportionate or robust evidence has been provided as required by Paragraph 040 of the neighbourhood planning section of NPPG. Particular objection to proposed LGS 14 and 23.</p> <p>Additional housing land should be allocated in Chapel-en-le-Frith. High Peak Land Limited supports the allocation of land to the south of Chapel-en-le-Frith High School for housing.</p>
<p>Knights on behalf of Mr S Robinson</p>	CP150	<p>Policy H1 has implications for housing delivery in the Central Sub Area, and there is a danger that the plan could be adopted in accordance with an out of date local plan. The adoption of the neighbourhood plan should be delayed until the outcome of the examination of the High Peak Local Plan is known.</p> <p>Given that the Development Management Procedure Order already requires the submission of a design and access statement, policy H2 is not considered to be necessary or justified and should be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Policy H6. The requirement for 50% affordable housing on greenfield sites would conflict with strategic policy H5 of the submitted High Peak Borough Local Plan, which requires affordable housing provision of 30% on sites of 25 units or more.</p> <p>Policy H7 is considered to be onerous and unnecessary and should be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Policy TM2 states that development for the use of land for small touring and/or camping sites will be supported - a definition of "small" should be defined more clearly.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Policy C1 identifies a proposed special landscape area that appears to surround the town and seeks to include all land outside the town boundary that does not fall within the Peak District National Park. This would rule out any new housing around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the event that additional housing land around Chapel-en-le-Frith has to be found as a result of the submitted High Peak Local Plan being found to be unsound at examination. The proposed designation is not supported by any substantial or compelling evidence. If the policy remains as it is, then the plan fails to meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Policy C2 seeks to identify and allocate 21 areas of local green space, however no proportionate or robust evidence has been provided as required by Paragraph 040 of the neighbourhood planning section of NPPG. Particular objection to proposed LGS 14 and 23.</p> <p>Additional housing land should be allocated in Chapel-en-le-Frith. Mr. Robinson supports the allocation of land to the south of Chapel-en-le-Frith High School for housing.</p>
<p>Knights on behalf of Mr John Rose</p>	<p>CP151</p>	<p>Policy H1 has implications for housing delivery in the Central Sub Area, and there is a danger that the plan could be adopted in accordance with an out of date local plan. The adoption of the neighbourhood plan should be delayed until the outcome of the examination of the High Peak Local Plan is known.</p> <p>Given that the Development Management Procedure Order already requires the submission of a design and access statement, policy H2 is not considered to be necessary or justified and should be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Policy H6. The requirement for 50% affordable housing on greenfield sites would conflict with strategic policy H5 of the submitted High Peak Borough Local Plan, which requires affordable housing provision of 30% on sites of 25 units or more.</p> <p>Policy H7 is considered to be onerous and unnecessary and should be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Policy TM2 states that development for the use of land for small touring and/or camping sites will be supported - a definition of “small” should be defined more clearly.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Policy C1 identifies a proposed special landscape area that appears to surround the town and seeks to include all land outside the town boundary that does not fall within the Peak District National Park. This would rule out any new housing around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the event that additional housing land around Chapel-en-le-Frith has to be found as a result of the submitted High Peak Local Plan being found to be unsound at examination. The proposed designation is not supported by any substantial or compelling evidence. If the policy remains as it is, then the plan fails to meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Policy C2 seeks to identify and allocate 21 areas of local green space, however no proportionate or robust evidence has been provided as required by Paragraph 040 of the neighbourhood planning section of NPPG. Particular objection to proposed LGS 14 and 23.</p> <p>Additional housing land should be allocated in Chapel-en-le-Frith. Mr J Rose supports the allocation of land to the south of Chapel-en-le-Frith High School for housing.</p>
Knights on behalf of Seddon Homes	CP152	<p>Policy H1 has implications for housing delivery in the Central Sub Area, and there is a danger that the plan could be adopted in accordance with an out of date local plan. The adoption of the neighbourhood plan should be delayed until the outcome of the examination of the High Peak Local Plan is known.</p> <p>Given that the Development Management Procedure Order already requires the submission of a design and access statement, policy H2 is not considered to be necessary or justified and should be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Policy H6. The requirement for 50% affordable housing on greenfield sites would conflict with strategic policy H5 of the submitted High Peak Borough Local Plan, which requires affordable housing provision of 30% on sites of 25 units or more.</p> <p>Policy H7 is considered to be onerous and unnecessary and should be deleted from the plan.</p> <p>Policy TM2 states that development for the use of land for small touring and/or camping sites will be supported - a definition of "small" should be defined more clearly.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Policy C1 identifies a proposed special landscape area that appears to surround the town and seeks to include all land outside the town boundary that does not fall within the Peak District National Park. This would rule out any new housing around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the event that additional housing land around Chapel-en-le-Frith has to be found as a result of the submitted High Peak Local Plan being found to be unsound at examination. The proposed designation is not supported by any substantial or compelling evidence. If the policy remains as it is, then the plan fails to meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Policy C2 seeks to identify and allocate 21 areas of local green space, however no proportionate or robust evidence has been provided as required by Paragraph 040 of the neighbourhood planning section of NPPG. Particular objection to proposed LGS 14 and 23.</p> <p>Additional housing land should be allocated in Chapel-en-le-Frith. Seddon Homes supports the allocation of land to the south of Chapel-en-le-Frith High School for housing.</p>
