

HIGH PEAK LOCAL PLAN

OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSES

December 2012

Contents

Section	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. High Peak Housing Requirements	5
3. Sub-Area Housing Requirements	10
4. Housing Site Options	14
- Buxton Sites	15
- Central Area Sites	84
- Glossopdale Sites	113
5. Questions on Other Development Issues	156
6. Review of Strategic Policies	189

1. Introduction

- 1.1 A new Local Plan for High Peak is being prepared to shape the future development of the Borough up to 2028. The new Local Plan will contain policies and identify sites for development or protection. The new Local Plan will build on the work previously undertaken during the preparation of a joint Core Strategy, which has now ceased. Once adopted in 2014, the new plan will replace the current High Peak Local Plan which has been in place since 2005.
- 1.2 This report summarises the response which were received to consultation undertaken on options for a number of key issues for the new Local Plan:
 - High Peak housing requirements
 - Sub-area housing requirements
 - Potential housing development sites
 - Other development issues
- 1.3 This report also summarises responses received to consultation on a review of the strategic policies originally proposed in the Joint Core Strategy document.
- 1.4 Public consultation on the options took place over a 6 week period from 13th September to 25th October with later representations being accepted. The consultation arrangements comprised of:
 - 9 drop-in sessions – Harpur Hill, Buxton (2), Glossop (2), Whaley Bridge, New Mills, Chapel, Chinley
 - Attendance at 3 public meetings – Old Glossop, Hayfield and Whaley Bridge
 - Consultation documents with questionnaires
 - A dedicated web page and on-line consultation portal
 - Consultation material available in key public locations
 - 1,057 emails and 1,144 letters sent out to all consultees and those on the Council's consultation database
 - Press notices and releases in local papers
 - Posters placed in appropriate locations
 - Approx. 2,000 letters to all residents living near to options sites
- 1.5 In order to allow people to focus on the options specific to their local area, three Local Plan options consultation documents were produced – one each for Buxton, the Central Area and Glossopdale.
- 1.6 The consultation documents asked for comments on a number of questions relating to the housing targets, the distribution of housing across the Borough, potential housing allocations and other development issues, such as employment, retailing, leisure and local green spaces. The same options for the High peak and sub-area housing requirements were provided in each document. Local options for potential housing sites and other development issues were set out in each sub-area options document.
- 1.7 A total of 1,146 respondents made comments in response to the consultation. Of these, 690 were from residents or organisations in the Glossopdale area,

311 from the Central Area and 133 from the Buxton area. Comments were also made and recorded from the drop-in sessions which were attended by approximately 530 local residents. Other responses received were a 600 signature petition in support of the Local Open Space designation at George Street Wood, Glossop, a poster signed by 26 people objecting to the potential development sites in Charlesworth, and a letter with 47 signatories objecting to development in Simmondley.

- 1.7 Consultation on the policies was more targeted to specific organisations and statutory consultees although it was also open for others to comment,
- 1.8 It should be noted that this report summarises only the responses made to the questionnaires. **A separate report has been produced which summarises the comments made at the drop-in sessions.**

2. High Peak Housing Requirements

Question HP1 – Which housing target do you think is the most appropriate for High Peak?

The consultation identified three housing targets for consultation:

- 270 dwellings per annum = 5,830 new homes over the plan period
- 300 dwellings per annum = 6,490 new homes over the plan period
- 330 dwellings per annum = 7,150 new homes over the plan period

The Council's preferred target for the purposes of consultation was 270 dwellings per annum.

HP1 - All Responses

	270/annum	300/annum	330/annum
Buxton	63	5	10
Central Area	121	8	8
Glossopdale	300	8	5
TOTAL	484	21	23

HP1 - Buxton Responses

Question	No. of Responses	Reasons
Option 1 : 270 homes per year	63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient infrastructure to support more development (13) • 2011 Census suggests a lower number is needed (5) • Bring empty homes back into use (7) • Lack of demand / homes for sale (10) • Few available brownfield sites (1) • Lack of local jobs (9) • Need to protect countryside / Peak District / character (12) • Avoid overdevelopment (4) • More will harm tourism (2) • Enough homes in Buxton (2) • Buxton should not become overspill for other towns/cities (1) • Building new homes will not fix economy (1) • Town centre is failing (1) • Too much traffic (3) • In line with housing needs in Buxton (3) • Need more affordable housing (2) • Even 270 is unsustainable (3) • Gradual development needed in sustainable locations (1) • Build Fairfield Link Road (1) • Limited number of suitable sites (1) • Least damaging option (1) • Focus on brownfield (2) • Need to keep evidence for housing needs under review (3) • Little difference between options (1) • Unfair burden on towns outside of National Park (1)
Option 2 : 300 homes per year	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closer to meeting needs (1) • Need for affordable housing (1) • Benefit of more working age people (1) <p>Trevor Osborne - Buxton would benefit from an increase in its population.</p> <p>Hallam Land - 300 per year is the only independantly tested figure available</p> <p>Buxton Group - This option is closer to meeting projected needs. Sites for this number should be made available initially and adjusted in the light of experience</p>

<p>Option 3: 330 homes per year</p>	<p>10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more Council / affordable housing (2) • Young people need places to live (1) • Preferred option would result in a lower rate of development than last few years (1) • Higher target should ensure needs are met (2) • Infrastructure needs should be planned for (1) • Lower options will still require new infrastructure (1) • Fewer homes = higher house prices (1) • Families forced to move away as they cannot afford to live locally (1) • Towns will stagnate with lower housing target (1) • Lower target will lead to reduction in working age population (1) • Careful planning can accomodate 330 a year appropriately (1) <p>Mr R Braddock - option 3 more closely matches housing needs and provides more affordable housing. Projections based on 2011 Census are unlikely to support a requirement as low as 270 per annum.</p> <p>Tesco - the plan should provide as many homes as is practical to deliver.</p> <p>Chatsworth Settlement Trustees - option 1 not consistent with NPPF. Option 3; better meets housing need, offers greater support to regeneration of Buxton, reduces trend of working age people moving away, greater opportunities for new infrastructure.</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - Support option 3 - pressure of growth for housing from different groups e.g. elderly, young singles and divided families.</p>
<p>General Comments</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the options are preferred (6) • Protect countryside (2) • 270 a year is unattainable (1) • Lack of demand (2) • 2011 Census suggests a lower number is needed (1) • Lack of local employment (2) • Poor infrastructure (3) • Buxton is too cold (2) • Buxton is an historic town (2) • No high speed broadband (1) • Overdevelopment will harm tourism (1) • More jobs before more housing (1) <p>Persimmon Homes - strongly object to</p>

		preferred target which will not meet housing needs as required by NPPF. Evidence is out of date. All opportunities to develop new homes should be exploited. Housing target in line with 2008 household projections should be adopted.
TOTAL RESPONSES	85	

HP1 - Central Responses

Question	No. of Responses	Reasons
Option 1: 270 homes per year	121	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 270 is too high (27) • Need to protect the countryside (23) • Limited job opportunities (7) • Will encourage more commuting (4) • Roads cannot cope with more traffic (12) • Traffic, sewerage and water supply are long standing issues in Furness Vale and Whaley Bridge (1) • Controlled development (4) • Need to retain character (7) • Smaller communities are better for health (1) • Train services run to capacity and parking facilities at all stations inadequate (1) • Lot of empty homes for sale (10) • Infrastructure cannot cope with more (3) <p>National Trust - It is agreed that it is important to protect the distinctive character of High Peak and in particular to ensure that new development does not adversely impact upon the setting of the Peak District National Park – including views to and from the National Park. Clearly if reasonable development needs can be met with a provision of 270 dwellings per annum then there is a good case not to exceed that number. National Trust is therefore content with the preferred option</p>
Option 2 : 300 homes per year	8	
Option 3: 330 homes per year	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New option 4 proposed: 410 pa based on 2008 based household projections (1) • Need houses for young people (2)
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None (10) • Plenty of empty homes (1) • Will encourage commuting (1) • Loss of wildlife habitats (1) • Loss of countryside (1)
TOTAL RESPONSES	139	

HP1 - Glossopdale Responses

Question	No. of Responses	Reasons
Option 1: 270 homes per year	300	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 270 too high (75) • should be similar to National park target of 110 (7) • large number of empty properties (3) • population growth in High Peak lower than the national average (1) • road network already congested (44) • not enough leisure facilities (15) • use empty properties (2) • no more until bypass is built (1) • only brownfield sites (1) • should be 150-170 pa (7) • review road layout and capacity before new homes built (1) • area of outstanding beauty so development will have a major impact (1) <p>Tameside - reduces potential for further pressure on existing infrastructure with High Peak/Tameside boundary linking M67 and Woodhead. Supports Greater Manchester economy, reduces pressure on greenfield sites</p> <p>Residents Association - Balances development and protection of the environment</p>
Option 2 : 300 homes per year	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • balance between needs and protecting the environment (1) • more affordable homes (1)
Option 3: 330 homes per year	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help deliver affordable homes (1) • will help to promote and create more employment opportunities, result in lower new house prices, lessen migration, help the viability and sustainability of the town centre facilities and related infrastructure
General Comments	33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None(33) • traffic congestion (6) • 150pa (7) • brownfield sites only (2)
TOTAL RESPONSES	346	

HP1 - General Responses

English Heritage - We do not have any detailed comments to make, however we would agree that this option offer the most balanced approach in terms of impact on the environment, including the historic environment.

Natural England - It is not within the remit of Natural England to specify an appropriate housing target for an area. Natural England emphasise the importance of allocating a sustainable housing target that is able to meet current development needs in the area, reflecting the sentiment expressed within the NPPF. Moreover, Natural England highlight the importance of considering the need to conserve and protect the natural environment and ecosystems on each potential development site.

Friends of the Peak District - Believe that the projected housing numbers should be re-visited, taking into account the impact of the recession and local statistics that more accurately reflect local trends, and that housing development should be restricted to affordable housing.

Derbyshire Fire & Rescue Service - DFRS do not currently anticipate that proposals for between 270-330 new homes per annum are likely to result in an adverse impact upon service delivery in terms of geographical coverage and response times. However it is considered important in the interests of creating sustainable and balanced communities that DFRS continues to monitor the preparation of the Local Plan and reserves the right to monitor its implementation and respond where potential impacts are identified and opportunities are presented to improve service delivery.

Derbyshire County Council -

3. Sub-Area Housing Requirements

Question HP2 – Which option do you consider to be the most appropriate for the distribution of housing growth across the High Peak?

The consultation sought feedback on the potential distribution of housing growth between the three sub-areas of the Borough – Glossopdale, Central Area and Buxton. Three alternative options were identified:

Option A Growth along the Buxton-Dove holes-Chapel-en-le-frith axis

Option B: Focus growth in the two principal market towns- Buxton and Glossop

Option C: Distribute growth amongst all of the market towns - Buxton, Glossop, New Mills, Chapel-en-le-frith and Whaley Bridge

Each of these options had different implications for the number of new homes needed in each sub-area:

Sub-area	% of High Peak housing target to be accommodated		
	Option A	Option B	Option C
Buxton Area	48%	38-42%	32-43%
Central Area	27%	27%	30-33%
Glossopdale	25%	31-35%	27-35%

All Responses

	Option A	Option B	Option C
Buxton	5	8	73
Central Area	50	81	28
Glossopdale	259	10	88
TOTAL	284	99	189

HP2 - Buxton Responses

Question	No. of Responses	Reasons
<p>Option A Growth along the Buxton-Dove holes-Chapel-en-le-frith axis</p>	5	<p>Persimmon Homes - largest proportion of growth should occur in the most sustainable settlement of Buxton.</p> <p>Mr R Braddock - option A supports regeneration in Buxton and Chapel and projects the Green Belt and environmentally sensitive sites.</p> <p>Chatsworth Settlement Trustees - broadly support option A subject to detailed assessments and better understanding of factors such as development site capacities and infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>Hallam Land - Option A & B supported - Buxton is a sustainable location with capacity for significant growth around Foxhill Farm (B20,B21 and B22 and beyond). This area could provide an area of significant sustainable growth adjacent an existing employment area.</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - Support option A:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buxton - Chapel axis is not constrained by Green Belt. 2. Enough suitable development available 3. Buxton's large employment base created by University, HSE and tourism. 4. Aging population, divided families and independent living. 5. No infrastructure constraints.
<p>Option B: Focus growth in the two principal market towns- Buxton and Glossop</p>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers best range of services (2) • Growth in main towns reduces need to travel (2) • Character of High Peak will be retained by concentrating growth (1) • Bring empty homes back into use (1) <p>Trevor Osborne - increased population in established towns would assist vibrancy and use of retail/leisure to support economy.</p> <p>Hallam Land - Option A & B supported - Buxton is a sustainable location with capacity for significant growth around Foxhill Farm (B20,B21 and B22 and beyond). This area could provide an area of significant sustainable growth adjacent an existing employment area.</p>

<p>Option C: Distribute growth amongst all of the market towns - Buxton, Glossop, New Mills, Chapel-en-le-frith and Whaley Bridge</p>	<p>73</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spread development to reduce impact / overcrowding and infrastructure problems (28) • Housing should match needs (6) • Need to maintain Buxton's character / attractiveness to visitors (4) • Buxton and Glossop already suffer from anti-social behaviour (1) • Enough homes for sale in Buxton (1) • Not enough jobs in Buxton (1) • Fairest distribution (4) • Best reflects access to jobs (1) • Growth in villages with services is acceptable (2) • Locate new homes in towns / sustainable locations (2) • Support even distribution because past policy has restricted growth everywhere apart from Buxton (2) • Provides more flexibility (2) • Option C reduces amount of greenfield development (1) • Bring empty homes back into use (1) • Support option C but focus on A6 corridor (1) • Reduces need for large estates (1) • Even distribution of affordable housing (2) • Less impact on Harpur Hill (1) • Spread benefits of new housing (1) • Help keep all market towns viable (1) <p>Buxton Group - Past policy has been to concentrate development within the Buxton sub-area, we believe that it should now be more evenly distributed and support option C</p>
<p>TOTAL</p>	<p>86</p>	

HP2 - Central Responses

Question	No. of Responses	Reasons
<p>Option A Growth along the Buxton-Dove holes-Chapel-en-le-frith axis</p>	50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads/transport facilities outside these areas are not adequate (5) • Need more affordable housing (1) • Supporting the existing strategy (6) • More open areas available (2) • Dove Holes good location for new growth (3)
<p>Option B: Focus growth in the two principal market towns- Buxton and Glossop</p>	81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the countryside (5) • Need more affordable housing (1) • Buxton and Glossop have the infrastructure to support growth (24) • It would support the long term growth of Buxton and Glossop as service centres (13) • Large towns with easy access to other towns around High Peak (1) • Growth of Whaley Bridge produces commuters and congestion (1) • Smaller towns lack facilities (4) • Buxton only as Glossop has serious traffic problems (1) • Keep smaller towns small (4) • Loss character risked (2) <p>National Trust - These are the key locations in High Peak and are best served in terms of the wider range of services that they already provide as well being better served by public transport infrastructure. National Trust would be more particularly concerned if Option C was pursued, which it is considered would put more strain on infrastructure and support services and be more likely to impact upon valued environmental resources, including the setting of the Peak District National Park. Turning to the distribution within the Central area it is agreed that the balance is about right, especially the concentration of the majority of new development within the more urban parishes. The provision of a low level of development, in particular in order to secure housing to meet local needs, in the two rural parishes is noted and supported.</p>
<p>Option C: Distribute growth amongst all of the market towns - Buxton, Glossop, New Mills, Chapel-en-le-frith and whaley Bridge</p>	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more affordable housing (2) • Fair to everyone (6) • Prevent Buxton and Glossop from becoming too big (1) • Carry on with tourism (1) • Greater choice between potential sites (1) • Careful and limited growth across areas that are already built up (1)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spreading growth minimises impact in any one place (3)
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield (1) • Growth should be around Buxton (1)
TOTAL	144	

HP2 - Glossopdale Responses

Question	No. of Responses	Reasons
Option A Growth along the Buxton-Dove holes-Chapel-en-le-frith axis	259	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no growth for Glossop (15) • Road congestion (8) • parking problems in Glossop town centre (15) • open country around Dove Holes suitable for development (1) • area not as built up (2) • space to grow and maintain individual settlements (1) • poor public transport (1) • need to improve infrastructure (13) • Glossop destroyed by more housing development (1) <p>Tameside - strengthens prosperity of Buxton, supports growth in Greater Manchester</p> <p>Residents Association - traffic and other inadequate infrastructure</p>
Option B: Focus growth in the two principal market towns- Buxton and Glossop	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • most sustainable locations (1) • established infrastructure (1) • reduce need to travel (1)
Option C: Distribute growth amongst all of the market towns - Buxton, Glossop, New Mills, Chapel-en-le-frith and Whaley Bridge	68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • balanced development (1) • market towns need to retain characteristics (1)
Other	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none(8) • traffic congestion (1)
TOTAL	345	

HP2 - General Responses

English Heritage - In terms of the historic environment, all of the potential options have advantages and disadvantages for the historic environment within High Peak and require careful consideration. We note the SA results identifying option C as the most sustainable strategy. We do not have any detailed comments to make on this; however we would agree that this option offers the most balanced approach and may be positive in terms of reducing pressure at Buxton, without compromising regeneration initiatives.

Natural England - Natural England favour Option B. We note that option A proposes the largest release of greenfield land around the town of Buxton. Whilst options B and C redistribute this growth around other towns, where; for example, Glossop has further possibility for brownfield development. Natural England support the re-use of land where it has become vacant or under used but would advocate that brownfield development is only undertaken where the site is of low ecological value.

Option B would focus growth on the two main towns of Buxton and Glossop which is considered a sustainable option in terms of proximity to services and transport hubs.

Friends of the Peak District - favour development focused on all three market towns (Option C) but only within environmental capacity.

Derbyshire County Council -

4. Housing Site Options

Question 3 – Which potential housing sites would you prefer to be allocated for development in the Local Plan?

The consultation identified a range of potential housing site options in each of the sub-areas and asked respondents to score each site that they wished to comment on by choosing one of the following options and to give reasons for their chose:

1. Strongly Object
2. Object
3. Neutral/general comment
4. Support
5. Strongly support

The following section provides a summary of the responses received for each sub-area.

Buxton Sites

Question B1 - Which potential housing sites would you prefer to be allocated for development in the Local Plan?

Site: B1 Batham Gate Road Peak Dale

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
74	9	7	29	22	8

Summary of Public Comments:

- Too remote (2)
- Homes already for sale (1)
- Too much traffic on A6 (1)
- No local amenities (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? – yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? –no
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site –no
- Would a TA be required? - no

Education:

Within normal area of Peak Dale Primary School. Housing development on this scale can be supported.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. Medium archaeological potential (roman road and likely pre-historic activity). Post-1650 enclosure, regular fields

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

No comment

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

The group is neutral regarding the two sites in Peak Dale (B1 and B2).

Site: B2 Land at Batham Gate Peak Dale

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
74	9	8	31	18	7

Summary of Public Comments:

- Too remote (2)
- Highway safety concerns due to HGV's / suitability of road (1)
- Lower speed limit to 30mph (1), electricity cable may need to be updated (1)
- Water supply for nearby properties is sourced at eastern end of site and runs under field (1)
- Local sewerage pumping station may not cope (1)
- Loss of privacy (1)
- Harm character (1)
- Used for agriculture (1)
- Devalue property (1)
- Pollution from quarry (1)
- Too much traffic on A6 (1)
- No amenities (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - yes, subject to adequate visibility splays so limited to locations towards the middle of site ie not adjacent the western or eastern boundary due to lack of or narrow footway.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? - yes, restrict number of individual accesses onto the classified road and improve fronting footway.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site -no.
- Would a TA be required? - no.

Education:

No comment made

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. Medium archaeological potential (roman road and likely pre-historic activity). Post-1650 enclosure, regular fields

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

No comment

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

The group is neutral regarding the two sites in Peak Dale (B1 and B2).

Site: B3 Land at Hogshaw (reserve land), Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
74	16	22	16	12	8

Summary of Public Comments:

- Should remain as reserve land (2).
- Not viable (3)
- N access (3)
- Contaminated (2)
- Protect land with amenity value (6)
- Develop link road (1)
- DCC report requires some land to be retained for Monsal trail (1)
- Traffic problems on Nunsfield Rd (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? – no. e does not have a controlled frontage to a public highway.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? - possibly, can only be developed in conjunction with adjacent site B4. Site identified in current local plan, however, it requires a new link road from the A6 to be provided to facilitate access to the site.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - n/a, within the site - not able to inspect.
- Would a TA be required? - yes, on the basis it can only be developed in conjunction with a neighbouring site. Transport assessment and travel plan required.

Transport Strategy

A6 corridor is congested throughout much of the day.

Education:

Within normal area for Fairfield Infants and Fairfield Junior School. There are rising numbers from within the existing population which will fill the existing surplus accommodation at this school, but the site can accommodate extension. Similarly, the junior school can accommodate additional numbers from within its current capacity.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. Medium archaeological potential (roman road may cross site). Post-1650 enclosure, regular fields

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Adjacent to a conservation area and there maybe other setting issues with nearby listed buildings, including Fairfield Farm. The sites have potential for non-designated archaeology.

Natural England

NE would not support the allocation of B3. Is currently allocated for open space within the existing Local Plan. NE would not support its loss to development unless a suitable replacement site of sufficient quality can be found and unless it can be demonstrated that its development would not harm any ecological features of importance.

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

Would prefer the reserve area (B3) to be a really last resort

Site: B4 Land at Hogshaw, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
78	15	20	12	24	9

Summary of Public Comments:

- Retain wildlife / mature trees present (4)
- Protect as green space for community (6)
- Concern re. pollution at former tip (5)
- No viable (3), no access (3)
- Develop link road (1)
- DCC report requires some land to be retained for Monsal trail (1)
- Traffic problems on Nunsfield Rd (1)
- Should be classified as greenfield (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - no – site abuts Nunsfield Road and Glenmoor Road, however, both these streets would be unsuitable to cater for the increased level of traffic as a result of development.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially- possibly, site is identified in the Local Plan, however, it requires a new link road from the A6 to be provided to facilitate access to the site (not currently shown as being controlled – TR3)
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? -Yes – intensification of existing streets (Nunsfield Road and Glenmoor Road) that are not suitable to cater for significant increases in traffic as a result of development. Fairfield Road also subject to frequent congestion.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - Yes – limitations in existing highway network (Nunsfield Road/ Glenmoor Road), within the site - Not able to inspect from public highway.
- Would a TA be required? - yes

Transport Strategy

A6 corridor is congested throughout much of the day.

Education:

Within normal area for Fairfield Infants and Fairfield Junior School. There are rising numbers from within the existing population which will fill the existing surplus accommodation at this school, but the site can accommodate extension. Similarly, the junior school can accommodate additional numbers from within its current capacity.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological desk-based assessment and field evaluation pre-application. Medium archaeological potential (roman road may cross site). Post-1650 enclosure, regular fields plus woodland.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Adjacent to a conservation area and there maybe other setting issues with nearby listed buildings, including Fairfield Farm. The sites have potential for non-designated archaeology.

Natural England

NE support the allocation of B4 as it already has secured an allocation for housing within the existing Local Plan. Natural England is concerned with the allocation of site B4 as it is predominantly greenfield with an area of woodland and TPO covering part of the site. It has a high propensity for supporting wildlife and other flora and fauna.

Network Rail

Site boundary includes Network Rail land. Developer should liaise with NR. A 2m gap is required between any building and structure on site and the Network Rail boundary. A minimum 1.8m high trespass proof steel palisade fence would be required to prevent trespass by any users/residents of the site onto the railway. The land at Hogshaw Lane is to the south of Bull Farm Foot Level Crossing and as such if there is a material increase in the type or volume of traffic using the crossing then Network Rail would in the first instance seek closure of the crossing with a developer funded alternative method of crossing the railway, e.g. footbridge (subject to Network Rail approval).