Mr John McNamara	CP153	<p>I would like to comment specifically on the document listed under the 'map' of area 24:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area C in the submission is not visible from Marsh Lane, the Golf Course or the Footpaths nor from a Castle Naze, Ladder Hill or Eccles Pike 2. C is not adjacent to Marsh Lane 3. The site is not tranquil 4. All the trees are covered by a TPO 5. Nothing grazes on C and the trees sustain the wildlife 6. C is not part of the 60 metre length of road referred to 7. The approach to Chapel is already protected by the TPO 8. The large number of people did not comment on area C. It has been stated to yourselves that C is not considered a LGS 9. C is not bounded by Marsh Hall Lane 10. There is no public access to C

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Emery Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes North West Ltd	CP154	<p>Our client's specific land interest is the north of Long Lane, which they are promoting for residential development.</p> <p>We consider that the CNP has been drafted on a fundamentally flawed basis and does not meet the basic conditions. These representations are accompanied by a Legal Opinion from specialist Counsel which identifies a range of serious substantive and procedural legal errors in the preparation of the CNP. One of the central legal and practical plan-making flaws with the CNP is the attempt through Policy C1 to install a landscape policy designation across the majority of land adjoining the settlement boundary, without any underlying evidence base. We also have fundamental concerns over the potential adoption of the plan ahead of the emerging High Peak Local Plan.</p> <p>At present, the CNP does not allocate enough land for housing and employment needs and therefore cannot meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>The designation of part our client's land at Long Lane (site ref 7: Target wall field and woodland adjacent to Warmbrook) as Local Green Space is contrary to NPPF, 76-77 and the PPG paragraphs on Local Green Space.</p>
Peacock and Smith on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc	CP155	<p>Policy TC1 is supported as it defines the extent of the town centre and confirms that the Morrisons store is included within the boundary. However the Plan does not include a map to show the area that the town centre is proposed to cover.</p> <p>The Plan should include a primary shopping area and primary and secondary shopping frontages for the town centre.</p>
Emery Planning on behalf of Lynn Hartley	CP156	<p>We have fundamental concerns over the potential adoption of the plan ahead of the emerging High Peak Local Plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>The CNP fails to provide any robust evidence as to why the proposed level of housing provision is justified in the context of the development plan, the NPPF and the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). We consider that the need is much higher than 950, taking into account the full OAN in the housing market area (High Peak) and the amount that should be distributed to Chapel-en-le-Frith, having regard to the town's size, services & facilities, past levels of growth and market signals.</p> <p>We object to Policy EP3 that states that existing employment sites should remain in employment use. This is contrary to national planning policy.</p> <p>We object to the proposed Special Landscape Area. The designation is not supported by any substantial or compelling evidence and would appear to restrict any future development outside of the existing settlement boundaries.</p> <p>We have serious concerns over the designation of the local green spaces as specified in Policy C2. The designation has been applied far more widely than only identifying a limited number of sites of particular local significance. We also have specific concerns relating to the designation of our client's sites</p> <p>at: Land at High Peak Works (site 2) and Land off Homestead Way (site 13).</p>
<p>Sgt Stephen Johnson</p> <p>Derbyshire Constabulary</p>	<p>CP157</p>	<p>Clearly exciting times lay ahead which should see Chapel and surrounding areas grow, develop and prosper which is good news. However, as stakeholders we like you to consider the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Police deal with a significant number of parking complaints which often escalate to the point where the police have to intervene. Ensuring adequate parking, both on and off road including dedicated spaces adjacent to developments will help prevent our limited resources from being diverted away from more important threat and risk matters. ● Open spaces/ parks. Please ensure appropriate environmental impact assessments are conducted when placing children's playing area's close to houses. For example, the Multi Use Games Area [MUGA] at Chapel

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>was designed and configured in such a way that the focus of children’s play directly effects residents causing numerous calls for service to you and the police – this issue is well documented and remains an ongoing issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCTV – has consideration been given to expanding this system? Can the capital costs be picked up by the developers? • Physical crime reduction measures within and around housing developments? The plan does not make reference to these issues.
Mr Robert Hancock	CP158	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>Regarding the old Mill Tip. This is industrial land and thus is suitable for industrial development. This is necessary for sustainability of industry within the area. This is important due to loss of industrial land at Ferodo and Dorma. People need jobs.</p>
Mr Dean McNicholas	CP159	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>I am a local resident that overlooks the industrial estate. The place has improved dramatically and I would be quite happy for them to extend onto the old tip.</p>
Mr Liam McCarthy Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council	CP160	<p>The N plan has been about 4 years in gestation and reflects the views of the community in the Parish. It is essential the views of local people are heard and this plan moves to a referendum as soon as possible. I particularly support section 5 which deals with special countryside and local green spaces. It is unfortunate that those who would benefit from development of LGS no7 have orchestrated a campaign opposing designation as a local green space oppose any changes to green belt boundaries in the parish area.</p> <p>Section 5 - C1 and C2</p> <p>Essential the landscape is preserved and LGS are designated for protection.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>EP7 in section 2</p> <p>There should be no encroachment into green belt land.</p> <p>Section 2 - all policies EP1 to EP6</p> <p>The parish need new sustainable employment for the economic wellbeing of the population and the prosperity of the area. The Parish Council is working in partnership with other agencies to determine if an existing employment site can be made available for starter businesses.</p>
Marie Brickell	CP161	<p>Housing</p> <p>A lot of hard work has been done to find out people's views whilst still providing the required number of housing required by the government. I disagree with the numbers on population growth. I am also appalled by subsequent planning decisions that have gone against local people's wishes and the neighbourhood plan. On page 6 there is a reference to a contained community set in open countryside, this is in real danger of being lost. The plan stresses the need for affordable housing, starter homes and bungalows. We have an over supply of 3/4 bedroom houses and yet this is largely what has been granted planning for. The N Plan has been well researched by people who love the area and have local people's views well catered for while providing for future growth, I fully support it being adopted. I also hope that someone is able to stop this development greed that is set to spoil our town and countryside for good. I would like to be informed of the plan's progress.</p> <p>Town Centre</p> <p>I like the thought given to enhancing the Market place as being the hub of the town. It would be great with a more relaxed, pedestrian feel to it. Please protect the cobbles, buildings and that lovely view form the parish church looking down Church Brow.</p> <p>TR1, page 30</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I support the transport and movement ideas in this local plan, however the reality will be much different. With so many houses being approved, far in excess of what is needed some areas will be grid-locked at peak times. (mostly school run times)</p> <p>1) Hayfield Road when all the houses are built and occupied on the Ferrodo site cars coming from there will cause a blockage round Fosters corner and block the main street.</p> <p>2) All the new houses being built on Long Lane, Crossings Rd and Manchester Rd will have to come through Chapel or through Whaley to get to the bypass. Both towns are a slow single track crawl during the school run. Once you have managed to get to the bypass, the A6 from Bridgemont to Stockport looks the same width and length it was 50 years ago it simply cannot cope with extra traffic. The once an hour train from Chapel South with its 2 carriages will also be a nightmare.</p> <p>Countryside</p> <p>The N Plan seeks to protect the special countryside of the parish and I support it wholeheartedly. Protecting the countryside and character of the area goes hand in hand in promoting tourism also. There are many areas of the parish that support wildlife that is in decline nationally, my concern is that you can't have endangered wildlife e.g Lapwings in a field and a housing development in the next, a sizeable buffer zone is needed. Lapwings in particular are ground nesting birds and the close proximity of houses would mean cats, dogs and children would disturb the young and they would cease to use the sites currently occupied.</p>
Mr John Hollinrake	CP162	<p>I think the plan has been well researched both with local people and national bodies. My concern is not with the plan, which I hope will be adopted but with the Borough Council and lack of a local plan. Because of HPBC failure to put a local plan in place greedy developers are riding roughshod over local people's wishes and the effectiveness of the Neighbourhood plan. I hope this greedy housebuilding will be stopped while we still have some countryside left to protect. We don't need 3/4 bedroomed houses in Chapel yet this is what we are getting. The infrastructure cannot cope on any level. These houses are not for local people and will be filled with incomers who will travel on the A6 to work in Stockport and Manchester.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Andrew Brickell	CP163	<p>There has never been any need for anything other than starter homes / affordable homes, bungalows and flats in Chapel. Now our hapless Borough Council have approved 600? 3 or 4 bedroomed homes despite over 90% of the local population objecting to it. 'Localism'!!! This is a dictatorship we live under where no one cares about the local people's views (Parish Council excepted). Had the plan been taken into account 12 months ago it would have had an extremely beneficial effect on the development of our local environment in a controlled & sustainable manner.</p> <p>I am dismayed by the total ineptitude and inactivity of HPBC and our local MPs to prevent the wholesale and thoughtless developments that they have approved. In the past 12 month, these, in my opinion, are likely to turn Chapel-en-le-Frith into a sleeper town for nearby larger towns and cities where the employment lies. There is woefully little in way of infrastructure to support such a massive local increase in the population that 800+ new homes will bring (jobs/roads/doctors/schools etc). Traffic [up] Tourism [down].</p> <p>I have nothing but admiration for the phenomenal amount of (voluntary) time and effort that has been put into the NP by the Parish Council and Chapel Vision. Let's get this plan approved quickly so at least we can stand up to the developers (and HPBC) who seem intent on desecrating our countryside and town!</p>
Mr David Barton CJK Packaging Ltd	CP164	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>The piece of land in question is already part of the industrial estate being the former tip. It is not overlooked by anyone and is an overgrown scrub land at the moment. The industrial estate was in a terrible state until taken over by CJK Packaging. The wrecked vehicles that dominated the site have been cleared and the buildings and roads around the estate have been vastly improved. The old tip would only benefit from being built on and of course any development would in time bring in much needed jobs and revenue to an area where they are both in short supply.</p>
Kristyna Barton	CP165	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I work on the industrial estate at CJK. The company is thriving and an expansion onto the old mill tip is vital! This would create more jobs in the area and it would be terrible if the company had to relocate due to the current location being too small.
Mr Paul Redfern CJK Packaging Ltd	CP166	Bridgeholme Industrial Estate I work for the company and I think expansion of the company would benefit us all who work there in future years. Also employment for the area.
Margaret Cox	CP167	All local green space I oppose further development of all local green spaces. Brownfield Industrial unused land I'm in support of development of these lands but with some of the land held back for future commercial development.
Mr Clive Narrainen	CP168	There are already many houses built outside the boundaries of the built up area shown in the plan particularly on the opposite sides of the road to the existing built up areas e.g Eccles Road. Policy H3 is too restrictive unless the built up area is now redefined to include existing housing on or in close proximity to the boundary. I would like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the examiners recommendations and future progress with the plan.