Other Bodies:Buxton Group

While the group would like to see some development in Fairfield and Hogshaw, we are adamant that this should not be started until action has been taken to relieve the pressure of traffic on Fairfield Road. This is now a really urgent issue because as the town grows, in whatever area, the need for journeys along this part of the A6 is going to increase. With that proviso, we support the development of the main area in Hogshaw (B4).

Site: B5 Ambulance Station, The Glade, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
78	9	3	9	29	27

Summary of Public Comments:

- Should remain as an ambulance station (3)
- Central location (1)
- No intrusion (1)
- Locate ambulance post at Buxton Hospital (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? – yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? –no
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site – no
- Would a TA be required? - no

Education:

No comment made

Archaeology

No archaeological issues

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

No comment

Natural England

Sites B5, B6 and B7 are all town centre locations and so represent sustainable locations for growth being close to the main transport hubs and located adjacent to existing residential areas.

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

We strongly support the use of the Ambulance Station site, off Park Road, (B5) as a site for housing.

Site: B6 Hardwick Square South, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
78	4	3	4	32	35

Summary of Public Comments:

- Retain employment (1)
- No space (1)
- Within an existing residential area (1)
- Present use is inappropriate (1)
- Central location (1)
- No intrusion (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - yes, subject to a speed reading survey being commissioned, a single point of access to Hardwick Square South only could probably be provided with adequate visibility splays. Multiple access points to Hardwick Square South could not be provided with adequate visibility splays and would therefore be resisted. Other potential access points to South Avenue and Market Street would need to be limited to pedestrian access only given the limited controlled frontage/visibility/pedestrian intervisibility
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? -no, replacement of industrial premises.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - no.
- Would a TA be required? - no

Education:

Within normal area of Buxton Infant and Primary Schools. Addressing the pressure from within existing population growth is proving to be exceptionally difficult for the Infant School, and these housing numbers (options B6, 7 & 10) and the potential impact on the school makes these proposals problematic for the Local Authority. The site of the Infant School is so tight that extension of the building is not an option and internal remodelling is limited in scope. Buxton Junior School could accommodate the numbers of pupils generated by the development.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological desk-based assessment pre-application; further work could be conditioned. Medium archaeological potential (roman / medieval). May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

B6 is wholly within the conservation area (the option cites only partial inclusion) and is also adjacent to a number of listed buildings. The setting of these heritage assets will need to be considered.

Natural England

Sites B5, B6 and B7 are all town centre locations and so represent sustainable locations for growth being close to the main transport hubs and located adjacent to existing residential areas.

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

We strongly support the use of the Otters factory site (B6) as long as adequate off street parking is provided

Site: B7 Market Street Depot, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
78	3	5	8	27	35

Summary of Public Comments:

- Would protect greenfield sites (1)
- Retain employment (1)
- Retain car parking (1)
- Central location (1)
- No intrusion (1)
- Include refurbishment of existing properties (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - yes, an extension of Clough Street and access to Market Street are feasible to serve development – preferable to provide a link joining the streets to improve permeability
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? - Possibly – the anticipated number of properties proposed would need to be counterbalanced against the traffic which may be generated by the existing commercial / industrial uses already found on site. The loss of town centre parking would increase on street parking demand in the area.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - no.
- Would a TA be required? - Yes – Transport Statement - developments less than 50 dwellings do not normally require assessment, however, in this instance the town centre streets may be sensitive to any increase in traffic

Education:

Within normal area of Buxton Infant and Primary Schools. Addressing the pressure from within existing population growth is proving to be exceptionally difficult for the Infant School, and these housing numbers (options B6, 7 & 10) and the potential impact on the school makes these proposals problematic for the Local Authority. The site of the Infant School is so tight that extension of the building is not an option and internal remodelling is limited in scope. Buxton Junior School could accommodate the numbers of pupils generated by the development.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological desk-based assessment and field evaluation pre-application. May have negative impact on adjacent Conservation Area. High archaeological potential (within roman town).

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Site B7 is adjacent to the conservation area

Natural England

Sites B5, B6 and B7 are all town centre locations and so represent sustainable locations for growth being close to the main transport hubs and located adjacent to existing residential areas.

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

We support development providing that the public parking provision is not reduced and that there is also additional parking to serve the new development.

Site: B8 Land west of Tongue Lane, Fairfield, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
81	6	8	20	23	18

Summary of Public Comments:

- Retain farm land (1)
- Needs link road (6)
- Install traffic lights at Fairfield Rd / Queens Rd junction (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

S Robinson - flat, low quality farmland with natural boundaries. Well related to existing settlement, good access to amenities and employment, well integrated in landscape, good site for affordable housing / homes for elderly, plans drawn up, within CS broad location for growth, highway engineer report confirms site can be accessed from Granby Rd, no constraints to viability, contributions towards infrastructure (inc. link road), contribute towards sustainability of Fairfield, other site not deliverable. **Barratt Homes** - suitable site for development subject to access improvements. Site is relatively flat, good potential access to town centre and public transport. Close proximity to employment sites. Access dependent on implementation of neighbouring development site and associated access improvements. Site would therefore be deliverable later in plan period.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? -No – Tongue Lane fronting the site is an un-made non-classified highway, single vehicle width and not suitable in its current form to cater for any increase in vehicular traffic.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? Possibly – only on the basis of the provision of the Fairfield link road linking Granby Road, Victoria Park Road to the A6 via a new roundabout junction and being able to link to it, bearing in mind the adjacent site is currently indicated as benefitting from planning consent (the layout approved may therefore not make allowance for access to this site).
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? - Yes – the existing residential estate streets and the A6 already suffer from frequent congestion. Not possible to provide meaningful mitigating improvements to offset additional impact.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - Yes – limitations on Tongue Lane, within the site – No
- Would a TA be required? - yes

Transport Strategy

A6 corridor is congested throughout much of the day. Bus service improvements to support major development at Fairfield. Link road would improve access.

Education:

Within normal area of Buxton Infant and Primary Schools. Addressing the pressure from within existing population growth is proving to be exceptionally difficult for the Infant School, and these housing numbers (options B6, 7 & 10) and the potential impact on the school makes these proposals problematic for the Local Authority. The

site of the Infant School is so tight that extension of the building is not an option and internal remodelling is limited in scope. Buxton Junior School could accommodate the numbers of pupils generated by the development.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological evaluation pre-application. Negative impact upon high value historic landscape (ancient enclosures). Close to Fairfield Low barrow.

Planning & Infrastructure

Detailed consideration should be given to the urban/rural interface, using the development as an opportunity to enhance the interface and landscape character type (plateau pastures)

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Difficult to judge relationship to views out of Park. Could be of strategic concern if Cunningdale skyline is being broken.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Potential to contain non-designated archaeology

Natural England

NE has some concerns. B8 is one of the largest potential sites identified and is Greenfield land. Represents an intrusion into the open countryside and there are also a number of young trees and two ponds within the site. It is less than 200m from Cuning Dale - part of the Peak Dales SAC. Further ecological examination of the site, including HRA, is required prior to its allocation for development.

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

We do not want to see Fairfield sprawling too far over the green fields towards Tongue Lane (B8). Perhaps a limited development might take place here in the later part of the plan period. We also recommend that a corridor is reserved so that the future development of a Fairfield bypass is not obstructed.

Site: B9 Land behind Granby Road, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
76	8	9	24	21	13

Summary of Public Comments:

- Should remain as amenity land (2)
- Needs link road (6), too congested (1)
- Install traffic lights at Fairfield Rd / Queens Rd junction (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? –No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? – no
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site – yes
- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

A6 corridor is congested throughout much of the day. Bus service improvements to support major development at Fairfield. Link road would improve access.

Education:

Within normal area for Fairfield Infants and Fairfield Junior School. There are rising numbers from within the existing population which will fill the existing surplus accommodation at this school, but the site can accommodate extension. Similarly, the junior school can accommodate additional numbers from within its current capacity.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. Post-1650 enclosures, altered by housing development. Close to Ashwood Dale cave.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Potential to contain non-designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

We think that The Launt (B9) should be protected as Local Green Space. We also press the Borough Council to enforce the conditions of Planning Approval HPK/2006/0861. Currently there is no proper path and there is still discarded construction debris, such as plastic pipe, lying about on the ground.

Site: B10 Land off Dukes Drive, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
79	23	12	14	17	13

Summary of Public Comments:

- Not viable, deliverable, achievable (1)
- May flood (1)
- Major encroachment in countryside (1)
- Poor / dangerous access (1)
- Highly prominent (1)
- Harmful to ecology (1)
- Central location (1)
- No intrusion (1)
- Only develop if link road between A6 - A515 is provided (1)
- Site adds to character of Buxton in current form (1)
- Dukes Drive should be widened / highway improvements needed (2)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Chatsworth Settlement Trustees - strongly support B10. Own majority of site which is; close to town centre, well located for walking, cycling and public transport access, safe for vehicle access off Dukes Drive, not in Green Belt, special landscape value or at risk of flooding or constrained by any legacy of previous use. many other options in Buxton may either be unachievable or unavailable or poorly located in terms of landscape impact or accessibility.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - No – whilst there is a considerable roadside frontage to Dukes Drive where satisfactory visibility sightlines could be met, access gradients would be a restrictive factor in providing a means of access to the site. There is an unmade road off Byron Street leading to the allotments – this would not, even with some upgrading, be suitable to serve a development of this scale.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? No – unlikely to be able to overcome deficiencies or impact associated with a large scale development.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? - Yes – the scale of development proposed would have impacts at both the A6 and A515 junction, both of which have existing limitations. Dukes Drive itself has limited carriageway width in parts, steep gradient from the A6 and very limited pedestrian provision along its entire length.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - Yes – site sits at a higher level than surrounding highways – unlikely to achieve satisfactory street gradients from Dukes Drive over the initial section of access route without significant re-profiling of the landform.
- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

Dukes Drive is narrow and is of poor horizontal and vertical alignment. Junction improvements and engineering works are likely to be required.

Education:

Within normal area of Buxton Infant and Primary Schools. Addressing the pressure from within existing population growth is proving to be exceptionally difficult for the Infant School, and these housing numbers (options B6, 7 & 10) and the potential impact on the school makes these proposals problematic for the Local Authority. The site of the Infant School is so tight that extension of the building is not an option and internal remodelling is limited in scope. Buxton Junior School could accommodate the numbers of pupils generated by the development.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological desk-based assessment and field evaluation pre-application. Medium / high archaeological potential. Lime kiln site. Prehistoric finds in vicinity.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Potential to contain non-designated archaeology

Natural England

B10 is a large greenfield site and its development would represent an intrusion into the open countryside. This site also lies adjacent to a wildlife site and less than a 1km from Cunning Dale. The specific impacts upon these natural assets would require consideration prior to an allocation.

Network Rail

There is encroachment in the southern section of the site. High Peak Council should remove all Network Rail land from the red line boundary area for site B10. A 2m gap is required between any building and structure on site and the Network Rail boundary. A minimum 1.8m high trespass proof steel palisade fence would be required to prevent trespass by any users/residents of the site onto the railway

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

The Buxton Group has always favoured the development of the fields within Dukes Drive (B10) if, and only if, it provided a better link road from the A6 to the A515. This would save all the heavy vehicles struggling to turn from Dale Road to London Road.

Site: B11 Sherbrook Lodge, Harpur Hill Road, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
77	8	8	18	28	14

Summary of Public Comments:

- Central location (1)
- No intrusion (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No – direct access to Ashbourne Road not possible. Limited frontage shown to Harpur Hill Road – previous planning application showed control of additional land to create access and visibility splays (not included in the current site outline).
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? Possibly – site previously obtained planning approval for 14 dwellings under reference HPK/2008/0234 , however, this included additional land to provide a safe means of access and visibility splays. If the same access arrangements as those approved under HPK/2008/0234 could be achieved development would be possible.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - Unlikely – there is a plateau where development for a limited number of dwellings is possible, however, there are sections of the land covered by mature trees on steep gradients, where development would be very difficult.
- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

No comment made

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. Medium archaeological potential. Route of roman road. Enclosures of unknown date.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Potential to contain non-designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

Now that the Sherbrook Lodge site (B11) has been messed up we strongly support its development

Site: B12 Land adjacent to Buxton Hospital, London Road, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
73	9	6	11	24	24

Summary of Public Comments:

- Should be used for health care (2)
- Council owned land (1)
- Fairly central (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? –No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - No. – within the site – No
- Would a TA be required? - No.

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education

No comment made

Archaeology

Would need archaeological evaluation pre-application. Route of roman road.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Potential to contain non-designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group
Support Cottage Hospital site (B12).

Site: B13 Green Lane Farm, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
88	42	15	7	5	9

Summary of Public Comments:

- Congestion due to school (2)
- Local primary school full (2)
- Few shops or amenities (2),
- Suitable for playing fields extension (9)
- Protect attractive site (1)
- Next to conservation area (2)
- Next to Grinlow Woods (3)
- Develop all brownfield sites 1st (1)
- Large new development nearby already (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Gladman - site represents a highly sustainable location for residential development and there is no technical reason why the site cannot be delivered in the short term.

Owners - Our strong preference is that our land is put forward in the Local Plan for housing development

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - No. No frontage to a public highway. Access to the plot is via a private track access which is of single vehicular width, without passing places or formal pedestrian margins.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? Not easily as the private track emerges onto Green Lane between two properties not included within the site. Would require additional land and demolition of property/boundary walls.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Potentially as there is a secondary school opposite the private track access junction. Access to Poole's Cavern Visitor Centre is within 160m to the west.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - No problems on Green Lane which is generally level in the vicinity of the private track access. The private track access gently slopes to the site - within the site - The site slopes up to woodland at the south which may impact on gradient for some plots
- Would a TA be required? - Yes due to proximity of the school and Visitor Centre to the site

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Lies within normal area of Burbage Primary School. This school is under great pressure for places from within existing population growth. Normal area numbers are rising and an additional two classrooms are being planned for September 2013 currently. The school site is restricted and access to undertake any construction work is difficult. Levels across the site restrict the potential location of future development as well. Development of all site options within normal area (B13-19) would require an additional two classrooms plus group room and toilets at least, but it is very difficult to see where it could be located and pressure on non-teaching accommodation would be unsustainable. This is not an area where education infrastructure can be developed to match housing growth.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological evaluation pre-application. Negative impact upon high value historic landscape. Setting impacts to nationally important Grin Low site.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Adjacent to a conservation area

Natural England

NE would not support the allocation of B13 or B14. NE notes the proximity of sites B13 and B14 to the Grin Low SSSI. Natural England would not support any allocation of these sites until such point that an ecological assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate that the no adverse impacts would result.

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

We regard Green Lane Farm (B13) and the adjacent field (B14) as unsuitable for built development of any kind because they form the setting for Grin Low Woods. They could, however, be used for playing fields, with single story sports pavilions if necessary, or for car parking, as both Poole's Cavern and Buxton Community School might need additional parking

Green Holm Community Group

B13 / B14 - It is part of the setting of Grin Low Ridge and Buxton Country Park. Partly designated as SLA to help protect the visual amenity value of Grin Low. Development of the site would place a large housing estate right at the foot of the Grin Low massif compromising its landscape value and the amenity of its woodlands. strong ecological reasons for leaving this site free of any development. Firstly, the vastly increased casual human presence in the wood resulting from a housing estate on its boundaries would threaten the unique floral assemblages of its calcareous glades that are responsible for its designation as an SSSI. Secondly, in his 2010 report to DEFRA, 'Making Space for Nature: A review of England's Wildlife Sites and Ecological Networks', Professor Lawton confronts the catastrophic decline in Britain's wildlife and flora. Populations are decreasing and species going extinct at an

accelerating rate as increased human presence fragments and destroys their habitats. To reverse the decline, call for the re-establishing of 'coherent ecological networks' through which species can move and repopulate the countryside. There is agreement that, as a first step towards this goal, existing conservation areas and wildlife refuges such as Grin Low Woods and Buxton Country Park need to be strengthened and protected by buffer zones free of development. increased traffic that development of this site would bring to Green Lane and Holmfield. These roads are used as a short cut between the London and Leek roads and the route is seriously congested at certain times of day, particularly when children are journeying to and from the two local schools. Extra housing on Green Lane can only increase the already substantial risk of traffic accidents.

Site: B14 Land to south east of Green Lane, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
76	37	14	11	5	9

Summary of Public Comments:

- Congestion due to school (2)
- Local primary school full (2)
- Few shops or amenities (2)
- Suitable for playing fields extension (9)
- Develop all brownfield sites 1st (1)
- Large new development nearby already (1)
- Next to Grinlow woods (2)
- Adjacent to conservation area (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Gladman - site represents a highly sustainable location for residential development and there is no technical reason why the site cannot be delivered in the short term.

Owners - Our strong preference is that our land is put forward in the Local Plan for housing development

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - no, site does not have a controlled frontage to a public highway.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? - no.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? no.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - no.
- Would a TA be required? - no.

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Lies within normal area of Burbage Primary School. This school is under great pressure for places from within existing population growth. Normal area numbers are rising and an additional two classrooms are being planned for September 2013 currently. The school site is restricted and access to undertake any construction work is difficult. Levels across the site restrict the potential location of future development as well. Development of all site options within normal area (B13-19) would require an additional two classrooms plus group room and toilets at least, but it is very difficult to see where it could be located and pressure on non-teaching

accommodation would be unsustainable. This is not an area where education infrastructure can be developed to match housing growth.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological evaluation pre-application. Negative impact upon high value historic landscape. Setting impacts to nationally important Grin Low site.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Adjacent to a conservation area and Grade II listed buildings (no 85 & 87 Green Lane).

Natural England

NE would not support the allocation of B13 or B14. NE notes the proximity of sites B13 and B14 to the Grin Low SSSI. Natural England would not support any allocation of these sites until such point that an ecological assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate that the no adverse impacts would result.

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

We regard Green Lane Farm (B13) and the adjacent field (B14) as unsuitable for built development of any kind because they form the setting for Grin Low Woods. They could, however, be used for playing fields, with single story sports pavilions if necessary, or for car parking, as both Poole's Cavern and Buxton Community School might need additional parking

Green Holm Community Group

B13 / B14 - It is part of the setting of Grin Low Ridge and Buxton Country Park. Partly designated as SLA to help protect the visual amenity value of Grin Low.

Development of the site would place a large housing estate right at the foot of the Grin Low massif compromising its landscape value and the amenity of its woodlands. strong ecological reasons for leaving this site free of any development. Firstly, the vastly increased casual human presence in the wood resulting from a housing estate on its boundaries would threaten the unique floral assemblages of its calcareous glades that are responsible for its designation as an SSSI. Secondly, in his 2010 report to DEFRA, 'Making Space for Nature: A review of England's Wildlife Sites and Ecological Networks', Professor Lawton confronts the catastrophic decline in Britain's wildlife and flora. Populations are decreasing and species going extinct at an accelerating rate as increased human presence fragments and destroys their habitats. To reverse the decline, call for the re-establishing of 'coherent ecological networks' through which species can move and repopulate the countryside. There is agreement that, as a first step towards this goal, existing conservation areas and wildlife refuges such as Grin Low Woods and Buxton Country Park need to be strengthened and protected by buffer zones free of development. increased traffic that development of this site would bring to Green Lane and Holmfield. These roads are used as a short cut between the London and Leek roads and the route is seriously congested at certain times of day, particularly when children are journeying

to and from the two local schools. Extra housing on Green Lane can only increase the already substantial risk of traffic accidents.

Site: B15 Land off Leek Road, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
76	10	12	27	16	10

Summary of Public Comments:

- Lack of infrastructure/ amenities (3)
- Site include grade 2 listed building - lime house (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - Yes – An access with adequate emerging and forward visibility can be achieved given the extent of controlled frontage.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? -no,
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site -yes.
- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Lies within normal area of Burbage Primary School. This school is under great pressure for places from within existing population growth. Normal area numbers are rising and an additional two classrooms are being planned for September 2013 currently. The school site is restricted and access to undertake any construction work is difficult. Levels across the site restrict the potential lcoation of future developemnt as well. Development of all site options within normal area (B13-19) would require an additional two classrooms plus group room and toilets at least, but it is very difficult to see where it could be located and presure on non-teaching accommodation would be unsustainable. This is not an area where education infrastructure can be developed to match housing growth.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. Post 1650 – parliamentary enclosure

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Includes a grade II listed limehouse – the setting of this will need to be carefully considered prior to the allocation of this site

Other Bodies:Buxton Group

The group is neutral regarding the land at Leek Road (B15) but feel it would be a difficult site to develop because of the steepness of the terrain and the lack of access.

Green Holm Community Group

This site is greenfield, once mined, but which has completely returned to nature. It provides some relief from the suburbanised landscape of the Carr Road and Anncroft Road estates which already despoil the southern entrance to Buxton. The gap in housing where the site meets the Leek road is particularly significant. As you leave the town, it provides a first glimpse of the hills and countryside beyond the built-up area. The neighbouring Carr Road and Anncroft Road estates are conspicuous from the National Park in violation of High Peak Saved Local Plan Policy OC5.

Development on this site will also be clearly visible from the Park further marring the view. There is only one shop local to the site, a newsagents, 500m away across a nasty main road. Consequently, residents will have to travel into town to shop generating more traffic, more pollution and adding to congestion on the Leek Road.

Site: B16 Harehills Kennels, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
79	15	5	23	24	12

Summary of Public Comments:

- Lack of infrastructure/ amenities (4)
- Flooding / drainage concerns (1)
- Land is contaminated from colliery wash out (1)
- Congestion (1)
- Prominent (1)
- Proximity to NP (2)
- Overdevelopment in Burbage (1)
- Support development of brownfield section (1)
- Retain trees (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Persimmon Homes - site and adjacent land is deliverable, makes efficient use of PDL, presents an opportunity to provide a sensitive development that complements the local environment. Forms a natural extension to existing housing. Suitable for inclusion in 5 year land supply.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - Yes – Given the controlled frontage available, very low volumes of traffic passing the site and low vehicle passing speeds, an access with adequate visibility splays could be achieved.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? –no
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - Some embankments within the periphery of the site.
- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Lies within normal area of Burbage Primary School. This school is under great pressure for places from within existing population growth. Normal area numbers are rising and an additional two classrooms are being planned for September 2013 currently. The school site is restricted and access to undertake any construction work is difficult. Levels across the site restrict the potential location of future development as well. Development of all site options within normal area (B13-19)

would require an additional two classrooms plus group room and toilets at least, but it is very difficult to see where it could be located and pressure on non-teaching accommodation would be unsustainable. This is not an area where education infrastructure can be developed to match housing growth.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological desk-based assessment pre-application

Planning & Infrastructure

Sloping site prominent in the landscape.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

(Option B16) is close to the River Wye and flood risk may be an issue as our Flood Maps do not currently include the flood risk associated with this part of the watercourse.

English Heritage:

Potential to contain non-designated archaeology

Natural England

NE note that B16 is described as relatively distant from the town centre and services. Town centre locations are considered to be the most sustainable areas for growth as development would be in the proximity of more services and better transport opportunities.

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Would infill the remaining countryside between the residential development and the National Park. Severe harm has been caused by the recent intrusive residential developments. No further encroachment on the setting of the Park or potential impacts on the SPA/SAC should be allowed.

Buxton Group

We support the use of Harehills Kennels (B16) for housing as long as the majority of trees are retained for screening.

Green Holm Community Group

This site is very close to the National Park boundary. A housing estate on the site would be conspicuous both from the Park [violating OC5] but also to visitors approaching Buxton on the Macclesfield Road. The slope of the site would make it a prominent feature of the landscape from the Leek Road adding to the suburbanisation of the southern gateway to Buxton and further degrading its appearance. As with B15, lack of local shops and distance from the town centre would generate more traffic and add to congestion.