Katie Craven	CP169	Bridgeholme Industrial Estate

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		The land to which the expansion wants to be built on is shrubland and will not have a direct affect on anybody. It will help populate more jobs in the local area and will ensure I keep my job at CJK as if this does not go ahead the company may have to move.
Jill Barton	CP170	Bridgeholme Industrial Estate As the land in question is partof the industrial estate, not overlooked, the building would enhance the estate. An expanding business equals new jobs which are needed in the area.
Lee Austin	CP171	Bridgeholme Industrial Estate I believe the expansion would be a good idea as it would develop the unused space on the site, would create more jobs in the area and would be a huge step in support of a small business trying to grow.
Annette Hemmingway	CP172	Bridgeholme Industrial Estate If the Council continues to build more house there will be a need for industrial sites. This land is disused and not overlooked. There is a need for employment in the area.
Mr Ronald Barker Light Haulage Contractor	CP173	Bridgeholme Industrial Estate I feel that if the Council approved expansion on 'old mill tip' site at the back of Bridgeholme Industrial Estate it would provide much needed employment in the High Peak, with all the new build houses which have received planning permission. Please notify of the decision.
Mr Jeremy Thorpe	CP174	Bridgeholme Industrial Estate

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		If planning consent was granted to build on 'old mill tip' site at the rear of Brideholme Industrial Estate it would provide more jobs to the area.
Mr Graham Bowman CJK Packaging Ltd	CP175	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate</p> <p>It is a good thing for employment in the local area. To expand on to the old mill tip. The expansion is a good thing and necessary for the expansion of the business and its infrastructure.</p>
Mr Jimmy Pakpahan	CP176	<p>Countryside policy C1</p> <p>There is a long list of local green spaces. I think there are too many odd pieces of land listed and it is unclear what purpose these green spaces are supposed to serve - other than to preserve a view for neighbours. For me, Chapel really needs more space for leisure use - space where people can walk their dogs, access public footpaths with their families - and access nature - At the moment too much of the land is restricted and inaccessible I would therefore support green spaces where there is recreational or public access - or where this landscape might act as a buffer between for example industrial sites and housing, but too much of it does not appear to do this.</p> <p>I strongly support the inclusion of Target field and Wharmbrook as green spaces and would not want to see any development on it. Comments on drug use/litter on this site are incorrect and appear to me to be intended to make people fearful (and think that development will lead to a clean up). I would like to see this area sold to a public body as a second recreation area or wildlife/walking area.</p> <p>It concerns me that having so many sites listed could actually put them all at risk if challenged by developers - therefore I would like to suggest that numbers are reduced to help preserve the really key sites.</p> <p>Employment Policy EP 7</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>This policy seems very restrictive of one specific employer - I would have no objection to a modest extension into a small part of the green belt which was previously used as a spoil tip - as long as this did not impact negatively on the meadow and green belt site behind this. I don't think this policy is fair.</p> <p>Policy TC1</p> <p>It is unclear why this is being proposed - and no map has been provided to show boundaries. I am concerned that this extension could lead to unintentional retail development in outlying locations which would now be closer to the official town centre. This would have a negative impact on the town shopping core. I therefore think this boundary should stay the same.</p> <p>TM1/TM2</p> <p>I don't really see the logic in these two policies - if the town wants to support tourism, then there is a logic to say that schemes which will bring in staying visitors (who will have pre-booked and turned up regardless of weather) should be supported. I wouldn't want to see static caravans but perhaps some attractive chalets in a managed area could create jobs and tourism spend? Tent campers are unlikely to spend much in local shops, and are more likely to come with all the supplies they need - I think therefore that the council should support tourism (and the principle of some well designed tourist chalets) or remove both policies.</p>
Sally Moore	CP177	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the 'off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the 'off street' cobbled section of the market place would have been a more suitable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiners's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Daren Robins	CP178	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the 'off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the 'off street' cobbled section of the market place would have been a more suitable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiners's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Laura Grundy	CP179	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the 'off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the 'off street' cobbled section of the market place would have been a more suitable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiners's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Sam Wright	CP180	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the 'off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the 'off street' cobbled section of the market place would have been a more suitable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiners's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Stewart Hobson	CP181	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the 'off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the 'off street' cobbled section of the market place would have been a more suitable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiners's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
William Grindey	CP182	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the 'off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the 'off street' cobbled section of the market place would have been a more suitable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiners's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Alan Birch	CP183	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the 'off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the 'off street' cobbled section of the market place would have been a more suitable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiners's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr P Hobson	CP184	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the 'off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the 'off street' cobbled section of the market place would have been a more suitable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiners's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
H Holland	CP185	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the 'off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the 'off street' cobbled section of the market place would have been a more suitable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiners's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
D Lomas	CP186	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to support local retail shops and restaurants in the manner it is aiming to do. The market place may benefit from renovation but the removal of parking from the 'off street cobbled section in the way proposed by the plan would have a detrimental impact on the retail and service businesses nearby. This parking facility is needed now and in the future and the complete removal will impact the ability of shop and restaurant owners to run their businesses as well as providing employment.</p> <p>I object to Policy TC9. It plans to provide suitable alternative parking nearby but cannot demonstrate the ability to deliver parking on the privately owned components mentioned in TC10. A time limit for parking on the 'off street' cobbled section of the market place would have been a more suitable plan.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiners's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr David Benning	CP187	<p>Section 1 - Housing</p> <p>I strongly support the two town centre housing sites proposed in Policy H1, totalling 42 units because of their very close proximity to the services and amenities of the town centre, and also frequent public transport, to which they would connect by generally level walking routes. They are ideal for those with</p> <p>mobility problems and/or no car. They are necessary to address the balance with many larger housing sites with recent planning permissions listed in Appendix 2. A large proportion of these (428 out of 813 or 53%) do not satisfy the criteria on page 10 about being within 15 minutes walk of a town or large village centre and so cannot be considered as sustainable developments in transport terms.</p> <p>Economic Development of the Parish</p> <p>Two of the bullet points in the Vision Statement on page 6 relate to (a) ample well-paid jobs; and (b) re-invigorating the town centre. These are followed by associated Plan objectives. 855 new homes are proposed in the Plan, of which 813 have planning permission with no conditions attached to provide infrastructure improvements that would contribute to the two vision points or to the objectives. Also no jobs come with the houses. Whilst accepting that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot in itself provide, for example more school places or greater capacity at doctor's surgeries, the Plan must provide appropriate and sufficient mechanisms, such as land allocations, to subsequently achieve the stated objectives and so the vision as well. Infrastructure improvements and more employment places are absolutely essential to match the 855 new homes, representing a population increase of 23%.</p> <p>The Chapel Vision survey found that the majority (72%) of working Chapel residents work outside the Parish. We must aim for this to be reduced to achieve the emissions targets and also to avoid extra loading on local transport systems. It is essential that as many jobs as possible are provided locally. Also sufficient usable local facilities, especially shops, must be provided. By usable, I mean that it must be possible to park nearby. The Neighbourhood Plan sees tourism as very important in the economic development of the Parish. So clearly there needs to be many new employment hectares identified in the Plan and the shops in the town centre need to be able to do</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>more business, which would also provide more employment. Also tourist facilities need to be expanded. The main requirement in relation to the shops is more car parking. The deficiencies in the Plan can be easily and satisfactorily addressed by :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reintroducing employment site ES2 (A6/Bowden Lane) into the Plan; 2. Reintroducing Car Park CP2 (Pickford Meadow) into the Plan; and 3. Amending the permitted land uses for some employment sites. <p>Section 2 - Employment, Tourism and Community Land Development</p> <p>I assume that 'employment' means B1, B2 and B8. For the avoidance of doubt, can words be included to explain that? A lot of jobs are of course in other sectors. If this definition is correct, the Plan appears to make very little provision for hotels, leisure and community facilities outside the town centre.</p> <p>The Plan provides 9.44ha of employment land. However site ES3 has now largely been developed. Therefore only 7.40ha of employment land is actually available to match the minimum of 855 new homes with 2000+ occupants. This is totally insufficient if excess travel distances are to be effectively tackled, as previously justified.</p> <p>It should also be noted that site ES1 is currently an under used employment site, as a lorry park. It does not appear to be commercially attractive as the owners have been marketing it unsuccessfully for redevelopment for several years now. It is an awkward shape and has a river running through the middle of the site. Sites ES4 and ES5 are hilly and unfortunately therefore may not be particularly attractive either. In order to provide a broad portfolio of employment land, Site ES2 should be reintroduced to the Plan. In order to improve the tourist offer and also provide facilities for travellers, land uses such as hotels, community facilities, leisure and a petrol filling station with the usual small shop, should be encouraged for site ES2 and/ or the other sites around the Bowden Lane roundabout. This would be the ideal location for a 'gateway to the Peak Park' type of development, with a budget hotel for overnight stops. So some C1, D1 and D2 but not at the expense of all B1 and B2. Incidentally the only filling station in Chapel, at Morrisons, is very overlooked at times, with queues backing - up on to Market Street blocking it for through traffic.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>Section 3 - Town Centre</p> <p>The current proposals do not provide (a) a substantial increase near the Market Place; and (b) a large car park to reduce searching time. The previous Chapel Vision residents' survey showed that half of the respondents thought parking is a problem, with most referring to the Town Centre and with a third identifying the Market Place specifically. The Plan provides only 53% of the required number of spaces, a very serious shortfall. The shortfall can be addressed simply by reintroducing Car Park CP3 Pickford Meadow, which would need to be about 70 spaces. A new bullet point should be added to Policy H10:- "Direct pedestrian routes are to be provided linking the site to the Market Place via Roebuck Place and Church Lane." Without these routes, pedestrians would have to use the vehicular access route which is a long detour on foot and has no footway in parts.</p> <p>Section 4 - Sustainable Transport and Movement</p> <p>The bullet points in Policy TR1 should be replaced with the following:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrate, by including indications on plans, safe walking and cycling routes in the immediate area of the site and to Chapel town centre (and to the nearest village centre where appropriate). In the case of residential development, safe walking and cycling routes from the development into the countryside should be similarly shown; 2. Demonstrate how the proposals link with public transport; 3. Demonstrate the impact of traffic arising from the development, including consideration of the cumulative effects with other known adjacent proposed developments; and 4. Provide a package of mitigating measures to address any identified impacts. <p>Section 5 - Countryside</p> <p>I strongly support the contents of this section and particularly welcome the large number of green spaces proposed for the reasons given in the Plan.</p> <p>General - A number of maps and plans are missing.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr John McNamara	CP188	<p>Local Green Space 24</p> <p>Any classification as a LGS should not relate to my garden and should only relate to the field below which is also within my ownership. The document states that all of LGS 24 has been recognised by 'local people during consultation' as a LGS. I have seen no evidence of this in so far as it relates to the space between 143 & 151 Manchester Road. This space is not 'demonstrably special' and does not hold any 'particular local significance'.</p> <p>Policy H3 is not consistent with the NPPF.</p>
Mr Stephen Barratt	CP189	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Hayden Gill	CP190	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Anna Ramczyk	CP191	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Rebecca Gill	CP192	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Ms Charlotte Gill	CP193	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Alastair Gill	CP194	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Mr Robert Heath	CP195	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Nigel Barratt	CP196	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Neil Sheldon	CP197	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Neil Sheldon	CP198	<p>Area 7 - Target wall field and Warmbrook</p> <p>As a land owner in Chapel I support developing Warmbrook. This area has been white land for many years and I feel that developing this area will benefit Chapel-en-le-Frith and bring prosperity to the town. The area could be developed to include attractive walkways, footpaths, cycle-paths and much needed relief roads.</p>
Hayden Gill	CP199	<p>Area 7 Target wall field and Warmbrook</p> <p>This area is 'white land' and would be a good use of the land as it is poor farming land and it mis-used by locals as a toilet for their dogs and illegal drug activities.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Thomas Smith	CP200	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Mrs Julie Heath	CP201	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs Gill Barratt	CP202	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Samantha Barratt	CP203	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Edward Ford	CP204	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p> <p>I support Warmbrook being put forward as part of the plan as a resident in the area for many years I have seen this land deteriorate. I think it would make a nice attractive development with footpaths, cycle paths, open space for the public as well as housing. Warmbrook is poor grazing ground that dog walkers use, allowing their dogs to roam and foul without picking up. I regularly walk around the area and see teenagers gathering on the land and making a mess, leaving litter everywhere - the landowners have to clear up after them which is not acceptable. The development of this site would be a positive step forward.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