Site: B17 Land behind Macclesfield Main Road, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
86	28	11	17	19	11

Summary of Public Comments:

- Lack of infrastructure/ amenities (3)
- Too prominent / landscape impact (4)
- Wildlife (1)
- Flooding / drainage concerns (2)
- Land is contaminated from colliery wash out (1)
- Congestion (1)
- Loss of grazing land (1)
- Proximity to NP (2)
- Deliverable (1)
- No ownership issues (1)
- No contamination (1)
- Benefits from recent drainage / flood relief scheme (1)
- Site in a bowl / not prominent (1)
- Good access on to A roads (1)
- Natural boundaries to site (1)
- Unstable ground / coal workings (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Private landowner (agent: higham and co)- owns major part of site. Site is adjacent to recent development and is available and deliverable within a short timescale. Strategic planting, screening and open space would form part of scheme. Site plan submitted.

Morten Property Partnership (agent: dowd planning)- own small part of site. Site plan submitted.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - Yes – Given the extent of controlled land, a single point of access could be provided to either Leek Road or Macclesfield Main Road. An access to Leek Road may require the introduction of a right turn harbourage which may affect the level of available emerging visibility and may conflict with an adjacent existing right turn harbourage. Whilst an access with adequate emerging visibility splays could be provided onto Macclesfield Main Road, an access would emerge within or close to a 50mph speed limit where there are only a limited number of existing agricultural accesses. The Highway Authority would therefore have a preference for any new access to be taken off Leek Road.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? - Possibly given the close proximity of an existing residential development and the busy junction between Leek Road and Macclesfield Main Road.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - Yes – the site is subject to significant change in levels and achieving satisfactory street gradients may be difficult.

- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Lies within normal area of Burbage Primary School. This school is under great pressure for places from within existing population growth. Normal area numbers are rising and an additional two classrooms are being planned for September 2013 currently. The school site is restricted and access to undertake any construction work is difficult. Levels across the site restrict the potential location of future development as well. Development of all site options within normal area (B13-19) would require an additional two classrooms plus group room and toilets at least, but it is very difficult to see where it could be located and pressure on non-teaching accommodation would be unsustainable. This is not an area where education infrastructure can be developed to match housing growth.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological desk-based assessment and field evaluation pre-application. Post-1650 – parliamentary enclosure. Adjacent to Cromford and High Peak Railway, prehistoric findspots in vicinity.

Planning & Infrastructure

B17, B18 and B19 are prominent locations on a key road into Buxton. Would extend the western built up area of Burbage into the open countryside with the potential to have a negative impact on views and landscape character.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

This is likely to be controversial, particularly as it will develop up to the National Park boundary. May be of strategic concern to the National Park.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Potential to contain non-designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

Buxton Group

The group is neutral regarding the two sites in Peak Dale (B1 and B2).

Site: B18 Land at A53/A54, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
77	20	8	16	21	13

Summary of Public Comments:

- Lack of infrastructure/ amenities (5)
- Prominent (1)
- Proximity to NP (1)
- Retain employment (1)
- Poor public transport (1)
- Support development of brownfield section (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - Yes – An access with adequate visibility splays can be achieved from both Leek Road and Macclesfield Main Road. However, there is no footway fronting the site on Macclesfield Main Road and an access would emerge within or very close to a 50mph speed limit. The Highway Authority would therefore have a preference for any new access to be taken off Leek Road.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? - Possible right turn harbourage may be required on Leek Road subject to the number of dwellings to be served. If so, emerging visibility splays may not be achievable within controlled land and third party land would probably need to be secured.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - Yes – Significant level differences off both the A53 and A54 and achieving a satisfactory street gradients may be difficult.
- Would a TA be required? - no.

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Lies within normal area of Burbage Primary School. This school is under great pressure for places from within existing population growth. Normal area numbers are rising and an additional two classrooms are being planned for September 2013 currently. The school site is restricted and access to undertake any construction work is difficult. Levels across the site restrict the potential location of future development as well. Development of all site options within normal area (B13-19)

would require an additional two classrooms plus group room and toilets at least, but it is very difficult to see where it could be located and pressure on non-teaching accommodation would be unsustainable. This is not an area where education infrastructure can be developed to match housing growth.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. Adjacent to Cromford and High Peak Railway. Enclosures of unknown date/irregular fields

Planning & Infrastructure

B17, B18 and B19 are prominent locations on a key road into Buxton. Would extend the western built up area of Burbage into the open countryside with the potential to have a negative impact on views and landscape character.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

This is likely to be controversial, particularly as it will develop up to the National Park boundary. May be of strategic concern to the National Park.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Potential to contain non-designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Would infill the remaining countryside between the residential development and the National Park. Severe harm has been caused by the recent intrusive residential developments. No further encroachment on the setting of the Park or potential impacts on the SPA/SAC should be allowed.

Buxton Group

However, we are neutral about the use of the two rather untidy areas off Leek Road A53 (B18 & B19).

Green Holm Community Group

These sites suffer from much the same drawbacks as the ones above. Both are close to or on the boundary with the National Park and occupy a prominent position at the southern entrance to the town. Their development for housing would create a blot on the landscape visible both to tourist in the Park and visitors entering Buxton on the A53 or A54. B19 is an outlier having no point of contact at all with the built boundary of the town. Again, because of the sites' remoteness from any shops, their development would create more car trips and congestion on the Leek road.

Site: B19 Ladmanlow Yard Leek Road, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
82	15	8	18	23	18

Summary of Public Comments:

- Lack of infrastructure/ amenities (5)
- Prominent (1)
- Proximity to NP (1)
- Retain employment (1)
- Poor public transport (1)
- Support development of brownfield section (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Private Landowner - brownfield site which consists of commercial yard and buildings. Good access to highway, town centre and bus route. Road and former railway form natural boundary to site. Set in a hollow reducing landscape impact. Single ownership with services in place.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? – yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? –no
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - The site is lower than the public highway but an existing access already serves the site and relocating the access appears achievable.
- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Lies within normal area of Burbage Primary School. This school is under great pressure for places from within existing population growth. Normal area numbers are rising and an additional two classrooms are being planned for September 2013 currently. The school site is restricted and access to undertake any construction work is difficult. Levels across the site restrict the potential location of future development as well. Development of all site options within normal area (B13-19) would require an additional two classrooms plus group room and toilets at least, but it is very difficult to see where it could be located and pressure on non-teaching accommodation would be unsustainable. This is not an area where education infrastructure can be developed to match housing growth.

Archaeology

No archaeological issues

Planning & Infrastructure

B17, B18 and B19 are prominent locations on a key road into Buxton. Would extend the western built up area of Burbage into the open countryside with the potential to have a negative impact on views and landscape character.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Developing the brownfield part of this site is not considered to be of strategic concern to the National Park. There may be some concern over the Greenfield areas of this site as they slope up from the site further encroaching towards the national park boundaries.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Potential to contain non-designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Would infill the remaining countryside between the residential development and the National Park. Severe harm has been caused by the recent intrusive residential developments. No further encroachment on the setting of the Park or potential impacts on the SPA/SAC should be allowed.

Buxton Group

However, we are neutral about the use of the two rather untidy areas off Leek Road A53 (B18 & B19).

Green Holm Community Group

These sites suffer from much the same drawbacks as the ones above. Both are close to or on the boundary with the National Park and occupy a prominent position at the southern entrance to the town. Their development for housing would create a blot on the landscape visible both to tourist in the Park and visitors entering Buxton on the A53 or A54. B19 is an outlier having no point of contact at all with the built boundary of the town. Again, because of the sites' remoteness from any shops, their development would create more car trips and congestion on the Leek road.

Site: B20 Land off Ashbourne Road, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
80	21	19	10	17	12

Summary of Public Comments:

- Lack of infrastructure/ amenities (6)
- Inspector previously deemed site to be visible / elevated (2)
- Does not help HH (1)
- No direct access to HH available (1)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (2)
- Poor public transport (2)
- Develop link road from A515 to HH (1)
- Retain a green strip between A515 and new development on site (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Hallam Land - B20, B21 & B22 - The site could accommodate between 300 to 500 dwellings and some employment or sui generis use which would bring jobs and housing and concentrate development in to a more sustainable deliverable location that can deliver a high quality scheme alongside publicly accessible well designed open space. Key headline factors include: The site is available and owned by one party who is very keen to deliver the scheme.

The land is being promoted by a developer with significant experience in delivering well designed, sustainable extensions to settlements.

The site is relatively flat with few physical constraints and has good access of the A515 Ashbourne Road. Therefore, there are no known constraints that would prevent a viable development from coming forward to deliver much needed housing in the short term and provide a wide range of tenures and house types.

There is a potential to improve pedestrian and cycle movements to Harpur Hill. The site is also on an existing bus route.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - Yes – given the proposed number of units a right turn harbourage may be required to serve a development of this scale (in-line with that implemented at the Staden Lane junction) or possibly 2 points of access. However sufficient frontage to Ashbourne Road is likely to be available to provide a satisfactory means of access.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? - Possibly – especially if development of neighbouring housing option sites are included. A515 junction in town centre already exceeding capacity.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - no.
- Would a TA be required? - yes

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to five ways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Within normal area of Harpur Hill Primary School. The school site has been reduced in the last four to five years by the location of a Children's Centre and sale of land to provide access for another housing development. It is possible to expand the school on the site with an appropriate S106 contribution.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological desk-based assessment and field evaluation pre-application; possible requirement to retain earthwork in situ, depending on significance. May impact setting of scheduled Foxlow barrow.

Planning & Infrastructure

B20, B21 & B22 are within the plateau pastures LCT which is a simple, sensitive landscape with open and expansive views. All three are greenfield sites that divide Harpur Hill from Buxton. The combination of all three sites would result in Harpur Hill being subsumed as an urban extension of Buxton. Development would change the nature and scale of the settlement and create urban sprawl southwards along the A515; an important gateway to Buxton. Significant landscape and visual concerns and the sensitive location potentially overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Concern that if this site extends too far up Fox Low then visibility from within the National Park could become an issue.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology. Roman road which runs through site.

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

At Foxlow Farm, we support the use of the lower area on Ashbourne Road (part of B20) for development. We suggest that this should be limited at 350 metres from the

road frontage. Higher up, near the farm buildings, we feel that there should be no development, because it is too visible. We therefore oppose areas B21 and B22 along with the higher part of B20.

Site: B21 Land at Foxlow Farm (between B20 and B22), Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
79	28	20	13	12	6

Summary of Public Comments:

- Inspector previously agreed site to be visible / elevated (2)
- Does not help HH (1)
- No direct access to HH available (1)
- Lack of infrastructure/ amenities (4)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (4)
- Develop link road from A515 to HH (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Hallam Land - B20, B21 & B22 cont. The site is well contained within the landscape, being contained by the housing to the west and north and employment uses to the east. The southern approach is protected by a rise in the ground and existing woodland. Landscape architects have visited the site and have drafted an initial Masterplan. Site can be delivered within 5 years. Other options in Buxton are constrained - deliverability, SPA etc.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - No – site does not have a direct frontage to a public highway. Access can only be achieved through adjoining housing site option B20.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? Possibly – access could be obtained through option site B20 if this is approved.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Possibly – especially if development of neighbouring housing option sites are included. A515 junction in town centre already exceeding capacity.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - n/a, within the site - Not able to inspect from public highway.
- Would a TA be required? - yes

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

No comment made

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application

Planning & Infrastructure

B20, B21 & B22 are within the plateau pastures LCT which is a simple, sensitive landscape with open and expansive views. All three are greenfield sites that divide Harpur Hill from Buxton. The combination of all three sites would result in Harpur Hill being subsumed as an urban extension of Buxton. Development would change the nature and scale of the settlement and create urban sprawl southwards along the A515; an important gateway to Buxton. Significant landscape and visual concerns and the sensitive location potentially overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Concern that if this site extends too far up Fox Low then visibility from within the National Park could become an issue.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology. Roman road which runs through site.

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

At Foxlow Farm, we support the use of the lower area on Ashbourne Road (part of B20) for development. We suggest that this should be limited at 350 metres from the road frontage. Higher up, near the farm buildings, we feel that there should be no development, because it is too visible. We therefore oppose areas B21 and B22 along with the higher part of B20.

Site: B21 Land at Foxlow Farm (between B20 and B22), Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
79	28	20	13	12	6

Summary of Public Comments:

- Inspector previously agreed site to be visible / elevated (2)
- Does not help HH (1)
- No direct access to HH available (1)
- Lack of infrastructure/ amenities (4)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (4)
- Develop link road from A515 to HH (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Hallam Land - B20, B21 & B22 cont. The site is well contained within the landscape, being contained by the housing to the west and north and employment uses to the east. The southern approach is protected by a rise in the ground and existing woodland. Landscape architects have visited the site and have drafted an initial Masterplan. Site can be delivered within 5 years. Other options in Buxton are constrained - deliverability, SPA etc.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - No – site does not have a direct frontage to a public highway. Access can only be achieved through adjoining housing site option B20.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? Possibly – access could be obtained through option site B20 if this is approved.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Possibly – especially if development of neighbouring housing option sites are included. A515 junction in town centre already exceeding capacity.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - n/a, within the site - Not able to inspect from public highway.
- Would a TA be required? - yes

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

No comment made

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application

Planning & Infrastructure

B20, B21 & B22 are within the plateau pastures LCT which is a simple, sensitive landscape with open and expansive views. All three are greenfield sites that divide Harpur Hill from Buxton. The combination of all three sites would result in Harpur Hill being subsumed as an urban extension of Buxton. Development would change the nature and scale of the settlement and create urban sprawl southwards along the A515; an important gateway to Buxton. Significant landscape and visual concerns and the sensitive location potentially overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Concern that this site may be extending too far up Fox Low and therefore visibility from within the National Park could become an issue.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

At Foxlow Farm, we support the use of the lower area on Ashbourne Road (part of B20) for development. We suggest that this should be limited at 350 metres from the road frontage. Higher up, near the farm buildings, we feel that there should be no development, because it is too visible. We therefore oppose areas B21 and B22 along with the higher part of B20.

Site: B22 Foxlow Farm Ashbourne Road, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
75	28	18	15	7	6

Summary of Public Comments:

- Inspector previously agreed site to be visible / elevated (2)
- Does not help HH (1)
- No direct access to HH available (1)
- Lack of infrastructure/ amenities (4)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (3)
- Develop link road from A515 to HH (1)
- Keep as green space linked to playing field (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Hallam Land - B20, B21 & B22 cont. The site is well contained within the landscape, being contained by the housing to the west and north and employment uses to the east. The southern approach is protected by a rise in the ground and existing woodland. Landscape architects have visited the site and have drafted an initial Masterplan. Site can be delivered within 5 years. Other options in Buxton are constrained - deliverability, SPA etc.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? – no
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? Possibly – access could be obtained through option sites B20 and B21 if they are successful.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Possibly – especially if development of neighbouring housing option sites are included. A515 junction in town centre already exceeding capacity.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - n/a, within the site - Not able to inspect from public highway.
- Would a TA be required? - yes

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Within normal area of Harpur Hill Primary School. The school site has been reduced in the last four to five years by the location of a Children's Centre and sale of land to provide access for another housing development. It is possible to expand the school on the site with an appropriate S106 contribution.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological desk-based assessment and field evaluation pre-application Negative impacts on area of high historic landscape value around Fox Low; impacts on setting of scheduled Fowlow barrow.

Planning & Infrastructure

B20, B21 & B22 are within the plateau pastures LCT which is a simple, sensitive landscape with open and expansive views. All three are greenfield sites that divide Harpur Hill from Buxton. The combination of all three sites would result in Harpur Hill being subsumed as an urban extension of Buxton. Development would change the nature and scale of the settlement and create urban sprawl southwards along the A515; an important gateway to Buxton. Significant landscape and visual concerns and the sensitive location potentially overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Concern that if this site extends too far up Fox Low then visibility from within the National Park could become an issue.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology. Roman road which runs through site.

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

At Foxlow Farm, we support the use of the lower area on Ashbourne Road (part of B20) for development. We suggest that this should be limited at 350 metres from the road frontage. Higher up, near the farm buildings, we feel that there should be no development, because it is too visible. We therefore oppose areas B21 and B22 along with the higher part of B20.

Site: B23 Land on Burlow Road (behind pub) Harpur Hill, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
76	27	9	21	16	2

Summary of Public Comments:

- Protect as green space for community (2)
- Visible / elevated (2)
- No direct access (1)
- Lack of infrastructure / amenities (5)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (5)
- Too remote (1)
- Support development of brownfield section (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - No – Extent of site does not appear to connect to a public highway.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? No – Multiple third party land issues to create an access meeting safe minimum criteria.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - Yes – site is significant higher than the nearest public highway and achieving satisfactory street gradients would be difficult.
- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Within normal area of Harpur Hill Primary School. The school site has been reduced in the last four to five years by the location of a Children's Centre and sale of land to provide access for another housing development. It is possible to expand the school on the site with an appropriate S106 contribution.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application.

Planning & Infrastructure

B23, B24, B25, B26, B28 and B29 are within the plateau pastures LCT which is a simple, sensitive landscape with open and expansive views. Developments would change the nature and scale of the settlement and significantly extend into the countryside. expansion would be visible, especially from A515; an important gateway to Buxton. Significant landscape and visual concerns and the sensitive location potentially overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

Round the village of Harpur Hill we support the small infill developments on sites B23, B25 and B26

Site: B24 Blue lagoon and adjacent land Harpur Hill, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
78	22	13	10	15	17

Summary of Public Comments:

- Protect as green space for community (3)
- Dangerous site in need of remediation (1)
- Development would need to be screened (1)
- No viable access (1)
- Use for employment (1)
- Lack of infrastructure / amenities (4)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (2)
- Problem site in need of attention (1)
- Use former railway as boundary (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - No – Extent of site does not appear to connect to a public highway.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? No – Multiple third party land issues to create an access meeting safe minimum criteria.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - Yes – site is significant higher than the nearest public highway and achieving satisfactory street gradients would be difficult.
- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

No comment made

Archaeology

Would need archaeological desk-based assessment in relation to railway features pre-application. CHPR features should be retained in situ.

Planning & Infrastructure

B23, B24, B25, B26, B28 and B29 are within the plateau pastures LCT which is a simple, sensitive landscape with open and expansive views. Developments would change the nature and scale of the settlement and significantly extend into the countryside. expansion would be visible, especially from A515; an important gateway to Buxton. Significant landscape and visual concerns and the sensitive location potentially overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Concern that the topography of the site is likely to make the site open to view from within the National Park, particularly from the north e.g. road immediately to the north of Heathfield Nook. At present from this vantage point this site provides a green backdrop to the existing development at Harper Hill, care would need to be taken to ensure that any development takes care not to affect the horizon. Could be of strategic concern to the National Park.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology. May also impact upon the setting of a scheduled monument (two Hlaews at Haslin House).

Natural England

Sites 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 (at Harpur Hill) are at elevated locations where intrusion into open countryside could have significant landscape impacts. Before allocation, the landscape impacts (individually and cumulatively) should be assessed.

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

We feel that the development of 72 dwellings on the Blue Lagoon site (B24) might swamp the village and suggest that this area is developed for employment use along with the Hoffman Quarry site.

Site: B25 Haslin Road Harpur Hill, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
71	25	13	17	15	1

Summary of Public Comments:

- Lack of infrastructure / amenities (6)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (5)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? -Yes – Sufficient controlled frontage to provide a single point access with adequate emerging visibility splays
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? -Yes – Access to the site would be via the junction between Haslin Road and Burlow Road. Emerging visibility from this junction is limited and cannot be improved without control of third party land on either side of the junction.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site -Yes – Achieving satisfactory street gradients may be difficult.
- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Within normal area of Harpur Hill Primary School. The school site has been reduced in the last four to five years by the location of a Children's Centre and sale of land to provide access for another housing development. It is possible to expand the school on the site with an appropriate S106 contribution.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application

Planning & Infrastructure

B23, B24, B25, B26, B28 and B29 are within the plateau pastures LCT which is a simple, sensitive landscape with open and expansive views. Developments would change the nature and scale of the settlement and significantly extend into the countryside. expansion would be visible, especially from A515; an important gateway to Buxton. Significant landscape and visual concerns and the sensitive location potentially overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology

Natural England

Sites 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 (at Harpur Hill) are at elevated locations where intrusion into open countryside could have significant landscape impacts. Before allocation, the landscape impacts (individually and cumulatively) should be assessed.

Other Bodies:Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

Round the village of Harpur Hill we support the small infill developments on sites B23, B25 and B26

Site: B26 Land between Haslin Road and Burlow Road Harpur Hill, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
73	25	11	19	17	1

Summary of Public Comments:

- Lack of infrastructure / amenities (5)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (5)
- Too remote (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? -Yes – Sufficient controlled frontage is available to locate an access with adequate emerging and forward visibility splays. Multiple access points to the public highway would be resisted.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? -no.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site -Yes – Achieving satisfactory street gradients may be difficult.
- Would a TA be required? - no

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Within normal area of Harpur Hill Primary School. The school site has been reduced in the last four to five years by the location of a Children's Centre and sale of land to provide access for another housing development. It is possible to expand the school on the site with an appropriate S106 contribution.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application

Planning & Infrastructure

B23, B24, B25, B26, B28 and B29 are within the plateau pastures LCT which is a simple, sensitive landscape with open and expansive views. Developments would change the nature and scale of the settlement and significantly extend into the countryside. expansion would be visible, especially from A515; an important gateway

to Buxton. Significant landscape and visual concerns and the sensitive location potentially overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology

Natural England

Sites 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 (at Harpur Hill) are at elevated locations where intrusion into open countryside could have significant landscape impacts. Before allocation, the landscape impacts (individually and cumulatively) should be assessed.

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

Round the village of Harpur Hill we support the small infill developments on sites B23, B25 and B26

Site: B27 Harpur Hill College Campus, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
82	4	0	8	12	59

Summary of Public Comments:

- Would protect greenfield sites (2)
- Relax affordable housing requirement to make it viable (1)
- Develop before other sites in Harpur Hill (3)
- Lack of infrastructure / amenities (4)
- Redevelopment of site would help community (3)
- Provide free buses into Buxton (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Barratt Homes - B27 is a brownfield site in a good location, subject to overcoming constraints such as site clearance, contamination and access. The site is currently allocated and has previously been granted consent (subject to S106 that was not signed). Scope to build around 105 homes (at least 32 affordable).

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? -Yes – previous planning application considered for this site (in excess of 200 dwellings). Access available direct from Burlow Road, however, it is also essential links are provided to the existing residential streets abutting the site – Kirkstone Road, Tedder Ave, Trenchard Drive
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? -Yes – especially if development of neighbouring housing option sites are included. A515 junction in town centre already exceeding capacity. Previous planning application considered enhancements to public transport service, traffic monitoring, minor highway improvements.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site –no
- Would a TA be required? - yes.

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Within normal area of Harpur Hill Primary School. The school site has been reduced in the last four to five years by the location of a Children's Centre and sale of land to provide access for another housing development. It is possible to expand the school on the site with an appropriate S106 contribution.

Archaeology

No archaeological issues

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology

Natural England

NE support the allocation of B27 as it already has secured an allocation for housing within the existing Local Plan. 70% brownfield land and is located adjacent to other residential areas. In general terms it represents a reasonable prospect for development that is unlikely to significantly harm the natural environment.

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

We strongly support the use of the former High Peak College site (B27).

Site: B28 Land at Haslin Road Harpur Hill, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
76	28	11	20	8	9

Summary of Public Comments:

- Lack of infrastructure / amenities (3)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (4)
- Too remote (2)
- Preserve toboggan run (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

S Robinson - flat, low quality farmland with natural boundaries. Well related to existing settlement, good access to amenities and employment in Harpur Hill, well integrated in landscape, good site for affordable housing / home for elderly, plans drawn up (masterplan submitted), within CS broad location for growth, highway engineer report confirms sites can be accessed from Burlow Road, Heathfield Nook and Hillhead Road, no constraints to viability, contributions towards infrastructure (e.g. potential shop, play facilities, changing rooms for playing fields), contribute towards sustainability of HH, other sites in HH are conspicuous / unviable, will support local employers.