D S Barratt	CP205	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
E Flower	CP206	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
S Flower	CP207	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Hannah Bowers	CP208	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Sharon Buivids	CP209	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Courtney Davis	CP210	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Ann Barker	CP211	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Emily Bury	CP212	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Mrs Tania Twigg	CP213	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Stuart Twigg	CP214	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Darren Robinson	CP215	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Ms Julie Wood	CP216	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr John Buivids	CP217	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
S R Thomson	CP218	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Shirley King	CP219	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Ruth Barratt	CP220	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs P Thomson	CP221	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
S J Thomson	CP222	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Allan Brown	CP223	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Peter Davies	CP224	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Colin Hindle	CP225	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Miss M Turner	CP226	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Mrs Norma Turner	CP227	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
S J Buckley	CP228	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Anna Smith	CP229	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Muriel Manning	CP230	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Nicola Holman	CP231	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
B Hancox	CP232	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr David Hallsworth	CP233	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Barry Wood	CP234	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Eric Burton	CP235	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Laura Dooley	CP236	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Louise Buckley	CP237	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Robin Longden	CP238	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Nicholas Hall	CP239	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Janet Hall	CP240	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Mrs Elizabeth Barratt	CP241	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Paul Barratt	CP242	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Craig Martin	CP243	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr John Morris	CP244	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Juliet Bradbury	CP245	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
L Fuller	CP246	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
M P Bradbury	CP247	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
C Cheavin	CP248	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Terence Buivids	CP249	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
W Buckingham	CP250	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mark Silver	CP251	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mrs Joan Buivids	CP252	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Mr Alan Slater	CP253	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
J S Greenhalgh	CP254	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Michael Buivids	CP255	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Fiona Aston	CP256	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Michelle Louise Marshall	CP257	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
R J Buivids	CP258	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
C Rowland	CP259	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Julie Matthews	CP260	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
R Sheldon	CP261	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Ian Hinde	CP262	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr James Milner	CP263	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Gordon Kirk	CP264	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Megan Hinde	CP265	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs Margaret Rowlands	CP266	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs P Mason	CP267	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Harriet Nuttall	CP268	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
C Savage	CP269	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Joannathan Stead	CP270	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Kim Rowlands	CP271	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Paul Hardy	CP272	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p> <p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
E Nadin	CP273	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
C Hockenhull	CP274	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Doris Wood	CP275	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Joseph Bowen	CP276	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
J S Barratt	CP277	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr John Morten	CP278	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
James Beesley	CP279	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mary Alger	CP280	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Marie Rowland	CP281	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Emma Hibbert	CP282	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
M P Wood	CP283	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Joseph Bowers	CP284	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Miss Amanda Dale	CP285	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Nicola Davies	CP286	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Alison Davies	CP287	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr David Bowers	CP288	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
Cheryl Beesley	CP289	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
J B Alger	CP290	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Tom Riley	CP291	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Tom Baker	CP292	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs N D Walker	CP293	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Michelle Wood	CP294	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr S W Holmes	CP295	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs W Carr	CP296	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p> <p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs I Hall	CP297	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Ms V Hall	CP298	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Mark Holmes	CP299	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr P A Dickinson	CP300	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Stephen Wood	CP301	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Angus Maclean	CP302	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Carl S Holmes	CP303	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
N Barlow	CP304	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr Stuart Williamson	CP305	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
J A Simpson	CP306	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Karl Wood	CP307	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
David Amis	CP308	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p> <p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
A Blain	CP309	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
S Somerset	CP310	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mrs J Gilman	CP311	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Frank Hall	CP312	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
J N McCoy	CP313	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
J M Aldred	CP314	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
A P Aldred	CP315	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Lisa Sheppard	CP316	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
D Blain	CP317	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Robert Barratt	CP318	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
M Bowden	CP319	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
R Wood	CP320	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
D Critchlow	CP321	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
J Smith	CP322	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Mr David Wood	CP323	I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
S Wardle	CP324	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.