Barratt Homes - B28, B29 and B30 offer the most suitable locations for immediate expansion as they are low lying, in close proximity to a bus terminus and employment sites and would have less landscape impact. They are set within a bowl, screened, have direct access onto adjoining roads and are oven ready. B28, 29 and 30 have a capacity for c. 350 homes (30% affordable).

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - Yes – access from Burlow Road possible given roadside frontage shown, however, only single or 2 points of access may be considered – the Highway Authority may seek to resist a proliferation of direct frontage access from multiple plots, given it is a busy classified route catering for a large proportion of HGV.s, Frontage footways will need to be provided. Possible links into option site B27 to provide a more permeable layout.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes – especially if development of neighbouring housing option sites are included. A515 junction in town centre already exceeding capacity. Any development would need to consider enhancements to public transport service, traffic monitoring, major/minor highway improvements.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - Possibly – northern part of site sits at a higher level than the adjoining carriageway making acceptable access gradients difficult to achieve in this location, however, an internal estate street layout could regulate gradients.
- Would a TA be required? - yes,

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in

this corridor, significant improvements would be required to five ways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Within normal area of Harpur Hill Primary School. The school site has been reduced in the last four to five years by the location of a Children's Centre and sale of land to provide access for another housing development. It is possible to expand the school on the site with an appropriate S106 contribution.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application

Planning & Infrastructure

B23, B24, B25, B26, B28 and B29 are within the plateau pastures LCT which is a simple, sensitive landscape with open and expansive views. Developments would change the nature and scale of the settlement and significantly extend into the countryside. Expansion would be visible, especially from A515; an important gateway to Buxton. Significant landscape and visual concerns and the sensitive location potentially overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology

Natural England

Sites 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 (at Harpur Hill) are at elevated locations where intrusion into open countryside could have significant landscape impacts. Before allocation, the landscape impacts (individually and cumulatively) should be assessed.

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

We see the sites south of Harpur Hill, B28, B29 and B30 as unsustainable because of their distance from the town centre. They should be regarded as sites of last resort.

Site: B29 Land between Burlow Road and Heathfield Nook Road
Harpur Hill, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
78	28	9	19	13	9

Summary of Public Comments:

- Lack of infrastructure / amenities (4)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (5)
- Too remote (3)
- Support development of brownfield section (1)
- Retain trees (1)
- Subject to fly-tipping / landfill (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

S Robinson - flat, low quality farmland with natural boundaries. Well related to existing settlement, good access to amenities and employment in Harpur Hill, well integrated in landscape, good site for affordable housing / home for elderly, plans drawn up (masterplan submitted), within CS broad location for growth, highway engineer report confirms sites can be accessed from Burlow Road, Heathfield Nook and Hillhead Road, no constraints to viability, contributions towards infrastructure (e.g. potential shop, play facilities, changing rooms for playing fields), contribute towards sustainability of HH, other sites in HH are conspicuous / unviable, will support local employers.

Barratt Homes - B28, B29 and B30 offer the most suitable locations for immediate expansion as they are low lying, in close proximity to a bus terminus and employment sites and would have less landscape impact. They are set within a bowl, screened, have direct access onto adjoining roads and are oven ready. B28, 29 and 30 have a capacity for c. 350 homes (30% affordable).

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - No – limited frontage to Heathfield Nook Road that is unlikely to achieve satisfactory visibility sightlines within the constraints available. Temporary access put in for restoration purposes only. Bridge abutments obscure visibility.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially? Possibly – could be developed in conjunction with housing option sites B27 & B28 to provide an alternative means of access to the site.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes – especially if development of neighbouring housing option sites are included. A515 junction in town centre already exceeding capacity. Any development would need to consider enhancements to public transport service, traffic monitoring, major/minor highway improvements.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - no, within the site - Possibly – northern part of site sits at a higher level than Heathfield Nook Road, however, an internal estate street layout could regulate gradients.
- Would a TA be required? - yes

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education:

Within normal area of Harpur Hill Primary School. The school site has been reduced in the last four to five years by the location of a Children's Centre and sale of land to provide access for another housing development. It is possible to expand the school on the site with an appropriate S106 contribution.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application

Planning & Infrastructure

B23, B24, B25, B26, B28 and B29 are within the plateau pastures LCT which is a simple, sensitive landscape with open and expansive views. Developments would change the nature and scale of the settlement and significantly extend into the countryside. expansion would be visible, especially from A515; an important gateway to Buxton. Significant landscape and visual concerns and the sensitive location potentially overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology

Natural England

Sites 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 (at Harpur Hill) are at elevated locations where intrusion into open countryside could have significant landscape impacts. Before allocation, the landscape impacts (individually and cumulatively) should be assessed.

Network Rail

Developers should liaise with NR. A 2m gap is required between any building and structure on site and the Network Rail boundary. A minimum 1.8m high trespass proof steel palisade fence would be required to prevent trespass by any users/residents of the site onto the railway

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone

moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

We see the sites south of Harpur Hill, B28, B29 and B30 as unsustainable because of their distance from the town centre. They should be regarded as sites of last resort.

Site: B30 Land south of Burlow Road, Buxton

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
78	27	10	24	10	5

Summary of Public Comments:

- Previous objections from quarry owners (1)
- Lack of infrastructure / amenities (5)
- Overdevelopment of Harpur Hill (5)
- Too remote (4)
- Too prominent (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

S Robinson - flat, low quality farmland with natural boundaries. Well related to existing settlement, good access to amenities and employment in Harpur Hill, well integrated in landscape, good site for affordable housing / home for elderly, plans drawn up (masterplan submitted), within CS broad location for growth, highway engineer report confirms sites can be accessed from Burlow Road, Heathfield Nook and Hillhead Road, no constraints to viability, contributions towards infrastructure (e.g. potential shop, play facilities, changing rooms for playing fields), contribute towards sustainability of HH, other sites in HH are conspicuous / unviable, will support local employers.

Barratt Homes - B28, B29 and B30 offer the most suitable locations for immediate expansion as they are low lying, in close proximity to a bus terminus and employment sites and would have less landscape impact. They are set within a bowl, screened, have direct access onto adjoining roads and are oven ready. B28, 29 and 30 have a capacity for c. 350 homes (30% affordable).

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

No comment received

Transport Strategy

Cumulative impact of all site options in Ashbourne Road corridor is a concern. A district centre in Harpur Hill would help to provide a range of local services and reduce the need to travel by car. To address the cumulative impact of site options in this corridor, significant improvements would be required to fiveways junction which would require property beyond highway boundary. Scope to improve Harpur Hill Rd / Ashbourne Rd junction. Bus service improvements to support major development at Harpur Hill.

Education

Within normal area of Harpur Hill Primary School. The school site has been reduced in the last four to five years by the location of a Children's Centre and sale of land to provide access for another housing development. It is possible to expand the school on the site with an appropriate S106 contribution.

Archaeology

Would need archaeological survey pre-application

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We have reviewed all the proposed housing site options (Options B1 to B30) and given that all options appear to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), we are in principle supportive of these housing options and can provide general comments.

English Heritage:

Surrounds a scheduled monument (Fox Low Bowl Barrow). There is also potential for non-designated archaeology

Natural England

Sites 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 (at Harpur Hill) are at elevated locations where intrusion into open countryside could have significant landscape impacts. Before allocation, the landscape impacts (individually and cumulatively) should be assessed. NE also note that B30 is described as relatively distant from the town centre and services. Town centre locations are considered to be the most sustainable areas for growth as development would be in the proximity of more services and better transport opportunities. Also see comments re. B24.

Other Bodies:

Friends of the Peak District

Fox Low is a prominent hill to the south of Buxton and development around it and on its slopes would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and setting of the town, especially when viewed from approaches to the south and the nearby National Park. Landscape Character SPD highlights high sensitivity of area (limestone moorland) to development. Harpur Hill's location and elevation in relation to town centre do not facilitate sustainable travel.

Buxton Group

Round the village of Harpur Hill we support the small infill developments on sites B23, B25 and B26

General Comments on Buxton Sites

Summary of Public Comments:

- Develop brownfield before greenfield (27)
- Compulsory purchase brownfield sites (1).
- Maintain rural / community feel of Harpur Hill (4).
- Only allocate greenfield sites when served by amenities (1)
- Only develop where there is a low environmental impact (2),
- Development will devalue property (1),
- Limited options available (1)
- Protect Buxton as a spa town / tourist destination (4)
- Develop sites near town centre / services (5)
- Oppose development that causes congestion (1)
- Bring empty homes back into use (2)
- Protect countryside to secure food supplies (1)
- Lack of jobs in Buxton (3)
- Little demand for housing in Buxton (2)
- Develop old quarry sites (1)
- Develop sites with permission (2)
- Lack of demand for housing (1)
- Poor infrastructure / communications in Buxton (3)
- Increase density of town rather than extend its boundary (2)
- Develop where existing infrastructure is good (1)
- Avoid impact on NP (1)
- Avoid sites on key routes into town due to visual impact (1)
- Only provide affordable housing for Buxton residents (1)

Barratt Manchester - sufficient land is available to meet the requirements of the option 2 target for Buxton. However, SHLAA does not currently identify sufficient land for option 3. More land outside settlement boundary will be needed. Development should be focused around sustainable urban extensions to Harpur Hill and Fairfield. Buxton is a self contained settlement that needs a degree of growth in order to sustain it, support the economy and infrastructure. Need for housing is urgent. Draft Core Strategy previously identified a broad location for development in Harpur Hill. Harpur Hill is a suitable location for a sustainable urban extension, which would provide opportunities to provide enhanced services and facilities for local residents.

Derbyshire County Council (Transport Strategy) - Travel strategy required for Buxton to improve public transport, walking and cycling. Minor junction improvements for some sites necessary. Smarter Choices measures should be promoted through residential travel plans for development sites. A6 corridor study currently looking at possible long term improvements to all modes of transport including public transport and freight along A6 corridor. Funding for improvement should from a number of means including S106, CIL, New Homes Bonus, Growing Places, rail re-franchising.

Derbyshire County Council (Education) - DCC would expect financial contributions from housing developers towards school places should proposed growth require it.

Derbyshire County Council (Archaeology) - Greenfield sites have potential for undiscovered archaeology and should be dealt with through the planning process via use of conditions etc. The development of some sites may have a detrimental impact

on heritage assets or historic landscapes. Development of industrial sites may present opportunities to re-use historic mill buildings and retain important features. **Derbyshire County Council (Planning & Infrastructure)** - Identification of very small sites for only a few units is not appropriate. From an infrastructure delivery point of view, a smaller selection of larger sites would be preferable as they are more likely to contribute towards infrastructure. A number of greenfield sites are not well related to the main urban areas and are unlikely to provide sustainable extensions. Preference should be given to sites that better relate to urban area.

Environment Agency - SFRA Level 2 needed for preferred options. Recommend that you apply a measure of avoidance as this is more sustainable than mitigation, by redefining the site boundaries of all the potential housing options so they lay outside of any flood zones. Advise that some watercourses that lie within flood zone 1 are not covered by the Flood Zone maps and may be subject to flood risk as our maps have only been produced for watercourses with a catchment area greater than 3km². For all housing option sites that are located adjacent to an unmapped watercourse it is recommended that refined flooding information (possibly in the form of a level 2 SFRA) is needed to ensure that all potential flood risk issues to these site has been clearly identified. NPPF gives priority to the use of SuDS and need to consider requirements of the SuDS Approving Body. Plan should help to move from a state of net loss in biodiversity to a net gain for nature and recognise the benefit of ecosystem services. Preference is for brownfield sites to be developed (except where flooding exists), however, with limited brownfield sites, we accept that there will be occasions when development on greenfield sites will be inevitable. Prefer that developments not be undertaken close to SSSIs or within protected habitats. Potential sites located near local nature reserves or those that would be developed in close proximity to watercourses must be given careful consideration and we recommend that an appropriate buffer strip is incorporated for all watercourses that protects and enhances local biodiversity. Under the Water Framework Directive, need to enhance the status and prevent the further deterioration of aquatic ecosystems.

Harpur Hill Residents Association - Report submitted with details of HHRA questionnaire. 110 respondents following public meeting with HPBC (140 in attendance). Key findings include: 1. 94% responded that 200 houses or less should be built in Harpur Hill in the next 16 years. 2. Concern that HH will be swamped with new homes. 3. More than half of the respondents felt that green field sites should never be used, whilst the remainder only felt that it was acceptable once all brownfield sites in High Peak and Derbyshire Dales have been exhausted - University site should be a priority for development. 4. Lack of starter homes for local people and that these should be prioritised. 5. No infrastructure to support the current level of occupancy of Harpur Hill and that these should be improved prior to new housing not as a condition of additional homes. 6. 97% feel that the roads in Harpur Hill are at capacity or struggling to cope with the current level of traffic. 7. 86% are concerned that Harpur Hill already presents road safety issues for residents. 8. People who live in Harpur Hill value its semi-rural location, the surrounding stunning countryside, the peace and quiet and sense of community and are concerned that this will be destroyed by the possibility of so much additional housing. 9. When asked what people would change about Harpur Hill, feelings are high that the brownfield site should be prioritised and that other issues in the area which are causing anti-social behaviour should be resolved. 10. 79% of respondents felt that HPBC don't listen to local views which is influenced by the repeated consultations over the last 6 years on suggested sites for housing. 11. 97% of respondents felt that the level of suggested sites for Harpur Hill is unacceptable.

Buxton Civic Society - Preferable to use brownfield sites and those closer to the town centre to encourage walking and save green spaces.

Additional Buxton Sites

Question B2 – Are there any additional sites that should be considered for housing development in the Local Plan

Site	No. Suggesting
Nestle, Station Road (as part of mixed-use scheme, excluding a supermarket)	1
Land adjacent to Option B16 (Harehills Kennels) (boundary submitted)	1
No other sites should be considered until landowners can demonstrate that sites are viable, available and developable.	1
Land to rear of Peak Dale Methodist Church. Church building itself may also be surplus to requirements subject to decision to be taken over next two years (boundaries submitted) - 0.11ha site	1
Develop land between Dove Holes and Buxton	1
Scope centre on St Johns Road	1
Rough semi abandoned land on Brown Edge Rd	1
Old Kents Bank Road School (move library to town centre premises)	4
Disused railway sidings, Buxton Station	2
Former car showroom, Leek Road / Macclesfield Old Road	2
Prince of Wales public house, Fairfield Road	2
Industrial land, off Ashbourne Lane	1
Hogshaw garage site	1
Disused quarry, Peak Dale (south of Batham Gate Rd, west of railway line)	1
Disused quarry, off Dale Lane, Dove Holes	1
Land adjacent to turning to Batham Gate on A6	1
Land opposite Haddon Hall	1
Cavendish Golf Club (57ha site)	1

Central Area Sites

Question C1 - Which potential housing sites would you prefer to be allocated for development in the Local Plan?

Site: C1 Hayfield Bus Depot, Hayfield

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
104	28	17	24	18	8

Summary of Public Comments:

- Loss of bus depot/parking area (7)
- Brownfield sites should be developed first (2)
- relocation may require taking a greenfield site (1)
- support but adequate car park must be retained (1)
- right of way onto trail (1)
- infill with good access (1); low building line (1)
- objected to by Parish Council

Owner/Developer Interest:

Derbyshire County Council

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway - No within the site – No
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: Access to multi-user route / PROW runs through site – any redevelopment would need to take these into account. Site consists of visitor centre and car parking which is well-used at different times of the day including evenings and not just in connection with access to multi-user route and PROW; also bus terminus and turning area (needs relocation and consultation with bus operators etc.)

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Not considered to be of strategic importance to the National Park but loss of public car park may discourage use of the Sett Valley Trail.

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Neutral

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

Option C1 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options.

English Heritage:

Site is adjacent to a Conservation Area and is adjacent to a number of listed buildings. The site is a former railway station site and there may be potential for non-designated archaeology.

Natural England

Site is in close proximity to the Dark Peak/South Pennine Moor SAC and SPA which is notified for its habitat and species importance. Nature England seek confirmation that there would be no adverse impact on the condition of the SSSI, SAC or SPA through increased recreational use (through the HRA). The Bluebell Wood LNR is located in close proximity (around 300m) to the site. Natural England seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact on this LNR through increased recreation use.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C2 Land at New Mills

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
103	36	18	32	6	1

Summary of Public Comments:

- Greenfield site (5)
- Impact on schools (1)
- traffic (4)
- support as barely seen from village (2)
- fewer houses better (1)
- infill with good access (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

In private ownership

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: Severely substandard exit visibility due to location on inside of bend also substandard forward visibility in respect of right turning vehicles. Insufficient frontage to create satisfactory access. Limited on-site parking provision for existing housing stock opposite so vehicles continually parked on grass verges in the vicinity of the site at all times of the day. High wall fronting the site and site slopes away. Limited linking footway opposite. Multi-user route to north of site.

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported.

Archaeology

No archaeological issues. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses.

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Neutral

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

Option C2 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

English Heritage:

Site is adjacent to a Conservation Area and a grade II listed building.

Natural England

Site is in close proximity to the Dark Peak/South Pennine Moor SAC and SPA which is notified for its habitat and species importance. Nature England seek confirmation that there would be no adverse impact on the condition of the SSSI, SAC or SPA through increased recreational use (through the HRA). The Bluebell Wood LNR is located in close proximity (around 300m) to the site. Natural England seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact on this LNR through increased recreation use.

National Trust

The concerns about this site relate to the fact that it is a greenfield site, on the edge of the settlement and adjoining a Conservation Area. It is not recommended that this site is taken forward, but if it is then careful attention would need to be given to the form of development to ensure that:

1. The outer edges incorporate significant landscaping, including native trees, to provide an appropriate 'green edge' to the development; and that the existing mature trees of merit are retained and safeguarded
2. Building heights were restricted to no more than two storeys to reduce visual impacts
3. The design of the houses was complementary in terms of key considerations such as scale, massing and materials to the nearby Conservation Area and that key views into and from the Conservation Area were safeguarded and if possible enhanced.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C3 Land off Derby Road, New Mills

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
95	33	8	34	10	1

Summary of Public Comments:

- Greenfield site (6) Impact on schools (1)
- Ideal for housing or industrial, connecting it to Thornsett Industrial Estate (2)
- extra traffic on High Hill Road a problem (1)
- infill with good access (1)
- cemetery on High Hill road needs to be maintained (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Possibly – based on the anticipated number of properties and depending on whether a link road can be achieved. Likely to be increased impact if access from High Hill Road only, especially at the junction of High Hill Road and Batemill Road which is currently a ‘STOP’ junction with limited visibility and at Watford Bridge Road.
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway Yes – access location Hayfield Road will require careful consideration given horizontal alignment. - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: Existing residential area with limited local services within easy walking distances. Bus routes on A6015 and High Hill Road – will require additional stops and possible link into the site. clearance to overhead cables?

Education:

The school could accommodate a very limited development to a maximum of 100 dwellings. The site is terraced into the side of a steep hill with NO possibility of expansion. If these developments are approved, this is a situation where the school would need a new site and to be re-built.

Archaeology

Would need an archaeological survey pre application

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses.

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Neutral

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Coal Authority

Site is within the shallow coal reserve area and in an area that has the potential to be affected by mining legacy issues. Development could raise issues relating to the sterilisation of coal resources. It will be necessary to investigate the mining position and ground conditions.

Environment Agency

Option C3 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

Natural England

The Watford Lodge Local Nature Reserve is approximately 300m from the site. Natural England seek confirmation that there would be no significant effect on the sensitive wetland habitat inhabited by a number of wetland and bird species that could be caused by increased recreational use.

National Trust

Similar issues to C2 although not affected by Conservation Area considerations. Clearly the pylon run is potentially an additional constraint and if unattended to would significantly reduce the capacity of the site – the potential to secure environmental improvements by undergrounding the overhead lines may be worthy of consideration.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C4 land off Low Leighton Road, New Mills

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
102	48	12	27	4	1

Summary of Public Comments:

- Greenfield site (8)
- Impact on schools (2)
- Ideal for housing estate with easy access onto Low Leighton Road (2)
- enough houses already in Low Leighton (1)
- traffic (3)
- access (1)
- loss of character (1)
- loss of open space (2)
- limited local facilities (1)
- poor public transport(1)
- loss of farming land (1)
- potential mine workings (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Private ownership

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No access to the garages to the southern section of the site is currently available to the A6015, however, this is not shown to be controlled nor would it be likely to upgrade this route to an acceptable standard to safely cater for a development on the scale envisaged.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway NA - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: No obvious access to the highway network and does not link to any other housing sites. Existing access to garages – not shown as controlled – as is unlikely to be able to be upgraded to a satisfactory standard to serve this scale of development. Existing footways limited in width in parts. A number of public rights of way cross the site.

Education:

The school could accommodate a very limited development to a maximum of 100 dwellings. The site is terraced into the side of a steep hill with NO possibility of expansion. If these developments are approved, this is a situation where the school would need a new site and to be re-built.

Archaeology

Would need an archaeological survey pre application

Neighbouring Authorities:Peak District National Park

Development would not have an impact on the nature of the valley bottom or the National Park provided it does not extend above the 200m contour.

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Neutral

Specific Consultation Bodies:Coal Authority

Site is within the shallow coal reserve area and in an area that has the potential to be affected by mining legacy issues. Development could raise issues relating to the sterilisation of coal resources. It will be necessary to investigate the mining position and ground conditions.

Environment Agency

Option C4 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

Natural England

Site is in close proximity to the Dark Peak/South Pennine Moor SAC and SPA which is notified for its habitat and species importance. Nature England seek confirmation that there would be no adverse impact on the condition of the SSSI, SAC or SPA through increased recreational use (through the HRA).

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C5 Land at Ollersett Lane/Piingot Road, New Mills

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
101	45	14	29	3	0

Summary of Public Comments:

- Greenfield site (8)
- Impact on schools (1)
- slopes (2)
- marshy (1)
- loss of views for existing residents (2)
- sewers can't cope (1)
- infill with good access (1)
- loss of farming land (1)
- traffic (1)
- coal mines

Owner/Developer Interest:

Private ownership

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No site frontage shown to Hayfield Road (A6015) . Site has a considerable frontage to Ollersett Lane this is a single track un-made road with no prospect of being made up to a satisfactory standard Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No additional land would be required to increase the roadside frontage to Hayfield Road for an access with appropriate visibility sightlines to be created.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Possibly
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: may require a right turn harbourage Bus stops nearby, although relatively distant from town centre facilities. Not able to upgrade Ollersett Lane Greenfield site with little traffic generation at present. No access to Pingot Road shown, not assessed at this stage.

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported with appropriate education contribution

Archaeology

Would need an archaeological survey pre application

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Development would not have an impact on the nature of the valley bottom or the National Park provided it does not extend above the 200m contour.

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Neutral

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Coal Authority

Site is within the shallow coal reserve area and in an area that has the potential to be affected by mining legacy issues. Development could raise issues relating to the sterilisation of coal resources. It will be necessary to investigate the mining position and ground conditions.

Environment Agency

Option C5 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

English Heritage:

May affect the wider setting of Ollersett hall Farm which is a grade II listed building.

Natural England

Site is in close proximity to the Dark Peak/South Pennine Moor SAC and SPA which is notified for its habitat and species importance. Nature England seek confirmation that there would be no adverse impact on the condition of the SSSI, SAC or SPA through increased recreational use (through the HRA).

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C6 Land at Laneside Road, New Mills

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
100	44	12	29	4	1

Summary of Public Comments:

- Greenfield site (9)
- Impact on schools (2)
- existing resident of Hawk Road concerned about loss of privacy and views, site access being next to their house plus loss of value in their property (3)
- wildlife (2)
- wet (1)
- potential mine workings (1)
- too far from town centre and lack of public transport (2)
- landscape impact (2)
- increased traffic (4)
- if access is through Hawk Road, Pingot Road would become very congested (2)
- infill with poor access (1)
- Laneside Road very congested with parked cars (2)
- empty properties (1)
- problems with existing social housing (2)
- loss of farming land (1)
- Hawk Road not suitable for through access (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Private ownership supported by developer.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No- within the site – No
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: Existing residential area with limited local services. Bus route on A6015 – may require additional public transport enhancements.