C Chapman	CP325	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
A Stafford	CP326	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
O Grzegorzek	CP327	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p> <p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
DJ Wallis	CP328	<p>I support the preparation of the plan. However I am very concerned that the plan as currently drafted would fail to allow for the sustainable growth of the town. The town needs to continue to grow sustainably if it is to provide the homes and employment opportunities that are needed now and in the future.</p> <p>I object to Policy H1. It plans for only 454 new houses. That is less than the emerging High Peak Local Plan, and does not involve any more housing than has already been approved in the town. Bearing in mind that those approvals were to help address the housing supply shortfall in the next 5 years, this plan should be taking a long term view. It should seek to provide enough houses for the next 20 years that meets local need and demand, and also responds to market signals such as house prices and affordability.</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>I object to Policy C1. There is already a special landscape area around Chapel-en-le-Frith in the High Peak Local Plan. Land that is excluded from that was excluded for a reason i.e. it does not meet the criteria of a 'special landscape area'. There is no evidence to demonstrate that any additional land should be included in a 'special landscape area'. Whilst we as local residents have a sentimental attachment to all countryside, that does not mean we should try and apply additional restrictions to existing countryside policies to prevent the future sustainable growth of the town. Policy C1 is also very restrictive. It seeks to limit new development to 'small developments or conversion, extension or replacement of existing buildings'. Because the proposed special landscape area wraps around the entire town, the policy would effectively prevent all potential options for the future expansion of the town beyond its existing boundaries. Chapel-en-le-Frith has always relied upon outward growth to meet its needs, and to provide decent housing for all residents to live in. Indeed many of us live in these houses now. Young people and future residents should be afforded the same opportunity. Currently Policy H1 would fail to meet those needs.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Policy C2. In my view too many sites have been identified, and in particular it has been applied to large parcels of land on the edge and outside of the town. These sites do not meet the definition of local open space as identified in national planning policy, and are no more demonstrably special to local people than any other green fields beyond the existing limits of the town. They also might be needed to meet development needs in the future, beyond the plan period.</p> <p>I would like the opportunity to appear at the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan. I would also like to be notified of the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation and future progress with the plan.</p>
Ms Sally Robbertse	CP329	I would reinforce the proposal of a moratorium on any proposed development with immediate effect until such time that revised figures for housing requirements are available. Councillors are elected by the residents of a Parish / Borough and therefore have a duty to serve in the best interests of that community. Housing is necessary but it has to be SUSTAINABLE and the relevant infrastructure has to be in place at the outset of any development.
Mrs Elizabeth Lee	CP330	Lack of supportive infrastructure anxieties. Decimation of countryside.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr David Coleridge	CP331	Support.
Mr Eric Presley	CP332	Support.
Ms Jane Moore	CP333	The Plan is brilliant - use it.
Ms Sue Hilditch	CP334	I support the Plan because this area is known as "beautiful" people come here for holidays etc. Also can I say that the housing builders need manner lessons they ride roughshod over home owners as well as Councils.
Mr Darron Coe	CP335	<p>Burnside Avenue. Maintaining green open spaces throughout Chapel.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan represents the considered thoughts, opinions and feelings of the residents of Chapel and should be adopted by the people who supposedly represent them.</p>
Mrs Raechael Coe	CP336	<p>Burnside Avenue - Local Green Space plus all of other stated local green spaces.</p> <p>Yes, I would like to be notified on the Council's decision on whether to accept the Examiner's recommendation. The Neighbourhood Plan is collective views of the local people and their wishes to have "special areas" to their community protected, it's been a privilege to have taken part in data collection and all be it a small submission in the grand scheme of the Plan. Good luck. We moved here in 1994, we chose to have children in Chapel-en-le-Frith, please don't over develop it.</p>
Angela Rowbotham	CP337	Good of Chapel Neighbourhood Plan - Please support.
Ms Yvonne and Frances Cohen	CP338	Please let us know the Council's decision on accepting the Plan. We do support the Plan as it looks to protect local people, local land and the beautiful characteristics of the landscape, whilst also looking to protect the local community, rather than to give developers carte blanche to rip up the countryside, pack houses in left right and

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		centre and to change the face of the town beyond all recognition - whilst walking away with a bulging bank account and no regard for the damage they've caused - to the landscape and the community. Local people have no power over their local area. This cannot be right and it's about time it changed.
Mrs Margaret Dyson	CP339	I support the Plan! But am concerned at the lack of interest by DCC Highways. Can we get this passed please, so that we can sort infrastructure and other problems.
Mr John Hibbert	CP340	Chapel-en-le-Frith is big enough! The few green fields that remain should be used for farming - it is alright relying on the Coop and Morrisons but if oil runs low, how will we get milk and meat etc!
Mrs Eileen Hobson	CP341	Support.
Mr Hobson	CP342	Need to protect residents views, lack of infrastructure and protecting the surrounding countryside.
Mrs Isla Harrop	CP343	Strongly support the Plan - building needs to be controlled and thought through with consideration for residents and the infrastructure in place.
Mr and Mrs John and Eileen Heyes	CP344	It appears we have housing by imposition. The people of this Parish have no say on the housing supply, it is decided by developers and the Inspector. Democracy is non existent.
Ms Angela Milne	CP345	The lack of consideration of infrastructure. The HPBC should have a strategy to deal with the need. To prevent further development on greenfield sites.
Ms Sandra Badura	CP346	2009 Target field area We do not need more houses in Chapel. Chapel has grown too big. We need green field areas.
Mr Joseph Badura	CP347	2009 Target field area All green field area is being built on.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Mr Geoffrey Slack	CP348	Housing to the level being currently put forward should be opposed as the assumptions underlying the projections do not appear valid.
Mr John Lomas	CP349	1) There should be an infrastructure plan for roads, rail, energy, water, sewerage in place and with clear funding agreed before any new housing developments are approved. 2) Building houses in rural areas to accommodate in-migration is failing our sustainable development aspirations because there isn't the work for those new people being provided and they will end up travelling back into the urban areas they came from every day for work, causing energy, waste etc.
Mrs Elaine Smith	CP350	It is a brilliant document. Implement it now.
Mr Christopher King	CP351	Too many houses. Lack of infrastructure. ie doctors, schools, transport, sewers.
Mr Paul Bennett	CP352	Chapel is big enough.
Mrs Valerie Gleave	CP353	Support.
Mr Ronald Bowers	CP354	The plan reflects completely the views and wishes of the local community. The developers must not be allowed to run rough-shod over sensible and meaningful reasoning.
Ken & Brenda Hope	CP355	Support.
Mr David J. Mellor	CP356	To help retain the type of town that Chapel has been as a nice place to live and not just an overspill from Manchester.
Ms Diane Taylor	CP357	Support.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
Ms Carol Frankland	CP358	I support the neighbourhood plan.
Mrs Lynda Carrington	CP359	We support the Neighbourhood Plan.
Mr Peter Taylor	CP360	I support the Plan and feel that without it, developers would ride rough shod over the planners. It must be followed to the letter to protect our area. Other areas have suffered without a proper plan to their cost!
Mrs Valda Wood	CP361	To try and stop any more large housing estates being built in Chapel. Please preserve any greenfield sites which are left.
Ms Cathy Stewart	CP362	Reduce number of new builds. Look at infrastructure.
Ms Ann Kilgarriff	CP363	Support.
Mrs M. Pollington	CP364	Support.
Mr Mike Gregg	CP365	The plan reflects the views of widely consulted local residents.
Mrs Caroline Gregg	CP366	Local people were widely consulted on this plan.
Mr Terence Marshall	CP367	Support.
Mr Paul Michaels	CP368	Support.
Mr Brian Lander	CP369	We support passing the Neighbourhood Plan for Chapel in its entirety and that it is implemented (immediately) as soon as possible. 1. So that there is some control over what appears to be a surge of development in our area.

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		<p>2. So that the residents of Chapel have a say in local planning.</p> <p>3. To end what appears to be chaotic and disorganised planning by the Borough Council.</p>
Mr Alan Theyer	CP370	Some VERY controlled developments on brown sites only.
Mr and Mrs Michael and Mary Taylor	CP371	The infrastructure is under immense pressure with the current housing and we all know something is going to let us down. Utilities are stretched beyond belief.
Mr John M. Baird	CP372	Support.
Mrs Bernice Wood	CP373	<p>I fully support the neighbourhood plan especially the Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Special Landscape Area. I am strongly against any more developments on greenfield sites. Although local residents are protesting it seems knowledge of planning law by High Peak Borough Council will not be good enough to deter developers from their intentions - they can afford expert solicitors, Borough Councils cannot! The National Planning Policy Framework has not got the balance right between developers and the local community. This government needs to remember - it is upsetting its own supporters and general elections are to be held in 2015. We all accept new housing is needed but the plan for the High Peak area is excessive and undemocratic!</p>
Mrs Ruth Mullis	CP374	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate, Charley Lane, Chinley</p> <p>The proposed development is already on a brownfield site. The owner has improved the industrial units making the area smarter. Hopefully as this is a locally run business it will bring more employment to local people, surely an aim of the plan.</p>
Ms Sarah McNicholas	CP375	<p>Bridgeholme Industrial Estate, Charley Lane, Chinley</p>

1 Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Publicity Stage Representations

Name	ID	Summary of Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
		I support the proposed development as it will provide more jobs for local people and is only developing waste land. If you propose hundreds of homes that ruin the town and its green land why are you opposing this???
Mrs Sonia Holt	CP376	I fully support the neighbourhood plan. I like the brownfield sites being used for housing and protecting the special landscape around the Parish. There are some good ideas from the transport and infrastructure section also. However much of this hard work done by the Parish Council and Chapel Vision has been rendered useless by the Borough Council's failure to produce a local plan and letting greedy developers and landowners run rough shod over our lovely countryside. Please adopt the plan while there is still some countryside left to protect.