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported with appropriate education contribution

Archaeology

Would need an archaeological survey pre application, including field evaluation.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Development would not have an impact on the nature of the valley bottom or the National Park provided it does not extend above the 200m contour.

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Neutral

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

Option C6 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

English Heritage:

May affect the wider setting of Ollersett hall Farm which is a grade II listed building.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C7 Land at Woodside Street, New Mills

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
88	9	4	25	24	16

Summary of Public Comments:

- Brownfield sites would benefit from development (6)
- convenient transport links (1)
- Works to east of site owned by Castex who wish to remain and request a letter stating that their premises have been removed from further planning proposals (1)
- northern part of site mid-section owned by Victoria Mill, remainder of Victoria Mill site should be included (1)
- would provide opportunity to regenerate the area and improve canal corridor (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Comprises of 4 parcels of land in private ownership with some developer interest.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Possibly
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: Existing residential area with local services nearby. Bus route on A6015 – may require additional public transport enhancements. Woodside Street and Victoria Street both very limited in terms of geometry and visibility at junctions with Albion Road – possible to link non-classified roads and provide a new link to Albion Road meeting safe minimum criteria. Site should be developed as a single entity to ensure the necessary highway improvements can be secured to develop the whole site. Desirable to remove commercial / industrial traffic from residential area

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported.

Archaeology

Opportunities for re-use of historic industrial buildings- in particular the canal warehouse. Archaeological desk based assessments/buildings appraisal needed pre application, further work could be conditioned.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Neutral

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

Option C7 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

English Heritage:

Contains the former mill buildings Victoria Mills. Consideration should be given to the mill's significance in determining if it is non designated heritage asset. Where possible , if significant, the buildings should be retained and converted as apt of any development.

Network Rail

The north part of the site is next to a Network Rail tunnel. Network Rail would object to any works that impacted on the tunnel.Would need to discuss appropriate mitigation measures.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C8 Land at Wharf Road, Whaley Bridge

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
117	12	15	15	41	26

Summary of Public Comments:

- Brownfield sites would benefit from development (6)
- Suitable for elderly person housing (6)
- Brownfield site should be developed first (1)
- level site, easy access to facilities (3)
- object because likely to be more than stated 20 homes (1)
- traffic (1)
- no more houses below Toddbrook Reservoir dam (1)
- poor access (2)
- access should be off Reservoir Road (1)
- collapse drainage channel needs restoration (1)
- suitable for 40 units (4)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? - Possibly as an extension of Wharf Road, however, access constraints would limit scale of development. – access unlikely to Reservoir Road due to topography issues.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Possibly
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? -Yes
- Comment: Existing residential area with local services nearby. Bus route running through Whaley Bridge – may require additional public transport enhancements - as well as train station nearby. Wharf Road very limited in terms of geometry and visibility at junction with Market Street. Need to extend adoptable highway through to join Wharf Court by bringing the existing private street up to adoptable standard or provide an adoptable link through the site. Improved access arrangements within the site could be achieved by acquisition of third party land (island of land within the site).

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported with appropriate education contribution

Archaeology

May have negative impacts on setting of Conservation Area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No responses

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Support. Up to 40 single storey units preferably sheltered. Concern about access. Site is flat close to shops and amenities.

Specific Consultation Bodies:Environment Agency

The Option C8 site (land at Wharf Road) is currently shown to be entirely within Flood Zone 3 (high risk) on our Flood Maps

English Heritage:

Site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and has the potential to contain non-designated archaeology.

Network Rail

Part of the site boundary is within land controlled by Network Rail. Development details that impacted on the railway would need to be agreed with Network Rail.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C9 Land to the south of Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
147	108	16	10	5	0

Summary of Public Comments:

- Too prominent development should be kept on valley floors (1)
- Greenfield site (18)
- Inadequate access (15)
- Traffic issues (13)
- landscape impact on Peak Park (9)
- support access using Linglongs Road (1)
- more houses could encourage more shops (1)
- impact on Midshires Way (4)
- well related to the built up area (1)
- would destroy the village feel of Whaley Bridge (1)
- lead to commuting (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Developer interest

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No Site frontage is limited on to Linglongs Road where safe minimum visibility splays do not appear to be achievable with controlled land/public highway.
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? Yes – subject to control of sufficient third party land to secure adequate emerging visibility splays-
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Probable negative impact at the junction of Linglongs Road with Macclesfield Road.
- Does topography present a highway problem? within the highway No- within the site Yes
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: Linglongs Road serves approximately 50 dwellings and a number of farms. A development of around 80 dwellings would be likely to have a significant impact at the junction of Linglongs Road with Macclesfield Road. A public right of way crosses the site which would need to be incorporated/diverted/upgraded.

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported with appropriate education contribution

Archaeology

Negative impact to primary Area of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity. Would need archaeological survey pre application.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Strongly object. Concern about inadequate access onto Macclesfield Road and resulting congestion. On street parking an issue. Problems caused by narrow bridge over the river Goyt. Drainage issues. Wildlife on site. Strong local opposition to this site. Not beneficial to the setting or character of the area.

Specific Consultation Bodies:Coal Authority

Site is within the shallow coal reserve area and in an area that has the potential to be affected by mining legacy issues. Development could raise issues relating to the sterilisation of coal resources. It will be necessary to investigate the mining position and ground conditions.

Environment Agency

Option C9 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

Natural England

The Toddbrook Reservoir SSSI is approximately 250m away from the site. Natural England would like reassurance that there would be no adverse impact or loss of existing habitats.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C10 Land at Horwich End, Whaley Bridge

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
143	86	24	17	7	1

Summary of Public Comments:

- Greenfield site (6)
- Traffic issues (12)
- best of bad set of options (1)
- steep, marshy, bad access (8)
- mains gas pipe (4)
- public footpath (4)
- close to Peak Park (4)
- mine workings (5)
- New Road must be adopted (1)
- Impact on Whaley Bridge's Scout Hut (1)
- dangerous (1)
- would destroy the village feel of Whaley Bridge (1)
- Lead to commuting (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No site does not have a controlled frontage to a public highway
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes on Mevril Road and its junction with Buxton Road
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway Yes - within the site Unable to assess
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: Greenfield site with no obvious frontage to a public highway shown. Some distance from facilities which would be compounded with no links to Buxton Road or New Road.

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported.

Archaeology

Negative impact to primary Area of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity. Would need archaeological survey pre application. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Planning and Infrastructure

Greenfield site with potential negative landscape impacts which were not included in the 2009 consultation. Is within the Dark Peak : Settled Valley Pastures Landscape

Character Type which is associated with settlement, are part of the adjacent countryside and within an AMES.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Maybe appropriate as infill.

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Object. Poor access. Hilly terrain. Gas pipeline across site. Mining activities and subsidence. Overdevelopment of Horwich End. Used for community recreation. Visible from the National Park. Geological fault line running through the site. Would add congestion to problems at the traffic lights.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

Option C10 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

English Heritage:

Site is adjacent to a Conservation Area.

Natural England

The Toddbrook Reservoir SSSI is approximately 650m away from the site. Natural England would like reassurance that there would be no adverse impact or loss of existing habitats.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C11 Land at Horwich End extension, Whaley Bridge

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
144	94	27	12	2	0

Summary of Public Comments:

- Too prominent development should be kept on valley floors (1)
- Greenfield site (7)
- Inadequate access (6)
- Traffic issues (12)
- landscape impact (4)
- borders Shallcross Greenway (3)
- steep, marshy (4); mine workings (5)
- Impact on Whaley Bridge's Scout Hut (1)
- dangerous (1)
- would destroy the village feel of Whaley Bridge (1)
- Lead to commuting (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No site does not have a controlled frontage to a public highway
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No Mevril Road and Manor Road are not considered to be of a satisfactory standard to serve additional development
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes – both Mevril Road and Manor Road. Unlikely impact could be mitigated
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway Yes - within the site Unable to assess
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: Greenfield site with no obvious frontage to a public highway shown. Some distance from local facilities. Public right of way abuts site.

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported with appropriate education contribution

Archaeology

Negative impact to primary Area of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity. Would need archaeological survey pre application.

Planning and Infrastructure

Greenfield site with potential negative landscape impacts which were not included in the 2009 consultation. Is within the Dark Peak : Settled Valley Pastures Landscape Character Type which is associated with settlement, are part of the adjacent

countryside and within an AMES. The sensitive location of this site possibly overrides the potential for development.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Possible adverse impact on the landscape and may be of strategic concern to the National Park.

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council - Object. Poor access. Hilly terrain. Gas pipeline across site. Mining activities and subsidence. Overdevelopment of Horwich End. Used for community recreation. Visible from the National Park. Geological fault line running through the site. Would add congestion to problems at the traffic lights.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

Option C11 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

Network Rail

Site is adjacent to the railway. Development details that impacted on the railway would need to be agreed with Network Rail.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C12 Land off Brierley Park, Buxworth

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
91	34	11	30	7	0

Summary of Public Comments:

- Greenfield site (19)
- Inadequate access (20)
- agricultural use (1)
- limited facilities in the village (17)
- limited infrastructure (1)
- small development would not have much impact (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

In Private Ownership

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No –
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site -sloping site
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: Development of this site is adversely affected by the severe limitations of the junction of Brierley park onto Station Road where both exit and forward visibility are severely substandard. The access corridor to the site fronting numbers 17-24 Brierley Park is of limited width and is without footway provision. Potential problems re access by service/delivery vehicles. Adjacent railway line. Is access required to surrounding farmland?

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported.

Archaeology

No archaeological issues.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council – Neutral

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

Option C12 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

English Heritage:

Site is adjacent to a Conservation Area.

Natural England

The Toddbrook Reservoir SSSI is approximately 650m away from the site. Natural England would like reassurance that there would be no adverse impact or loss of existing habitats.

National Trust

This is a not an insignificant site on the edge of the Brierley Green and within about 750 metres of the Peak District National Park. The area of land edged in red appears to be larger than the 0.25 ha referred to and to have potential capacity far greater than 3 units. If the intention is truly to provide just three houses and to utilise the majority of the site for environmental improvements then the Trust's concerns would be lessened to quite an extent.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: C13 Land at Buxton Road, Buxworth

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
82	20	8	29	13	2

Summary of Public Comments:

- 31 houses is too many (3)
- Impact on schools (1)
- Suitable for elderly person housing (1)
- Traffic issues (3)
- support if modest and sensitive (2)
- problems with access, parking and lack of local facilities (1)
- infill, good access, good local facilities (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: There is no footway across the site frontage and therefore an extension to the existing footway to the west of the site would need to be extended as part of any proposals. Given the existing school accesses on the opposite side of the road, careful consideration would need to be given to a new access location.

Archaeology

Would need an archaeological survey pre application

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Whaley Bridge Town Council – Neutral

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

Option C13 appears to be located within flood zone 1 (low risk), therefore we are in principle supportive of these housing options

Network Rail

Site is adjacent to the railway. Development details that impacted on the railway would need to be agreed with Network Rail. Site boundary includes a small area of land controlled by Network Rail

Other Bodies:
No response

General Comments on Central Area Sites

Summary of Public Comments:

- Brownfield sites only / first (22)
- lack of access (2)
- extra traffic on Macclesfield Road and Buxton Road dangerous (2)
- congestion through Whaley Bridge (7)
- keep traffic out of Whaley Bridge centre by building on sites closer to by-pass (1)
- Object to Forge Works, Chapel may allocate but impact is on Chinley (1)
- no sites, no homes (1)
- negative impact on Whaley Bridge infrastructure and resources (6)
- evidence from previous consultation should be included (1)
- job opportunities needed (3)
- urban sprawl: loss of character (3)
- Concern over any new development in the centre of New Mills roads are already congested (1)
- Impact on schools in New Mills (1)
- No need for new houses are already many properties for sale (3)
- Brownfield sites outside New Mills town should be used (1)
- there is a need for houses in the central area to support the local economy and provide for population growth (1)
- lack of facilities in new Mills; owner of Dormer site wants it included

Environment Agency: We would like to advise that the scope of your SFRA may need to be increased to a Level 2 Assessment when your preferred housing allocations are known. A Level 2 SFRA will be more stringent than for a Level 1 and is dependant on whether any sites on your final list of preferred allocations remain in Flood Zone 3 or 2 after being sequentially allocated (Sequential Test) as part of the Sustainability Appraisal. For all sites, but with particularly reference to green field sites, you will need to keep in mind the requirements of the NPPF that gives priority to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and the requirements of the Sustainable Drainage Systems Approving Body. It is important to note that full SuDS systems will require land-take and this may have implications for the numbers of housing proposed on each site.

Given that each housing option is indicative only, we recommend that you apply a measure of avoidance as this is more sustainable than mitigation, by redefining the site boundaries of all the potential housing options so they lay outside of any flood zone outlines.

Natural England: Seven of the sites are greenfield land. Natural England would like reassurance that there would be no adverse impact or loss of existing habitats on these sites. Also that any development would not harm the unique landscape character of the National Park through increased recreation use.

Additional Central Area Sites

Question C2 – Are there any additional sites that should be considered for housing development in the Local Plan

Site	No. Suggesting
Old gas works in front of New Road currently in industrial use	1
Britannia Mill Buxworth	4
Land by Tesco's Whaley Bridge	3
Land alongside A6 near small industrial units on Buxton Road in Furness Vale - between canal and road.	1
Anywhere that does not spoil views and countryside	
Jodrell Arms, Whaley Bridge	3
Green belt land at Whaley Bridge with access to by-pass	
Old church site next to Town Hall, New Mills (where Magistrates Court failed)	2
Old Jones Wood factory, Watford Bridge Road, New Mills	
Cromford Court, Whaley Bridge: for sheltered accommodation	2
Rear of Caldene Terrace and Old Road, Whaley Bridge	4
Rear of Whiteley's Factory, Bingswood Road	3
Site of disused Foundry on Paddock Lane	
Hogs Yard	2
Taxal Lodge, Linglongs Road	5
Part of Bingswood Industrial estate	
Garrison Works, Birch Vale	2
part of Thornsett Industrial Estate	
Parcel of land adjacent to railway line next to New Mills Newtown station	
Whaley Bridge Fire Station	2
Ex gas works area to north of New Road, Whaley Bridge	3
land to south of Bingswood Road and east of High Peak railway footpath	
Land at end of Forge Road, Whaley Bridge	
Derelict house off Macclesfield rd at entrance to Clover Chemicals	
west of land designated LT4, Chapel, site plan provided	
Land adjacent to tramway trail, Whaley Bridge	
Shallcross foundry	2
Industrial estate containing Gisbourne house, Whaley Bridge	
Vista engineering, Whaley Bridge	
Ringstones, Whaley Bridge	
Land between Botany Mews and Botany Industrial estate	
Land to rear of Cromford Court, Whaley Bridge	2
Land to north of Hogs Yard	
Land between Buxton Road and Old Road	
Yacht Club, reservoir Road, Whaley Bridge	
House adjacent Whaley Hall	

Land at junction of Chapel Road and Buxton Road	
Land between Chapel Road and river	
Land to north of Bingswood (formerly allotment)	
disused foundry, Paddock Lane, off Elnor lane	
Location plan supplied with letter: The Croft, off Reservoir Road	
Burgess Brothers land on Marsh Lane Trading Estate owner supplied details by letter, adjacent to Brown Brow Quarry, also new site suggestion	
Brown Brow Quarry, Marsh Lane Trading Estate, New Mills, adjacent to Burgess Brothers land, also new site suggestion	
Extension to C7 to include all of Victoria Mill, Victoria Street, New Mills, plan provided with letter from agents Greenham	
Meadows Farm, Hayfield, plan supplied by agents S J Design Ltd	
Adjacent to Chapel secondary school	
Land to the rear of Elmwood House and Penlee, Church Lane, New Mills (currently suggested as Green Wedge); and	
Land off Buxton Road, Bridgemont, Whaley Bridge	
Extension to C7 to include all of land owned by Majic Rental Services, Hawthorn Industrial Estate	
Torr Vale Mill, New Mills	
Taxal Lodge Area Linglongs Road old school site. Site behind Whiteleys on Bridge Street. Caldene Terrace off Old Road. Opposite Tescos along the railway embankment. Old gasworks at Dorethea. Land at the end of Forge Road.	
Opposite Tescos along the railway embankment.	
the HGV Operating Centre, off Old Road/Caldene Terrace	
Brownfield sites at Thornsett, Bingswood Trading estate and Furness Vale	
greenfield sites to the North of Whaley Bridge, linking to Furness Vale	
The A5004/A6 corridor between the northern extent of Whaley Bridge (at Tesco/Hall Farm Close) and Furness Vale, including the Britannia Mill	
Rivertown Developments Ltd, Britannia Mills, New Britannia Trading Estate, Buxworth	
land off bypass	
land east of River Sett at the end of Hyde Bank Road	
Garage behind New Mills chip shop	

Glossopdale Sites

Question G1 - Which potential housing sites would you prefer to be allocated for development in the Local Plan?

Site: G1 Arnfield Water Treatment Works, Tintwistle

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
291	32	15	50	74	120

Summary of Public Comments:

- traffic congestion (2)
- affect proposed bypass (1)
- privacy (2)
- congestion (2)
- school (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

United Utilities Property Solutions

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? - No
- Comment: need comment from HA as A628 is a trunk road

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported with an appropriate S106 education contribution.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No response

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage:

Adjacent to Arnfield Water Tower Grade 2 listed

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G2 Paradise Street, Hadfield

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
244	38	19	43	61	83

Summary of Public Comments:

No specific comments

Owner/Developer Interest:

Southern part of the site is owned by HPBC. Northern vertical strip has previous planning permission for residential; last planning permission granted in 1998 - extension of planning permission by five years for 32 dwellings.HPK/0003/6876

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? If Paradise St was laid out and constructed to an adoptable standard.
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? No

Education:

Growth in numbers within the area currently has led to a feasibility study being undertaken. The building can be expanded by one classroom but no more. The site is very tight and the levels would make construction difficult. This level of housing could be accommodated, but no more than this

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

No response

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G3 Roughfields, Hadfield

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
369	258	20	47	39	5

Summary of Public Comments:

- remove gap between Padfield and Hadfield (30)
- loss of views (1)
- loss of peace and quiet (2)
- loss of childrens play area (1)
- loss of playing pitches/recreation area (35)
- too large for one place (2)
- greenfield (1)
- National Park (9)
- traffic (5)

Owner/Developer Interest:

HPBC

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? -Yes
- Comment: need to improve pedestrian facilities on Padfield Main Road

Education:

Growth in numbers within the area currently has led to a feasibility study being undertaken. The building can be expanded by one classroom but no more. The site is very tight and the levels would make construction difficult. This level of housing could be accommodated, but no more than this.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

No response

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G4 Temple Street, Padfield

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
344	243	26	46	29	0

Summary of Public Comments:

- detrimental to Padfield Conservation area (72)
- application refused in 1974 (45)
- identity of village destroyed (25)
- flora and fauna affected (27)
- no infrastructure (5)
- close to National Park (3)
- trees destroyed (2)
- greenfield (3)
- school full (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Two parcels in private ownership.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? yes
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: pedestrian facilities limited

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported with an appropriate S106 education contribution.

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

No response

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G5 Adjacent to Park Crescent, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
195	97	27	62	9	0

Summary of Public Comments:

- currently grazing land (1)
- must preserve local landscape (1)
- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- drainage problems (1)
- protect green lung between Hadfield and Glossop (6)
- protect amenity land (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? yes
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: Park Crescent is a rural lane with little or no footway provision

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported

Archaeology:

May have negative impacts on setting of designated heritage assets; Scheduled monument, Conservation Area, Registered park; would require archaeological evaluation pre application

Planning & Infrastructure

Concern over visual prominence and sensitive location overrides development potential

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Adjacent to Conservation area and Grade II listed Park. On hillside so likely to impact on these assets. Possible wider impacts on Castle Hill. English Heritage would raise concern over allocation for housing.

Other Bodies:
No response

Site: G6 North Road, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
254	159	37	43	13	2

Summary of Public Comments:

- currently grazing land (1)
- must preserve local landscape (1)
- maintain gap between Padfield and Glossop (3)
- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- will destroy visible countryside amenity (1)
- traffic in Padfield (3)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Two parcels in private ownership.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Possibly
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? - yes
- Comment :need additional pedestrian facility

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported

Archaeology:

May have negative impacts on setting of designated heritage assets - Scheduled monument, Conservation Area, Registered Park. Would require archaeological evaluation pre-application.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Adjacent to Conservation area and Grade II listed Park. On hillside so likely to impact on these assets. Possible wider impacts on Castle Hill. English Heritage would raise concern over allocation for housing. Maybe scope in southern part of the site.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G7 Land off Woodhead Road (Kingsmoor Fields), Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
236	99	54	64	14	5

Summary of Public Comments:

- Private ownership by 5 residents (2)
- remove from plan (1)
- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- children play on field (1)
- fauna inc bats (2)
- access onto Woodhead Road constrained (10)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Local residents have said site has been bought by properties on Kingsmoor Fields to protect it from development

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? no
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway yes - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment : pedestrian facilities limited

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported with an appropriate S106 education contribution.

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application.

Planning & Infrastructure

Concern over visual prominence and sensitive location overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

Residents Association

Spoil attractive access into Glossop. Access onto busy Woodhead Road

Site: G8 Land off Woodhead Road, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
230	102	62	46	14	6

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- conservation area (1)
- landowner unaware (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

In private ownership.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: no footway or bus stop in proximity of site

Education:

This school was brought onto a single site recently. There is some capacity for expansion but by no more than two classrooms with an appropriate S106 education contribution, but other facilities like car parking would be a significant problem. Whilst it is possible technically to do it, the Local Authority would favour location of this level of housing development elsewhere within Glossop if possible.

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Planning & Infrastructure

Concern over visual prominence and sensitive location overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Considered to potentially be of strategic concern to the National Park, by virtue of their encroachment to the designated boundary, thus reducing the natural setting currently afforded to the National Park.

Town/Parish Council:

Object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Adj to Old Glossop Conservation Area. Adj to listed Laneside Farm. Given topography would raise concern over allocation for housing.

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

Residents Association

Attractive open countryside, borders Green belt. Wildlife. Contrary to Design and Place making strategy

Site: G9 Land off Woodhead Road (1), Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
228	91	64	49	14	10

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- conservation area (2)
- part of registered agricultural holding (1)
- access issues (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

- In private ownership. Developer interest. Representation from John Rose Associates to state site is deliverable and that G9, 10 and 11 together could deliver 100 dwellings

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? - no
- Comment: no footway or bus stop in proximity of site

Education:

This school was brought onto a single site recently. There is some capacity for expansion but by no more than two classrooms with an appropriate S106 education contribution, but other facilities like car parking would be a significant problem. Whilst it is possible technically to do it, the Local Authority would favour location of this level of housing development elsewhere within Glossop if possible.

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Planning & Infrastructure

Concern over visual prominence and sensitive location overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Considered to potentially be of strategic concern to the National Park, by virtue of their encroachment to the designated boundary, thus reducing the natural setting currently afforded to the National Park.

Town/Parish Council:

Object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Adj to Old Glossop Conservation Area. Given topography would raise concern over allocation for housing.

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

Residents Association

Attractive open countryside, borders Green belt. Wildlife. Contrary to Design and Place making strategy

Site: G10 Land off Woodhead Road (2), Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
227	82	48	65	23	9

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- conservation area (1)
- registered agricultural holding (1)
- access issues (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

In private ownership. Developer interest. Representation from John Rose Associates to state site is deliverable and that G9, 10 and 11 together could deliver 100 dwellings.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? possible from land to north
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: access from adjoining land not public highway

Education:

This school was brought onto a single site recently. There is some capacity for expansion but by no more than two classrooms with an appropriate S106 education contribution, but other facilities like car parking would be a significant problem. Whilst it is possible technically to do it, the Local Authority would favour location of this level of housing development elsewhere within Glossop if possible.

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Planning & Infrastructure

Concern over visual prominence and sensitive location overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Considered to potentially be of strategic concern to the National Park, by virtue of their encroachment to the designated boundary, thus reducing the natural setting currently afforded to the National Park.

Town/Parish Council:

Object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Impact on setting of Grade2 listed Roman Catholic Church

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

Residents Association

Attractive open countryside, borders Green belt. Wildlife. Contrary to Design and Place making strategy

Site: G11 Land off Woodhead Road (3), Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
219	84	47	65	15	8

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- conservation area (1)
- part of registered agricultural holding (1)
- access issues (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

In private ownership. Developer interest. Representation from John Rose Associates to state site is deliverable and that G9, 10 and 11 together could deliver 100 dwellings.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? yes. Thorpe St narrow with no pedestrian facilities or turning facility
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway no - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: part of Thorpe st is one way and emerging visibility is adequate

Education:

This school was brought onto a single site recently. There is some capacity for expansion but by no more than two classrooms with an appropriate S106 education contribution, but other facilities like car parking would be a significant problem. Whilst it is possible technically to do it, the Local Authority would favour location of this level of housing development elsewhere within Glossop if possible.

Archaeology:

Entirely within Conservation Area- may have major negative impact. Would need archaeological survey pre-application.

Planning & Infrastructure

Concern over visual prominence and sensitive location overrides development potential.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

Considered to potentially be of strategic concern to the National Park, by virtue of their encroachment to the designated boundary, thus reducing the natural setting currently afforded to the National Park.

Town/Parish Council:

Object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Impact on setting of Grade2 listed Roman Catholic Church. Within Old Glossop Conservation Area and due to topography may impact on setting of listed buildings.

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

Residents Association

Attractive open countryside, borders Green belt. Wildlife. Contrary to Design and Place making strategy

Site: G12 Land off Bute Street, Old Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
215	79	38	57	21	20

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (9)
- flood risk (1)
- Blackshaw Clough ecologically important (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Northern part of the site owned by Hawkshead Mill. Remainder of site appears to be owned by Jacksons Fasteners. Southern part of site is privately owned.

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? yes. Thorpe St narrow with no pedestrian facilities or turning facility
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway no - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: public highway fronting appears only to serve rear of hospital

Education:

This school was brought onto a single site recently. There is some capacity for expansion but by no more than two classrooms with an appropriate S106 education contribution, but other facilities like car parking would be a significant problem. Whilst it is possible technically to do it, the Local Authority would favour location of this level of housing development elsewhere within Glossop if possible.

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application.

Planning & Infrastructure

The site acts as a green wedge in the valley bottom below a series of reservoirs adjacent to the PDNP. It is considered highly sensitive to any form of development.

Neighbouring Authorities:

Peak District National Park

This is largely a green field site, 70%, it currently offers a green wedge out into the countryside of the National Park, and is likely to be prominent when seen from certain vantage points within the National Park, this site is therefore considered to be of strategic concern to the National Park.

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

We can advise that the Land at Bute Street (Option G12) has a previous history of flooding and the 'comment' given on page 30 is incorrect as the south of the site is shown to be located within Flood Zone 3. The previous flooding is known from a site specific consultation where it has been shown that a minor watercourse is the source that does not have a flood zone produced at that scale. This site may need to be sequentially allocated as part of the Sustainability Appraisal and refined flooding information produced to ensure that all potential flood risk issues to the site are clearly identified. The Flood Risk Assessment, specific to this site may provide a useful starting point.

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

Residents Association

Concerns over loss of greenfield site, impact on wildlife, flood risk and character of Old Glossop.

Site: G13 Hawkshead Mill, Old Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
291	42	20	48	63	118

Summary of Public Comments:

No specific comments

Owner/Developer Interest:

Hawkshead Mill Old Glossop

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? yes. junctions with Hope St are restricted in terms on emerging visibility
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway no - within the site no
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: need footway fronting Hope St

Education:

This school was brought onto a single site recently. There is some capacity for expansion but by no more than two classrooms with an appropriate S106 education contribution, but other facilities like car parking would be a significant problem. Whilst it is possible technically to do it, the Local Authority would favour location of this level of housing development elsewhere within Glossop if possible.

Archaeology:

Archaeological desk based assessment/buildings appraisal needed pre-application; further work could be conditioned.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No comment.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Mill building should be assessed and if appropriate retained.

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

Residents Association

Too many homes. Traffic impact

Site: G14 Hope Street, Old Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
207	61	40	59	23	24

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Four parcels of land in private ownerships

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? yes
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? Possibly
- Comment: recent application showing access through Firth Rixon to Shepley St

Education:

This school was brought onto a single site recently. There is some capacity for expansion but by no more than two classrooms with an appropriate S106 education contribution, but other facilities like car parking would be a significant problem. Whilst it is possible technically to do it, the Local Authority would favour location of this level of housing development elsewhere within Glossop if possible.

Archaeology:

No archaeological issues. Any have negative impact on Conservation area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No comment

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

Residents Association

Made comments on planning application.

Site: G15 York Street Depot, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
290	29	12	36	86	127

Summary of Public Comments:

No comments

Owner/Developer Interest:

Agent for landowner

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? - no
- Comment: recent planning application

Education:

This school was brought onto a single site recently. There is some capacity for expansion but by no more than two classrooms with an appropriate S106 education contribution, but other facilities like car parking would be a significant problem. Whilst it is possible technically to do it, the Local Authority would favour location of this level of housing development elsewhere within Glossop if possible.

Archaeology:

No archaeological issues.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No comment

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G16 Woods Mill High Street east, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
288	25	12	43	71	137

Summary of Public Comments:

- Woods Mill site is strategically located and has the potential to significantly contribute to the wider regeneration of Glossop. The opportunity exists for Woods Mill to become an attractive and vibrant mixed-use neighbourhood, offering a range of residential and commercial uses. The mixed-use regeneration of Woods Mill is one of the key objectives identified by the Options Consultation document. The current designation as a Primary Employment Zone needs to be reviewed. The majority of the site is now redundant Uses such as a Class A1 foodstore, non-food comparison retail floor space, food and drink (Classes A3 and A4), leisure (Classes A3, A4, C1 and D2), and residential. As suggested by Option G16, residential development would be part of this overall masterplan. We would therefore agree that residential development should be included within the overall mix of the Woods Mill development site. In terms of location, given the wider commercial uses towards the west, the north eastern section of the site lends itself to residential development.

Owner/Developer Interest:

Agent for landowner

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? Possibly subject to significant highway works
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? Yes

Education:

Development can be supported with appropriate s106

Archaeology:

Archaeological desk based assessment/buildings appraisal needed pre-application; further work could be conditioned. Opportunity for reuse of historic industrial structures (loss of mill buildings unacceptable within Conservation Area)

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

Environment Agency

The housing options site referenced G16 is shown to be at high risk (flood zone 3) of flooding from the Glossop Brook and has been affected by flooding. This site will need to be sequentially allocated as part of the Sustainability Appraisal and refined flooding information produced to ensure that all potential flood risk issues to the site are clearly identified.

English Heritage

Site G16 is within Glossop conservation area and contains the grade II listed Howard Town House. The site contains a mixture of modern developments with the leisure centre and former historic mill buildings. Development of the site for housing or other requires careful consideration of the historic environment attributes, however we do not object to the principle of allocating of the site, ideally for a mixed use, which includes the retention of historic buildings and protects the setting of Howard Town House.

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G17 Land off Cliffe Road, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
209	58	29	89	25	8

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- includes part of garden of properties on Bank St which should be removed

Owner/Developer Interest:

Private landowner

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? possibly
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway yes - within the site yes – 4
- Would a TA be required? No

Education:

Development can be supported with appropriate s106

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No comment.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Possible Setting issues

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G18 Bank Street, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
202	53	29	93	20	7

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)

Owner/Developer Interest:

In private ownerships

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? Yes
- Comment: no footway or bus stop in proximity of site

Education:

No response

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No comment.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Possible Setting issues

Natural England

Within 1Km of Shire Hill Ancient woodland. Seek reassurance that there would be no adverse impact from increased recreational use.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G19 Dinting Road/Dinting Lane, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
223	76	52	57	23	15

Summary of Public Comments:

- access constraints (3)
- shouldn't access from Ashleigh Ave (1)
- school time congestion(1)
- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Agent for landowner

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? Possibly
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? yes
- Comment: no footway on Dinting Road, public rights of way, gradient issues

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Potential for non designated archaeology

Network Rail

The developer would need to contact the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer and submit plans, method statements and risk assessments for all excavation/earthworks, drainage/water features, scaffolding, landscaping, lighting, piling works, any crane and plant. Any future development must not encroach upon Network Rail land or over-sail Network Rail airspace. A 2m gap is required between any building and structure on site and the Network Rail boundary. A minimum 1.8m high trespass proof steel palisade fence would be required to prevent trespass by

any users/residents of the site onto the railway (the council is reminded that trespass is a criminal offence under s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949) . If there are any hard standing areas high kerbs will be required to ensure no vehicle accidentally roll onto the railway or damage the existing boundary treatments.

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G20 Dinting Lane, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
226	76	55	62	21	12

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8) access constraints (2)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway no - within the site no
- Would a TA be required? yes

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Potential for non designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

No response.

Site: G21 Land off Dinting Road, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
219	73	49	58	25	14

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- access constraints (2)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Agent for landowner

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? - no

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application- possibly including evaluation.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

No response

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G22 Plot 3 Dinting Road, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
206	71	25	75	25	10

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- access constraints (2)

Owner/Developer Interest:

In private ownership

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required?

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported

Archaeology:

No archaeological issues.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object

Specific Consultation Bodies:

No response

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G23 Former Railway Museum, Dinting

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
232	70	20	62	51	29

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- access constraints (2)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Agent for landowner

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? yes

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported

Archaeology:

Archaeological desk based assessment/buildings appraisal needed pre application; further work could be conditioned.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Potential for non designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G24 Land to the rear of Cottage Lane, Gamesley

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
242	88	23	59	33	39

Summary of Public Comments:

- trees (3)
- used by residents as garden and for recreation (4)
- congestion on Cottage lane (4)
- impact on wildlife (2)
- greenfield so should not be considered for development (9)
- loss of privacy (1)
- legal issues (1)
- traffic (1)
- in Carpenters Detailed emergency planning zone (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Agent for landowner

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site no
- Would a TA be required? no

Education:

The increased demand for places at this school is being accommodated by building two new classrooms for September 2013. The site of the school can accommodate some further expansion of the school and this level of development would be within those parameters. This expansion would be subject to a S106 education contribution.

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application- possibly including evaluation.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No response

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Potential for non designated archaeology

Other Bodies:
No response

Site: G25 Land off Melandra Castle Road, Gamesley

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
261	71	25	49	76	40

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)

Owner/Developer Interest:

HPBC

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? Yes
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? – no

Education:

The increased demand for places at this school is being accommodated by building two new classrooms for September 2013. The site of the school can accommodate some further expansion of the school and this level of development would be within those parameters. This expansion would be subject to a S106 education contribution.

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application- possibly including evaluation.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Potential for non designated archaeology

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G26 Land adjacent to Gamesley slidings

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
256	58	21	42	83	52

Summary of Public Comments:

- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Sanas Romeo Astor Properties Ltd

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? no:

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported

Archaeology:

Archaeological survey could be conditioned. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No response

Specific Consultation Bodies:

No response

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G27 Land adjacent to 40-46 Glossop Road, Charlesworth

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
339	210	39	71	17	2

Summary of Public Comments:

- village will not cope with traffic increase (83)
- rat run to Charlesworth (1)
- detrimental effect on Conservation area (42)
- decontamination (1)
- wildlife (6)
- drainage (1)
- traffic flows in April 2012 329,803 vehicles on Long Lane each month, 11,933 per day and 8,064 speeding (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

In private ownership

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: limited pedestrian facilities

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported.

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage:

May affect setting/ partially within Conservation Area

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G28 Land off Glossop Road, Charlesworth

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
335	205	36	68	20	6

Summary of Public Comments:

- village will not cope with traffic increase (82)
- rat run to Charlesworth (1)
- detrimental effect on Conservation area (42)
- will the stone barn be protected (6)
- drainage (2)
- traffic flows in April 2012 329,803 vehicles on Long Lane each month, 11,933 per day and 8,064 speeding (1)

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site No
- Would a TA be required? No
- Comment: limited pedestrian facilities

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported.

Archaeology:

Would need archaeological survey pre-application. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

Strongly object.

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage:

May affect setting/ partially within Conservation Area

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G29 Spring Rise, Simmondley

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
222	80	28	60	29	25

Summary of Public Comments:

- traffic congestion (1)
- rat run to Charlesworth (1)
- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- Simmondley Pre school petition of 47 signatures- child safeguarding, loss of use of current outdoor play space, road safety, health and safety during building

Owner/Developer Interest:

Agent for landowner

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? no

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported

Archaeology:

Archaeological survey could be conditioned. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No response

Specific Consultation Bodies:

No response

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G30 Land between Spring Rise and High Lane, Simmondley

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
224	81	32	62	26	23

Summary of Public Comments:

- traffic congestion (1)
- rat run to Charlesworth (1)
- greenfield so should not be considered for development (8)
- Simmondley Pre school petition of 47 signatures- child safeguarding, loss of use of current outdoor play space, road safety, health and safety during building

Owner/Developer Interest:

Unknown

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? No
- Could a satisfactory access be achieved potentially (either through demolition of a property within the control of the applicant or other measure)? No
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway yes - within the site yes
- Would a TA be required? no

Education:

Development of this scale can be supported

Archaeology:

Archaeological survey could be conditioned. May have negative impact on Conservation Area.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No response

Specific Consultation Bodies:

No response

Other Bodies:

No response

Site: G31 Charlestown Works, Glossop

Responses:

Total No.	Strongly Object	Object	Neutral/general comment	Support	Strongly support
286	28	16	39	57	146

Summary of Public Comments:

No comments

Owner/Developer Interest:

Agent for landowner

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

- Can a satisfactory access be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn? Yes
- Would the development of the site cause an adverse impact on surrounding highway network? No
- Does topography present a highway problem? - within the highway No - within the site no
- Would a TA be required? -yes

Education:

Housing development on this scale can be supported with an appropriate S106 education contribution.

Archaeology:

Archaeological desk based assessment/buildings appraisal needed pre application; further work could be conditioned. Opportunity for reuse of historic industrial structures.

Neighbouring Authorities:

No response

Town/Parish Council:

No response

Specific Consultation Bodies:

English Heritage

Significance of buildings should be assessed and retained if necessary

Other Bodies:

No response

General Comments on Glossop Sites

Summary of Public Comments:

- Brownfield must be considered before greenfield (25)
- town centre before sites which are highly visible (15)
- traffic issues (4)
- all kept free for recreation and dog walking(1)
- consider Logwood Mill (1)
- no building on greenfield sites - 25 out of 31 are all or partly greenfield(1)
- reuse empty properties (1)
- green areas make Glossop distinctive (1)
- use derelict sites first (1)
- inadequate infrastructure (2)

Derbyshire County Council:

Highways:

Additional housing will lead to additional demand for travel, which is already significant. What is needed for Glossopdale is a travel strategy that will provide improvements to the local transport infrastructure, thereby improving accessibility for the towns existing residents. A mitigation strategy for Glossop would seek to develop improvements to the local public transport network, and walking and cycling facilities- for example, by extending bus routes and increasing bus frequencies, and designing sites to facilitate walking and cycling. In order to maximise public transport uptake, each local plan site should have access to at least a 15 min service. It may be possible in some circumstances to improve the capacity of existing roads by relatively minor physical adjustments such as improving the geometry of junctions within the existing highway boundary.

Additional Glossop Sites

Question G2 – Are there any additional sites that should be considered for housing development in the Local Plan

Site	No. Suggesting
Ferro alloys	15
Partington nursing home retirement flats	3
Woods hospital retirement flats	2
Waterside (behind Beesons)	33
Logwood Mill (Lancashire Chemicals)	1
Kierners Mill, Coombes Lane, Chisworth	2
Land off New Road Hadfield	1
Land off Graphite Way	1
Land off A57 Woolley Bridge behind Hillside	1
Land East of Shaw Lane	1
Lambgates	7
Land off Dinting Road	1
Extension to Charlesworth, Glossop Road	1
Extension to Simmondley, off Storth Meadow Road	1
Adderley Place Simmondley Lane	1
Land between Brooklands Drive and Nursing Home off Turnlee Road, Glossop.	1
Triangle site at Dinting lane	1
Ss036	1
Ss037	1
Land at Glossop Road Gamesley	1

5. Questions on Other Development Issues

The consultation asked questions regarding other development issues that would need to be addressed in the Local Plan. These included:

- land for business or industrial uses
- leisure and recreational uses
- land to be protected from development for its value to the community or environment
- education provision
- shopping and town centres

Buxton Responses

Question	No. of Responses	Comments/Suggestions
<p>B3 - Do you feel that the sites currently identified for business or industrial use in the Central Area should remain designated for such purposes in the new Local Plan? These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primary Employment Zones - Land allocated for future business/industrial use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Hoffman Quarry, Harpur Hill o Staden Lane extension o Tongue Lane extension 		
All Responses	21	
Yes	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop sites as necessary (1) • Hoffman Quarry needs to be screened (1), • Research needed to identify which employment sites can be used for housing (1) • Hoffman Quarry, Staden Lane extension and Tongue Lane extensions should only be designated as fall-back status sites if there is a proven need for additional employment land in the future (1) • Support further business development at Staden Lane (1) • Query feasibility of Hoffman Quarry (1), • High quality development needed on Ashbourne Rd (1) • Staden Lane should be landscaped (1) • Develop vacant plots on Harpur Hill industrial estate (1) <p>Natural England - welcome the intention to reuse vacant or underused brownfield land however would highlight that only brownfield land that is of low ecological value should be considered for future allocation.</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - Yes</p> <p>Buxton Group - Support Staden Lane extension. Hoffman Quarry (extending into blue lagoon) also supported provided that access is not via Burlow Rd). Tongue Lane opposed until link road is built.</p>
No	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider business land for housing (4) • Tongue Lane is unsuitable due to poor access (2) • Tongue Lane should be dependant on link road (3) • Use Hoffman Quarry for leisure (2) • Focus development around Waterswallows (1) • No need to extend Staden Lane (1)

General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redesignate Neste site for housing (1) <p>Derbyshire County Council (Archaeology) - Hoffman quarry - no archaeological issues. Staden Lane - Would need archaeological desk-based assessment and field evaluation pre-application. Tongue Lane - Negative impact upon high value historic landscape; would need archaeological evaluation pre-application.</p> <p>Derbyshire County Council (Planning & Infrastructure) - Hoffman Quarry - visually prominent in landscape (plateau pastures LCT). Development would require sensitive design and mitigation. Staden Lane extension - is on rising ground. Potentially visually prominent in landscape (plateau pastures LCT). Development should enhance character of white peak and mitigate impact on countryside. Tongue Lane extension - landscape is in poor condition with derelict dry stone walls. development should enhance character of white peak and mitigate impact on countryside in this open landscape.</p> <p>English Heritage - Hoffman Quarry – as with housing site option B24, development here may impact upon the setting of a scheduled ancient monument. Staden Lane - there is potential for the site to contain non-designated archaeology as well as the wider setting issues at Staden earthworks ancient monument and Cowdale Quarry ancient monument. Cowdale is now on heritage at risk register. Tongue Lane - potential for the site to contain non-designated archaeology.</p> <p>Friends of the Peak District - New businesses should be located within the urban areas, and be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport. Appropriate use of employment land should seek to reduce out commuting.</p>
B4 - Are there any new sites that should be identified in the Local Plan for business or industrial use?		
All Responses	8	
Yes	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nestle site, Station Road (1) • British Legion Building (1) • Eagle Hotel (1) • Hillhead (1) • Local Plan should focus on creating jobs (1) • Greenfield sites next to main roads (1) • Flexibility to support businesses (1) • Blue lagoon (1) • Triangle of land south east of Staden Lane bounded by Staden Lane industrial

		<p>estate, A515 and railway (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disused quarry sites (1) • Extension of HSE site (1) <p>Hallams - Cowdale Quarry</p> <p>Hallam Land - Land off Ashbourne Road (mixed-use development with housing in Option site B20)</p> <p>Nestle Waters - extend PEZ at Waterswallows to enable future expansion</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - Waterswallows Quarry</p>
No	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None known (1)
B5 - Are there any sites that should be set aside for leisure or recreational purposes?		
All Responses	29	
Yes	27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land behind Green Lane for sports pitches (5) • Request that the word 'cultural' is used in a suitable policy to protect and promote leisure activities (1) • Protection to ensure continued theatre use is also provided for other venues, offering performance arts that may not be covered by listing or conservation area designations (1) • Protect pubs (1) • Former college site (1) • Hogshaw options B3 / B4 (1) • Hoffman Quarry (2) • Nestle site, Station Road for indoor leisure (8) • All open green areas where recreation is condoned by LA (1) • Option B21 (1) • Option B22 (1) • Option B29 (2) • People should have access to open countryside (1) • Option B28 for sports pitches (2) • Spring Gardens car park (1) • Hoffman Quarry (2) • Neighbourhood green spaces (1) • Town centre all weather facilities for residents and visitors (1) • Need to find land for allotments (1), blue lagoon (1)
No	1	
General Comment		<p>English Heritage - Tongue Lane - there is potential for the site to contain non-designated archaeology.</p> <p>Natural England - Although it is not within</p>

		<p>NE's remit to suggest sites for allocation, NE encourage LPA's to seek multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions such as for; wildlife, recreation flood risk mitigation, carbon storage or food production. NE recommend the use of ANGst as a tool that can ensure adequate provision of accessible natural greenspace.</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - All existing recreational sites should be protected from development in the Local Plan.</p>
B6 - Are there any sites or areas that should be considered for designation as a Local Nature Reserve?		
All Responses	18	
Yes	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hogshaw (3) • All green / open space (2) • Woodland behind Morrison's (1) • Tram track at Dove Holes (1) • Option 20, 21, 22 (1) • Grinlow Woods (2) • Serpentine (1) • Need to consider special landscape areas between Buxton and National Park (1) • Option B10 adjacent to Ashwood Wildlife site (1) • Option B11 • Option B13 • Option B16 (greenfield section only (1) • Option B24 • Option B29 (part of site with mature trees (1) • Greenfields at Harpur Hill (1) • Blue lagoon (1) <p>Natural England - encourage the preservation, promotion, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets. The designation of sites as Local Nature Reserves is therefore fully supported by NE.</p>
No	3	
General Comment		<p>Environment Agency - To meet the objective in the NPPF of a healthy natural environment you Authority will need to "<i>planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure</i>" (Para 114). Areas of particular local importance or significance that help deliver this objective can be designated as Local Green Space in Local Plans. These areas will than have the same protection as green belt (Para 76-78).</p>

		When considering whether to designate sites as Local Nature Reserves or Local Green Spaces, priority should be given to those sites that create connecting biodiversity corridors, i.e. optimisation of interconnectivity between watercourses (rivers, ditches, drains, streams, wetlands). The same should be considered for terrestrial sites as these also offer good quality habitat creation.
B7 - Are there any other sites that you feel should be designated as a Local Green Space?		
All Responses	24	
Yes	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land behind Green Lane, inc. Pooles Cavern (2) • Land at Hogshaw, option B4 (5) • Fox Hill above B22 (1) • All green / open space (3) • Tram track at Dove Holes (1) • Option 20, 21, 22 (1) • Options B13, B14 (1) • Option B9 (2) • Harpur Hill playing fields (2) • B9, B10, B11, B12 (part of site containing mature trees) (1) • B15, B16 (Greenfield part of site) (1) • B17, B18 & 19 (Greenfield part of sites) (1) • B24 (1) • B29 (part of site containing mature trees) (2) • B28 (1) • Pavilion Gardens, Serpentine, Slopes, Ashwood Park, Cote Heath recreation ground, Cricket Club, Temple Fields, options 13 and 14 (2) • Lismore Fields archaeological site, green north of St Johns' Road and west of the river Wye, green by St Peter's Church, Fairfield, greens on Hardwick Mount and Berwick Road, play areas on Green Lane and Brown Edge Road, playing fields at Hogshaw and Heathfield Nook Road, Fairfield Common, Cavendish Golf Course, The field south of Sherwood Road, Buxton cemetery, fields currently used as school playing fields, unless equivalent provision is made elsewhere, all churchyards, Civic Association woodlands, allotments, land next to fern Rd (1) <p>Natural England - NE encourages the Plan to make provision for an appropriate quality and quantity of green space to meet identified local needs as part of a wider open space provision. NE recommend the use of ANGst as a useful tool that can help ensure adequate provision of accessible natural</p>

		<p>greenspace,</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - The Launt, Temple Fields, The Park, Fairfield Common, open spaces which are open to the public, all other open spaces, all woods belonging to the Civic Association.</p> <p>Buxton Group - The Launt, off Granby Road, Pavilion Gardens, Serpentine, Slopes, Ashwood Park, Cote Heath recreation ground, Cricket Club, Temple Fields, Fields off Green Lane, Lismore Fields archaeological site, green north of St Johns' Road and west of the river Wye, green by St Peter's Church, Fairfield, greens on Hardwick Mount and Berwick Road, play areas on Green Lane and Brown Edge Road, playing fields at Hogshaw and Heathfield Nook Road, Fairfield Common, Cavendish Golf Course, The field south of Sherwood Road, Buxton cemetery, fields currently used as school playing fields, unless equivalent provision is made elsewhere, all churchyards, Civic Association woodlands, allotments</p>
No	0	
General Comments		<p>Environment Agency - To meet the objective in the NPPF of a healthy natural environment you Authority will need to "<i>planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure</i>" (Para 114). Areas of particular local importance or significance that help deliver this objective can be designated as Local Green Space in Local Plans. These areas will then have the same protection as green belt (Para 76-78).</p> <p>When considering whether to designate sites as Local Nature Reserves or Local Green Spaces, priority should be given to those sites that create connecting biodiversity corridors, i.e. optimisation of interconnectivity between watercourses (rivers, ditches, drains, streams, wetlands). The same should be considered for terrestrial sites as these also offer good quality habitat creation.</p>
B8 - Which option to increase secondary school capacity do you prefer?		
All Responses	77	

<p>Option A - extend school premises on existing school site by relocating the outdoor sports pitches onto land adjacent to the existing school playing fields</p>	<p>63</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheapest option (18) • Dukes Drive unsuitable for extra traffic (2). • Replacement tennis courts needed (1). • Parts of Dukes Drive prone to flooding (1). • Highway safety concerns at break times with pupils crossing Green Lane (1). • Make use of primary school land (1). • Dukes Drive is too remote (6). • Retain school within community (4). • Development on Dukes Drive would harm caravan site (1), • Scope for extra parking on school site (1) • Dukes Drive too prominent (1) • Most practical (13) • In keeping with area (1) • Least impact (2) • Preserves setting of Grinlow Woods (3), • Development on Green Lane should be sensitive to conservation area (1) • Risk of vandalism to sports pitches on separate site (1) • Land between B13 and playing fields is owned by Hockey Club (1) • Retain public access (1) • Preferable to housing development (1) <p>Derbyshire County Council (Education) - DCC committed to work with HPBC to address secondary school provision to support sustainable growth. Option A is preferred as it would retain school site and is the most cost effective and deliverable. Developer contributions of c. £3.75m required based on standard formula. Providing a replacement school would require £20m and 10ha of land.</p> <p>English Heritage - No detailed comments to make - option A is adjacent to the conservation area and use of this land for sports pitches may be more sympathetic to the character and setting of the area than housing (options B13&B14)</p> <p>Natural England - support option A, as this would cause the least impact to Greenfield land and encourage a more compatible recreational use on adjacent land. Furthermore, this area has been identified within the Buxton Area Consultation Document as potential housing allocation site B13, which is located close to Grin Low SSSI, a recreation/education allocation on this site is less likely to have a negative impact on the ecosystem within the SSSI area.</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - support option A</p>
--	-----------	---

		<p>- would be a sensible, sustainable and preferable use rather than housing. It would provide for the expansion of the school and retain the green nature of the site, preserve the environment as an ideal setting for the County Park</p> <p>Buxton Group - Support Option A , which makes use of the existing buildings with additional capacity added on the same site. Green Lane Farm would provide for plenty of space for outdoor sport but should not be built up, other than to provide single story accommodation for essential services to the playing fields.</p>
Option B - build a replacement school on land off Dukes Drive	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plenty of space (1) • Unsafe for children to cross Green Lane (1) • Unconstrained site (1) • Good location (1) • Least disruption to school timetable or facilities (1)
Other - are there any alternative options that we should consider?	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new school is not needed (1) • Build an additional school to provide competition (1) • Existing school site is constrained and Dukes Drive is inappropriate (1) • Use former college site in Harpur Hill
General Comments		<p>Chatsworth Settlement Trustees - Whilst recognising that the site has potential for residential development and that may represent its optimum use, we support further investigation of the potential for a replacement school on the Dukes Drive site (Option B). Many of the site's advantages for residential development apply to the site's potential suitability for education use.</p>
B9 - Should any changes be made to the boundary of Buxton town centre?		
All Responses	34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future development of Nestle site should accommodate cycle trail (1)
Yes	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude Nestle site from town centre (14) • include Dale Rd from Fiveways to Market St (including fiveways) (1) • Full review of boundary needed - exclude; palace hotel, university and the park, include; shops in Market Street, Dale Road and Bridge street (under the bridge)? (1) • Include Methodist Church and Chapel Street (1) <p>Trevor Osborne - TC should cover a substantial area, including area south of</p>

		<p>Spring Gardens extending towards Hardwick Square South and South Avenue. Only ancillary retail should be permitted at Nestle site.</p> <p>Threadneedle - town centre boundary is too wide. Nestle site does not match NPPF definition of town centres and should be excluded and considered out-of-centre.</p> <p>Buxton Group - We propose that the town centre boundary should be redrawn to exclude the housing area from the town centre. This is shown in red on the attached plan.</p>
No	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing boundary is appropriate (1) • May lead to new parking restrictions (1) <p>Tesco - boundary should be maintained, including Nestle site as it provides a strong opportunity to improve retail offer.</p> <p>Natural England - support the current town centre boundary and its aim to ensure retail, leisure and hotel planning applications are encouraged within this area as this promotes sustainable development principles. Town centres are generally better served in terms of public transport and other services and this promotes the use of more sustainable transport modes. Natural England would encourage the promotion of residential use on upper floors in the town centre as this encourages a more sustainable form of urban living by reducing resource consumption and greenhouse gas emissions (through use of sustainable modes of transport accessible in Buxton), along with the re-use of existing under-used or vacant buildings.</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - No change</p>
B10 - Should any changes be made to the primary frontages for Buxton Town Centre?		
All Responses	25	
Yes	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include; Terrace road (1) • The Market Place (5) • Eagle Parade (1) • Scarsdale Place (1) • High Street (3) • London Rd to Fiveways (1) • Boundary should be fundamentally reviewed (1) • Exclude frontage opposite Palace Hotel, possibly the quadrant (1) <p>Waitrose - Primary Shopping Area should</p>

		<p>include Waitrose as a key anchor store in Buxton town centre.</p> <p>Threadneedle - primary frontage should include premises within Spring Gardens Shopping Centre.</p>
No	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce business rate (1) • Too many charity shops (1) Too many empty shops (1) <p>Trevor Osborne - frontages should be kept south of Station Road to exclude Nestle.</p> <p>Tesco - no change necessary at present. Retail development at Nestle would require an update to frontages in the future.</p> <p>Buxton Civic Society – no change</p>
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontages should be defined in a separate DM DPD (1) • Improve Spring Gardens (1) • No more supermarkets (1) • Better links between Spring Gardens and market needed (2) • Reduce business rates (1) • Improve market (1)
B11 - Which parts of the town centre should be defined as secondary shopping frontages?		
All Responses	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontages should be defined in a separate DM DPD (1) • Market Place (5) • Fairfield Road, to and including Bridge Street (2) • Top of Hall Bank from former Esso Garage to bottom of London Road (3) • High Street (3) • None - all should primary frontage (1), consider frontages to serve local communities e.g. Fairfield, Burbage, Harpur Hill (1) <p>Waitrose - Primary Shopping Area should include Waitrose as a key anchor store in Buxton town centre.</p> <p>Trevor Osborne - secondary frontages are not needed, all retail should be protected.</p> <p>Tesco - Nestle site for primary or secondary frontage if developed for retail.</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - include B10</p> <p>Buxton Group - Market Place and High</p>

		Street. Possibly Station Rd
B12 - Should the Local Plan identify any local or district centres?		
All Responses	25	
Yes	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect retail of benefit to local communities (3) • Protect Spring Gardens (1) • Old garage site, Harpur Hill (1) • Higher part of Harpur Hill Rd / Burlow Rd (1) • Higher Buxton (1) • Top shops in Fairfield (3) • Harpur Hill (2) • Burbage (2) • Dale Road (1) • London Road (1) <p>Tesco - where there is a genuine cluster of shops and services in areas smaller than a town centre should these be identified</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - Burlow Road, Fairfield Shopping Centre. Macclesfield Rd adjacent to Burbage traffic lights.</p> <p>Buxton Group - Top shops in Fairfield</p>
No	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shops have already gone (2) • Focus on town centre (1) <p>Trevor Osborne - market demand should identify requirement</p>
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buxton doesn't need another supermarket (1) • Improve the market (1)
B13 - How should the Local Plan best meet the identified retail needs in Buxton?		
All Responses	85	
Option A - allocate land at for a foodstore at Spring Gardens Shopping Centre and car park	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand existing supermarket (1) • Use Station Road site for car parking (1) • Only develop supermarket if needed (2) • include frontage onto Station Rd (1) • Provide underground car parking / service yard (2) • Need to unify town centre (1) • Sufficient land on site to accommodate identified need (1) • Emphasis to be placed on coordination with existing shops (1) • Station Rd site is disjointed from TC (1) • Closer to other shops (1) <p>Threadneedle - Spring Gardens is sequentially preferable and compliant with</p>

		<p>NPPF. The site offers more scope for linked trips to support TC and to improve frontage to Station Road. Nestle site is segregated from TC, not sequentially preferable, its elevated position would be prominent in the landscape in a setting of listed buildings.</p> <p>English Heritage - Both options lie next to conservation area and listed buildings. Spring Gardens site offers the potential to significantly enhance Buxton's townscape in this area and its wider economy. However it will be essential to ensure that development does not have a negative impact on the historic environment within this area. We consider that the Spring Gardens site has more scope for a foodstore. However, should an allocation go forward, a development brief should be made, given the sensitivities for this area. Key considerations should include the setting of nearby heritage assets, including the Crescent. An understanding of the character of the area, key views, and good urban design principles are required in the development of this land, in accordance with the adopted SPDs.</p>
<p>Option B - allocate land for a new foodstore at the Nestle site, Station Road</p>	<p>21</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morrison's needs competition (1) • Retain Spring Gardens parking (4) • Prime location (1) • Will support town centre trade (1) • New Tesco (1) • Nestle site will become an eye-sore if derelict (1) • Need to unify town centre (1) <p>Tesco - fully endorse identified need for new foodstore in a central location. Spring Gardens is closer to PSA but has a smaller footprint. Its development will likely result in either a loss of TC parking or a multi-storey car park. Design, heritage and flood risk issues likely at Spring Gardens conflicting with SPD's. Nestle site offers opportunity for better parking provision and without significant impact on heritage assets - in line with SPD's. Scope for mixed-use frontage on Station Road. Better pedestrian links to TC, streetscene improvements etc would be provided.</p> <p>Nestle Waters - An anchor food retail store on the Nestlé site as a centrepiece to comprehensive redevelopment is the right solution for a key gateway location in Buxton town centre. The site is available and the development as a whole is viable. The development has the capacity to transform the appearance of the Station Road corridor through environmental renewal and distinct</p>

		<p>buildings. Spring gardens site will need to be multi storey which will present design / heritage issues, be difficult to utilise from an operators perspective, barrier to improving pedestrian links across TC flood risk issues, unavailable, unlikely to be deliverable.</p> <p>Buxton Civic Society - HPBC claim there is an identified case for a further foodstore in Buxton. To progress this and any alternative options, there should be a further consultation with all interested parties in Buxton.</p>
<p>Other - are there any alternative options that we should consider?</p>	<p>47</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buxton doesn't need another supermarket / harm to town centre (44). • Address empty shops (3). • Attract retailers that complement Crescent (2) • Support small independents (5) • People now buy food online (1) • Supermarket will harm character (1) • Owners of both sites should work together to deliver an integrated plan to meet retail needs that provides environmental & design benefits (1) • Use Nestle for car parking / transport interchange (2) • Use Spring Gardens for leisure (3) • Small scale food store might be acceptable (1) • Improve rear of Spring Gardens (6) • Need to improve / retain car parking (5) • Extend Sainsburys (1) • Focus on improving leisure (1) • Improve range of non-food shops (1) • Focus on improving retail in neighbourhoods (4) • New supermarket would create congestion (1) • Nestle site conflicts with 2 SPD's, consider reopening of Matlock-Buxton railway (1) • Use Bryant's Arcade (1) • Create indoor market in town hall (1) • Use Nestle site for leisure/housing/mixed use (8) <p>Waitrose - no justification for allocating new foodstore sites on the edge or outside the Town Centre in this version of the Local Plan. Amend the text to clarify that there is limited identified need of 77 sq.m net 'main food' at 2026 using a realistic market share. Should a higher market share strategy be adopted, there is only need for up to 1,664 sq.m gross at 2026, which translates to approximately 1,109 sq.m gross in 2012, in accordance with the evidence base.</p>

		<p>Trevor Osborne - no need for a new supermarket. LP should allow an extension of Waitrose. Focus on occupation of vacant shops. Use Nestle site for leisure, housing etc.</p> <p>Buxton Group - It would be far more sustainable if local convenience outlets, providing a basic range of foods alongside other essentials, should be provided in the growing suburbs of Harpur Hill and Burbage. The Buxton Group therefore opposes a new supermarket on either of the proposed sites. the Nestlé Water Bottling Works site would be available for sustainable and affordable housing which we would regard as much more beneficial to the town, than a supermarket. The Station Road frontage could be used for retail or some other commercial use. Threadneedle site - some development is urgently needed. The capacity of the car park needs to be increased and the unsightly back of the Spring Gardens Centre needs to be screened. We favour the part opposite the station being used for a budget hotel. The lower end, east of Waitrose, could have small footprint shops along the Station Road frontage and multi-storey car parking behind. It is important in any such development that advantage is taken of the incline on Station Road, as more than one car park entrance would save wasting space with internal ramps.</p>
General Comments		<p>Natural England - welcomes the aim of allocating a site for a new food store and enhancing the potential for linked trips within the wider town centre area. Both of the site options presented are brownfield sites within close proximity to the main town centre area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
B14 - Are there any other issues that the Local Plan should consider?		
All Responses	38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free / more parking (4) • Leisure facilities (cinema, bowling, indoor climbing etc) (5) • Health care (1) • Empty homes (2) • Infrastructure (5) • Protect character of area (3) • Affordable housing provision is too low (2) • Additional town centre parking (1) • Homes for families (1) • Flats in Dove Holes (1) • Small developments in Wormhill / Cowdale (1) • Protect tobaggan runs (1) • Impact of recession on housing needs (1) • More consultation (2)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve local character (1) • No housing until new hospital is built (1) • Relocate ambulance station with fire station (1) • Housing in Harpur Hill and Fairfield will help improve facilities there (1) • Housing needs evidence is unsound (1) • Consider impact of benefits changes on housing needs (1) • Census 2011 indicates fewer homes are needed (1) • Brownfield sites difficult to develop leading to urban sprawl in countryside (1) • Locate new homes near to town centre (1) • Must build enough homes for community (1) • Remove Buxton water protection zone - all areas should be protected equally (1) • Retain special landscape area (3), improve public transport / walking / cycling links to National Park (1) • Improve Station Rd (2) • Improve Fairfield Rd (1) • improve Higher Buxton (1) • Allotment provision / local food production (2) • Enhance Buxton's environmental/green credentials (1) • Relocate the market (1) • Bypass of Fairfield Rd (2) • Review of major roads (1) • More focus on renewable energy (2) • Matlock-Buxton railway (1) • Shared space on streets to improve pedestrian safety (1) • Develop old sidings and shed at station (1) • Identify a location for a budget hotel (1) • Housing in British Legion Club / derelict pubs (1) • Ensure that electricity supply is adequate (1) • Development brief for Nestle site (1) • Public transport / walking / cycling links to town centre (1) <p>Trevor Osborne - a development brief should be prepared for the Nestle site to determine scale / form of mixed-use development.</p> <p>S Robinson - The starting point for new housing allocations should begin with where the now abandoned Draft Local Plan left off</p> <p>Peak District National Park - It would be helpful to clarify NP/HP/RSS housing policy in plan e.g. "the East Midlands Regional Plan</p>
--	---

	<p>confirms that homes that are provided....etc" The projection for the High Peak Area of the PDNP, 110 new homes between 2012 to 2028, is consistent with the PDNPA Core Strategy. However it is requested that the emphasis in the following sentence is revised as shown below. "However, it is important to recognise that the Peak District National Park Authority is not required to provide this number of homes." If paragraph 4 of this section could be amended to reflect the following it would provide more clarity. "Ongoing monitoring of the development of new homes and planning consents in High Peak, including the Peak District National Park, will continue to be undertaken to ensure that they are taken into account in considering any need to review this strategy."</p> <p>Natural England - No mention of Green Links or Rights of Way, this is an omission given the potential links to the Monsal and High Peak Trail, both of which converge on Buxton. NE would seek to promote green links within an area such as Buxton as it lies adjacent to a National Park. LA's should consider the value of local Rights of Way to; health and wellbeing, access to nature and the countryside, delivering modal shift, reducing CO2 and from an economic (tourism) development perspective.</p> <p>Transport for Greater Manchester - It would be useful for the Local Plan to identify Park & Ride sites for cars and bicycles. There may be potential on the Buxton line and Glossop line. A joint study of the A6 corridor is due to commence.</p> <p>Fire Service - Where necessary, local authorities should therefore consider the use of conditions and information notes/recommendations on planning permissions to secure the provision of sprinkler systems and associated water supply infrastructure. The local planning authority could adapt and use the following example wording as a condition on a planning permission to ensure a development is appropriately designed to provide adequate safety.</p> <p>Buxton Civic Association - Plan for the future with consultation with all public and private groups.</p> <p>Buxton Group - The pressing need is that the development supports a quota of affordable units, either on site or elsewhere. If contributions to the cost are collected by the</p>
--	--

		<p>council they need to be spent immediately and not just be held to help the borough's cashflow. We suggest that a site, which is easy to develop and sustainable in terms of access to shops and services, should be identified as an "Affordable development location". This could be developed in phases as funding becomes available. Retain land at Hogshaw for railway infrastructure. Identify A6 bypass corridor for Dove Holes and Fairfield, develop Fairfield Link Road, need link road between A6 and A515, need leisure centre, provide health, education and retail services in neighbourhoods, retain special landscape area, improve Higher Buxton Shopping Centre, Fairfield Road and the area round the Railway Station.</p>
--	--	---

Central Responses

Question	No. of Responses	Comments/Suggestions
<p>C3 - Do you feel that the sites currently identified for business or industrial use in the Central Area should remain designated for such purposes in the new Local Plan? These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primary Employment Zones - Land allocated for future business/industrial use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Garrison Works, Thornsett o North of Bingswood Industrial Estate, Whaley Bridge o Furness Vale - Sites identified for other possible uses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Birch Vale Industrial Estate o Thornsett Industrial Estate o Bingswood Industrial Estate o Britannia Mill, Buxworth o New Mills Newtown 		
All Responses	35	
Yes	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remain to provide local jobs (1) • The existing sites at Calico Lane, Knowles and Botany should continue as Primary Employment Zones. The land to the west of Calico House (see page 36) is currently used for car parking. There is no objection to some of this area being used for business or industrial purposes.(1) • Site by station in New Mills could be built on (1)
No	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of Botany Works should be used for residential development (1) • Bingswood and Bridgemont to be used for housing (4) • Britannia Mill for mixed use incl. housing (2) • All business sites to mixed use; Unused or undeveloped industrial sites in Birch Vale, Bingswood Trading Estate, Thornsett and New Mills canal basin should be considered for residential purposes. Scope to use some for other uses. (1)
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites should be considered in terms of access and traffic generation many sites in High Peak are unsuitable for heavy traffic (1) • Bingswood run down, needs a clean up (1); • new bridge needed to Bingswood (1) • Joint redevelopment of all sites to provide modern business units and new housing (6) • goods lorries on High Hill Road hang over pedestrians due to road camber (1) • Forge Road and Wharf Rad, Whaley Bridge both suitable for housing (2)

		National Trust - It is considered that they should still be allocated for business/industrial use.
C4 - Are there any other suitable uses that the areas identified above could be used for?		
All Responses	31	
Birch Vale Industrial Estate	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing (6) • affordable homes (1) • leisure (1) • heritage centre (1) • retail (1) • field activity centre (1) • starter units for small industries (1) <p>Derbyshire County Council (Archaeology) - Archaeological desk-based assessment/buildings appraisal needed pre application; further could be conditioned.</p>
Thornsett Industrial Estate	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing (6) • affordable homes (1) • leisure (1) • heritage centre (1) • retail (1) • field activity centre (1) • starter units for small industries (1) <p>Derbyshire County Council (Archaeology) - Archaeological desk-based assessment/buildings appraisal needed pre application; further could be conditioned.</p> <p>Natural England - The proposed undeveloped site is adjacent to ancient woodland. Development should not harm this woodland. Would like information on how the woodland would be protected possibly through section 106 funding.</p>
Bingswood Industrial Estate	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing (8) • Access to Bingswood is a problem it undermines the canal basin and regeneration potential (3) • affordable homes (1) • leisure (1) • heritage centre (1) • retail (1) • field activity centre (1) • starter units for small industries (1) • No should stay industrial, with access road coming off bypass and housing on fields away from industrial estate (1) • keep Bingswood for jobs (2) <p>Derbyshire County Council (Archaeology) - Opportunities for re-use of historic industrial buildings. Archaeological desk-based</p>

		assessment/buildings appraisal needed pre application; further work could be conditioned.
Britiannia Mill Buxworth	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing (8) • Mixed use (4) • affordable homes (1) • leisure (2) • heritage centre (1) • retail (1) • field activity centre (1) • bungalows (1) <p>Derbyshire County Council (Archaeology) - Opportunities for re-use of historic industrial buildings. Archaeological desk-based assessment/buildings appraisal needed pre application; further work could be conditioned.</p> <p>Natural England - The site is located adjacent to Goytside Meadows LNR.If the site is developed for either employment or housing there may be an increase in air emissions from additional traffic. Natural England want reassurance that there would be no adwers impact on the LNR through an increase in air emssions and increased recreational use.</p>
New Mills Newtown and the canal basin	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational use (1) • Housing (8) • affordable homes (1) • leisure (1) • heritage centre (1) • retail (1) • field activity centre (1) • bungalows (1) • IT based uses (1)
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry using HGVs to be avoided (1) • if safe access cannot be achieved for these sites, housing should be considered (1) • housing on all sites (3) • housing on some (2) • Should stay as they are to provide jobs (1) <p>Derbyshire County Council (Archaeology) - May be opportunities for the re-use of historic industrial buildings. Archaeological desk based assessment/building appraisal needed pre application; further work could be conditioned.</p> <p>Natural England - Bluebell Wood LNR is located approximatley 1km from the site. If the site is developed for either employment or</p>

		housing there may be an increase in air emissions from additional traffic. Natural England want reassurance that there would be no adverse impact on the LNR through an increase in air emissions and increased recreational use.
C5 - Are there any new sites that should be identified in the Local Plan for business or industrial use?		
All Responses	42	
Yes	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forge Works (1); • Land close to Tesco Whaley Bridge (2); • Land around the industrial estate at Bridgemont (2); • Jones Wood working, Watford Bridge Road, New Mills (1); • Milton Meadow, Tunstead Milton 3 acres for camping, caravans, lodges, motel owner supplied site details (1); # • Burgess Brothers land on Marsh Lane Trading Estate owner supplied details by letter (1);
No	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have sufficient sites but they need to be modernised (2); • Sufficient sites if dispersed enterprises consolidated (1)
General Comment		Natural England - Welcome additional sites particularly if they are in locations that provide enhanced connectivity to areas of natural value. Additional sites would reduce recreational pressure on South Pennine SAC.SPA and would provide an opportunity to for biodiversity enhancement and the creation of new habitats.
C6 - Are there any sites that should be set aside for leisure or recreational purposes?		
All Responses	42	
Yes	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Macclesfield Road Road Whaley Bridge (1) • Buxton Road Whaley Bridge (1); • C9, C10 and C11 (25); • Allotments at Buxworth recreation grounds (1); • All valley bottom from Chapel through Goytside Meadows to locks at Marple (1); • Ollersett Fields, New Mills (1); • "Picker" Fields, New Mills (1); • C9 should be designated AONB (1); • Carr field at junction of Chapel Road and Market Street, Whaley Bridge (1); • Newtown canal basin (1); • Milton Meadow, Tunstead Milton 3 acres for camping etc owner supplied site details (1); • All open green areas within the Built Up Area Boundaries whose current use for public recreation is officially recognised and condoned by the both the authorities

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and the landowners (1); Allotments: There is a shortage of allotments. The expansion of the existing site (off Goyt Road/Macclesfield Road) should be supported. The use of Carr Field should be investigated. Furness Field: The field off Yeadsley Lane, Furness Vale should be protected for leisure and recreational purposes (1); Additional allotments in Whaley Bridge at Goyt Road and Carr Field (2); Area around Todd Brook Reservoir (1) Ladyshawe Bottom should be considered for mixed use (1) Wharf Road use for leisure (1); Britannia Mill; Land between Reservoir Road, Whaley Lane and Start Lane; Thornsett Industrial Park (currently used as lorry park) to be used for holiday accommodation; allotments at junction High Hill Road and Bate Mill Road
No		
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countryside is accessible for recreation (1) Need allotments(1);
C7 - Are there any sites or areas that should be considered for designation as a Local Nature Reserve?		
All Responses	43	
Yes	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bings Wood Off Bings Road (1) The Roosdycke (1) Macclesfield Road Whaley Bridge; Around Toddbrook Reservoir (2); C9, C10 and C11 (13); Land behind houses on Hawk Road (1); C4, C5 and C6 (3); C9 (7); Carr Field a wetland reserve (1); Woodlands – Gardens – Parks - (e.g. Peak Park, Eccles Pike) Moorland – (e.g. Castle Naze, Chapel); The land adjacent to the Jodrell Road Children’s Recreation Ground, transferred in 2011 to High Peak Borough Council under a Section 106 agreement by the developer of the Hockerley New Road development, should be protected and designated as a Local Nature Reserve. The Botany Pond (north-east of Taxal Church) should be considered (subject to the site NOT being within the Peak District National Park) for designation as a LNR (1); Land at Toddbrook Reservoir (near Reddish Farm) (3); Goyt Valley and Sett Valley Trail (1) Shallcross Incline including 100m corridor on the western side (1)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffer around High Hill Road to Sett Valley Trail (1) • Taxal Pond (1)
No	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable farming (1); • Just existing sites (1);
General Comment		<p>Natural England - Support the creation of additional LNR particularly given the uneven distribution of LNR at present. Welcome additional sites particularly if they are in locations that provide enhanced connectivity to areas of natural value. Additional sites would reduce recreational pressure on South Pennine SAC.SPA and would provide an opportunity to for biodiversity enhancement abnd the cretion of new habitiats.</p>
C8 - Are there any other sites that you feel should be designated as a Local Green Space?		
All Responses	55	
Yes	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Macclesfield Road Whaley Bridge (4) • Buxton Road Whaley Bridge (1) • Clough and fields between Diglee Road and Yearldsey Lane (10); • C9, C10 and C11 (20); • New Mills Green Wedge (1); • What's left of Hogs Yard, Whaley Bridge (1); • C13 (1); • Carr Field (2); • Land surrounding and following the Midshires Way south and west of Whaley Bridge (1); • Around Ollersett Moor (1); • Wood behind Taxal Lodge buildings to Taxal Church (1); • South of Toddbrook reservoir, between reservoir and football pitches (1); • Whaley Bridge Memorial Park (1); • Area between Valley Road and Kinder Road, Hayfield (1); • All open green areas within the Built Up Area Boundaries whose current use for public recreation is officially recognised and condoned by the both the authorities and the landowners, i.e.: Gardens – Parks - (e.g. War Memorial Park, Chapel), Football/Rugby/Tennis grounds – (e.g. Chapel Golf Course, Chapel football ground, Recreation grounds – (e.g. all such areas within BUABs), Woodlands – (e.g. all such areas within BUABs), Open Land, informal Public Open Space, to the south of Warmbrook, Chapel; C10 (1); • All the existing significant open green land within New Mills (1); • All greenfield sites(1) • The Torrs, Goyside Derby Fields area (1) • Slopes between Orchard Road and reservoir Road (1);

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Roosdyke
no	1	
C9 - Do you think that the areas at New Mills should become green wedges in the Local Plan?		
All Responses	37	
Land between St Georges Road and Church Lane	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is an important green space.(1); Owner objects and has put forward site for housing (1); Individual owns part of wedge fronting Low Leighton Road and queries implications for him.
Land at Ladyshaw Bottom	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site should be used for housing (1)
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horwich End and Carr Field should be wedges (1) <p>Natural England - Yes. Would increase open space provision in the area and would enhance the potential for biodiversity and new habitat creation.</p>
C10 - Should the identified site in Furness Vale be re-designated from Green Belt to allow residential development?		
All Responses	77	
Yes	45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Houses needed to support local community (3) Low level housing near the railway (4); If residents of Furness Vale support it (3); Needs careful access design onto A6 (2); Also redesignate green belt north of Whaley Bridge (1); Site is brownfield and is surrounded by development on three sides and railway line on the other side (1) Redesignation would not harm the wider green belt around Furness Vale (1); Affordable housing (1); In collaboration with a wider strategic review of the use of Green Belt around Whaley Bridge (6); Subject to amenities and infrastructure being capable to support (1)
No	33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion on A6 (4); Green belt protected at all costs (4); Preserve break in built environment (1); Too distant from shops (1)
General Comments		<p>Natural England - Goytside Meadows LNR is located approximately 500m from the site. If the site is developed for either employment or housing there may be an increase in air emissions from additional traffic. Natural England want reassurance that there would be no adverse impact on the LNR through an increase in air emissions and increased</p>

		recreational use.
C11 - Should any changes be made to the town centre boundaries for Whaley Bridge and New Mills?		
All Responses	36	
Yes	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Areas should be maintained (1); • Whaley Bridge Transshipment Warehouse should be excluded from the designated Town Centre to avoid its possible inappropriate use for retail (2); • Include area around Howich End junction (1); • Boundaries abolished (1); • Extended to Horwich End (3); • Albion Road, New Mills (1); • Include Sainsburys and pull boundary to Torr Top St New Mills (1)
No	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brown field only (1);
C12 - Should the primary frontages for New Mills and Whaley Bridge be defined?		
All Responses	30	
Yes	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail/local shops should take precedence to fast food outlets to keep centres alive (1); • As per current local plan (1); • Major applications should be publicised (1); • Between Railway station and junction with Old Road, Whaley Bridge (1); • Whole town centre (1); • Strong support from WB amenity soc; New Mills Market Street; Whaley Bridge: Market Street/Buxton Road, from Reservoir Road junction to railway bridge (1);
No	3	
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail outlets needed, not charity shops, estate agents or takeaways (2); • Chapel should be defined as a town centre and its boundary include the Morrisons store (1);
C13 - Which parts of New Mills and Whaley Bridge town centres should be defined as secondary shopping frontages?		
All Responses	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Mills - Albion Road and Church Road (2); • Bingswood, if new bridge makes new shops possible (1); • Horwich end, Whaley Bridge (3); • None (2); • New Mills Market Street and Union Street (2)

C14 - Should the Local Plan identify local or district centres?		
All Responses	31	
Yes	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local centres are important for those who cannot travel (1); New Mills and Whaley Bridge (1); then an area could have a "name" to associate with a shopping area (1); Horwich End and Furness Vale (4); Horwich End (8); Low Leighton (1); Hayfield (1)
No	5	
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear hierarchy of retail centres needed (1)
C15 - Do you think that Torr Vale Mill should remain a Regeneration Area?		
All Responses	43	
Yes	37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Its one of the most remarkable urban recreational areas in the whole of Europe (1); heritage centre, small business and housing (1); education and office use (1); residential use (4) <p>Natural England - Site is located adjacent to an ancient woodland.</p>
No	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential only
C16 - Do you think that Hogs Yard should remain a Regeneration Area?		
All Responses	58	
Yes	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs a new access from the bypass (2); re-designated for housing (2); Some land for car-parking (1); redevelopment such that Goyt Bridge delivered and Horse Tunnel preserved (2) Need better access (1)
No	33	
Should the proposed mix of uses remain the same?		
Yes	2	
No	0	
C 17 Are there any other issues that the Local Plan should consider?		
All Responses	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brownfield areas should be used for housing (4) New buildings should be environmentally friendly and conform to BREEAM (1) No development in the east side of Whaley Bridge is largely unchanged (1) Free town centre parking (1) Improve sustainable transport (1) No fast food outlets near schools (1) Need to consider school capacity (3) Need homes for the elderly (3)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use empty homes (2) • Need to consider traffic impact of industry (1) • Traffic on Macclesfield Road Whaley Bridge is a major issue (1) • No more development up Yeadsley Lane (1); new medical facilities (2); • Consider impact of more cars (1); • Lack of local jobs (2); • Jodrell Arms, Whaley Bridge to be developed for sheltered housing, affordable units, library or TIC (1); • Forge Works should be used to relocate Chinley Primary school (1); • Recreation centre for young people in Whaley Bridge (1); • Allocations to be made conditional on population milestones reached and after unsold properties examined (1); • Provide lots of progress updates (1); • Traffic calming on Macclesfield Lower Road and Furness Vale school (1); • Green belt review (1); • Protect openness (1); • Consider impact of growth on character of area (1); • Consider infrastructure (1); • Clear hierarchy of retail centres needed (1); • Skate parks and BMX tracks should not be located with childrens playgrounds but in less central positions (1) • Chapel-en-le-Frith must be included within the overall strategic consultation for the borough; The new Local Plan should reinstate the Chapel area into the consultation process (1); • HBPC should adopt the AMES study, recognise that the countryside around Chapel en le Frith Parish is particularly sensitive to development, increase the emphasis on protecting and enhancing the countryside there and find a way of protecting particularly highly valued landscape areas; housing target option 4: 410pa to be considered; The greenfield sites proposed in this plan should be considered for reclassification as green belt if they border existing greenbelt sites; Green Belt designation around Whaley Bridge, which currently precludes development near the A6, should be reviewed to protect the setting of the southern edge of the town (3); • Use of design codes; vision for renewal of New Mills Newtown and canal basin
--	--	---

Glossopdale Responses

Question	No. of Responses	Comments/Suggestions
G3 - Do you feel that the sites currently identified for business or industrial use in the Glossopdale Area should remain designated for such purposes in the new Local Plan? These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primary Employment Zones - Land allocated for future business/industrial use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Waterside, Hadfield o Bridge Mills, Tintwistle o Land off Wrens Nest Road o Land off Glossop Road, Gamesley - Sites identified for other possible uses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Hawkeshead Mill, Old Glossop o Charlestown Works, Glossop 		
All Responses	75	
Yes	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rossington Park (1) • Charlestown Works (1)
No	45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wren Nest Road for housing (2) • Hawkshead Mill housing (2) • Charlestown Works housing (4) • housing(2) • Woods Mill (1)
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will need transport impact assessment (3) <p>English Heritage - Historic interest should be assess and building retained if necessary</p>
G4 - Are there any other suitable uses that the areas identified above could be used for?		
All Responses	160	
Hawkshead Mill	81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • housing or industrial units (33) • housing (17) • Arts and recreation (1) • education centre (1) • visitor centre (7) • Nature reserve (4) • leisure (1) • allotments (1) • limited road access (1) • small businesses (5) • retain for employment (1)
Charlestown Works	79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • housing or industrial units (35) • housing (18) • Arts and recreation (1) • education centre (1) • employment (4) • leisure (1) • nature reserve (1) • allotments (1) • park (1) • teenages (1) • retain for employment (4)

G5 - Are there any new sites that should be identified in the Local Plan for business or industrial use?		
All Responses	30	
Yes	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kieners Mill Charlesworth (1) • Volcrepe (7)
No	20	
G6 - Are there any sites that should be set aside for leisure or recreational purposes?		
All Responses	75	
Yes	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1 for village hall (1) • G5 (1) • G6 (1) • G17 (1) • G18 (1) • G20 (1) • G21 (1) • G 22 (1) • St Charles hall (1) • greenfield sites (7) • Roughfields (40) • next to Surrey St Football ground (1) • Wren nest mill (1) • G3 for allotments (2) • All open green areas within the Built Up Area Boundaries whose current use for public recreation (1) • Dinting Road sites (5)
No	1	
General Comment		<p>Environment Agency - When considering whether to designate sites as Local Nature Reserves or Local Green Spaces, priority should be given to those sites that create connecting biodiversity corridors, i.e. optimisation of interconnectivity between watercourses (rivers, ditches, drains, streams, wetlands). The same should be considered for terrestrial sites as these also offer good quality habitat creation.</p>
G7 - Are there any sites or areas that should be considered for designation as a Local Nature Reserve?		
All Responses	45	
Yes	44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • option G5 (20) • option G6 (18) • G19(1) • G20 (4) • G21(1) • G22 (4) • G23 (3) • Shire Hill (3) • Castle Hill (3) • The Orchard in Chisworth (1) • G4 (3) • Roughfields (4) • any of the greenfield sites (6) • Hawkshead Mill (1)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charlestown works (1) • Woods Mill (1) • Cottage lane (4) • Gamesley Wood (3) • Reservoir in G6 (1)
No	1	
General Comment		Environment Agency - When considering whether to designate sites as Local Nature Reserves or Local Green Spaces, priority should be given to those sites that create connecting biodiversity corridors, i.e. optimisation of interconnectivity between watercourses (rivers, ditches, drains, streams, wetlands). The same should be considered for terrestrial sites as these also offer good quality habitat creation.
G8 - Do you support the proposed designation of the land off George Street as a Local Green Space in the new Local Plan?		
All Responses	229	
Yes	221	<p>Derbyshire County Council (Planning & Infrastructure) - The principle of green space in urban areas is strongly supported</p> <p>English Heritage - Old Mill site and designation may protect remaining industrial archaeology. Important open area in Conservation area.</p>
No	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use for elderly persons housing (2) • doesn't meet requirements for open space designation (1)
General Comment		Environment Agency - When considering whether to designate sites as Local Nature Reserves or Local Green Spaces, priority should be given to those sites that create connecting biodiversity corridors, i.e. optimisation of interconnectivity between watercourses (rivers, ditches, drains, streams, wetlands). The same should be considered for terrestrial sites as these also offer good quality habitat creation.
G9 - Are there any other sites that you feel should be designated as a Local Green Space?		
All Responses	95	
Yes	93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padfield triangle bounded by Temple St, Post Street and Platt Street (81) • option G5 (2) • option G6 (2) • Hawkshead Mill (1) • all greenfield options options (8) • Roughfields (2) • Bluebell wood (2) • Bus turning circle at Marple Road Chisworth (1) • any greenfield site (7) • land between Fauvel road/ Norfolk Street (DCC playing fields) (1) • All open green areas within the Built Up

		Area Boundaries whose current use for public recreation Dinting Road corridor (4)
No	2	
General Comment		Environment Agency - When considering whether to designate sites as Local Nature Reserves or Local Green Spaces, priority should be given to those sites that create connecting biodiversity corridors, i.e. optimisation of interconnectivity between watercourses (rivers, ditches, drains, streams, wetlands). The same should be considered for terrestrial sites as these also offer good quality habitat creation.
G10 - Do you think that the proposed Strategic Gap should be identified in the Local Plan?		
All Responses	163	
Yes	162	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional strategic gap between Padfield, Hadfield and Glossop to include all Green Belt land (44) • Include Cemetery Road, North Road and Woodhead Road (1) • will retain a well used green area (2) • include strategic gap between Glossop and Old Glossop (1) • include G25 and G26 <p>Derbyshire County Council (Planning & Infrastructure) - support designation</p>
No	1	
G11 - Should Changes be made to the town centre boundaries?		
All Responses	97	
Yes	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include Police station, Smithy Close and Quarry Close (1) • Wren Nest Road (1) • Woods Mill (1)
No	94	Tameside - support retention or contraction to help strengthen and sustain future of the town centre.
G12 - Should any changes be made to the primary shopping frontages identified for Glossop town centre?		
All Responses	45	
Yes	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include Tesco (1) • both sides of High St West to Shrewsbury St

No	43	
G13 - Which parts of Glossop town centres should be defined as secondary shopping frontages?		
All Responses	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woods Mill (1) • High Street East (2) • Howard Town Mill complex (1) • George St (2) • Victoria St (1) • anything not primary (1) • Wren Nest Mill (1) • High St from Shrewsbury St to Tesco (1)
G14 - Do you feel that a primary and secondary retail frontage should be identified in Hadfield? If so, where?		
All Responses	16	
Yes	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station Road (7) • Green lane (1)
No	9	
G15 - Should the Local Plan identify local or district centres to promote or protect retail that serves local communities?		
All Responses	21	
Yes	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High St and George St (1) • Hadfield (4) • Gamesley (6)
No	10	
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy introduced to encourage small scale convenience(2)
G16 - What type of development do you think that the new local plan should support on the Ferro Alloys site?		
All Responses	52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing or flats (27) • Green space with fitness trail (1) • indoor olympic size swimming pool (1) • fitness centre for young people (1) • relocate leisure centre (3) • car park (1) • leisure and recreation (2) • too contaminated for residential (1) • employment/distribution (1) • would require infrastructure improvements (1) • astro turf (1) • small businesses (10) • retail (5) • employment uses only (1) <p>English Heritage - support retention or contraction to help strengthen and sustain future of the town centre.</p>
G17 - Should the pedestrianisation of George Street be given further consideration in the Local Plan?		
All Responses	128	
Yes	88	

No	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic congestion on Chapel St (1) • loss of parking on George St (1) • deliveries (1) • alt to cobble George St and create table junction at Chapel St (1)
General Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • home zone (1) <p>English Heritage - In a Conservation Areas and any street works and furniture should be sensitive to this.</p>
G18 - Are there any other issues that the Local Plan should consider?		
All Responses	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Padfield has had more than its fair share of housing. Rhodes Top increased village by 20%.(24) • Any building should not adversely affect the visual appearance, character, quality of landscape (2) • highly visible land from long range • views should not be considered (1) • can emergency services cope (2) • adequate leisure facilities(2) • additional gritting/waste collection (2) • enough schools (2) • inadequate road network (4) • provision for young people (1) • green space for horse riding (1) • redo Norfolk square to diagonal paths (1) • define Community facilities (theatres Trust) (1) • include section on community infrastructure (1) • Enterprise park in Hadfield (1) • need to consider type of housing and where people want to live (1) • protect history of Glossop inc stone and slate buildings (1) • emergency response times (6) • reinstate Chapel en le Frith into the consultation process (1) • healthcare provision (1) • Gamesley Halt (1) • markets (1) • allotments (2) <p>Derbyshire County Council (Planning & Infrastructure) - All designations should provide a high degree of protection to the distinctive character of the High Peak and location, scale and design should enhance landscape character.</p> <p>Tameside - more consideration of transport and infrastructure issues particularly in relation to proposed levels of growth. Congestion is key issue. Release of employment sites could add to congestion and infrastructure pressures.</p>

		Friends of the Peak District - New businesses should be located within the urban areas, and be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport. Appropriate use of employment land should seek to reduce out commuting (especially in Glossopdale).
--	--	---

6. Review of Strategic Policies

- 6.1 The Draft Joint Core Strategy included several strategic policies to guide development across the Borough for the Local Plan period. Since the preparation of the Draft Joint Core Strategy there have been a number of changes to guidance and legislation which need to be taken into account in the preparation of the next stage of the Local Plan.
- 6.2 In order to assist the consultation on the review of these policies, a table was produced which attempted to bring together all of the influences and to highlight areas where changes could be made to both the Draft Joint Core Strategy policies and to the supporting text. The table did not set out detailed wording changes to policies or supporting text as these are more appropriate to consider as part of any subsequent agreed preferred option for the Local Plan after consultation on the scope of the policies to be reviewed has been concluded.

<p>Question 1- Do you agree with the potential direction of change to the policies? Please state Policy Number when making comments specific to any policy:</p>
<p>Chapel Vision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We consider some elements and numbers within the Strategic Options Policy paper to be out-of-date. Accordingly, we suggest that the paper should be withdrawn, updated, and then re-submitted for consultation.
<p>United Utilities:</p> <p><u>CS1 Sustainable Development Principles & CS20 infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A key consideration for development is the capacity of the existing supporting infrastructure, the future infrastructure needs and the timescales for its delivery. Current policies such as CS20 infrastructure must make provisions for the sustainable use of existing and/or the delivery new water supply and wastewater infrastructure; not only meeting the growth needs of a single development but also supports your Local Plan; your neighbouring community's growth aspirations; maintains the health and wellbeing of your community and also protects the environment; if not, then new policies must be drafted to address this issue. <p><u>CS7 Green Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council should seek opportunities to use developer financial and/or resources contributions to meet common objectives. Use green and open spaces, sports and recreation facilities to address surface water and climate change issues. Building green infrastructure assets such as ponds, swales and wetlands will not only meet the Council's Green Space needs but also their local existing and/or future surface water/ climate change issues. Artificial pitches; cycle paths; play areas multi-use games areas and skate parks can be used to local underground civil engineering SuDS solutions. SuDS solutions that incorporate irrigation systems will help support and maintain the Council's allotments, parks and garden areas. The Council's should identify opportunities for the installation retro fitting SuDS. <p><i>[Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable, properly drained; prevents flooding</i></p>

and environmental damage]

The Woodland Trust

CS4 Biodiversity

- We support the strong emphasis on protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees in the current policy CS4 and we would like to see this retained in the new local plan. In fact, as these habitats are irreplaceable, we would like to see them given absolute protection from development. We support broadly the direction of change proposed, although we would be concerned about over emphasis on statutory designations, as we estimate that around 85% of ancient woodland in the UK has no statutory protection through a designation.

John Herington Associates:

- As a general comment, surely the ethos of the NPPF is as much about the economic and social dimensions of sustainable development as about environmental enhancement (although that is of course important)?
- The direction of change is not altogether clear from the Policy Review i.e. how is the settlement hierarchy to be reassessed? Will this be subject to further consultation?

Ms Siobhan Spencer, DGLG:

- It is difficult to understand how this process is being taken forward, given that the document under review was a strategy prepared jointly with Derbyshire Dales, whereas this review deals only with High Peak. That in itself must influence the review and should be acknowledged in the policy review.

Daniel Sellers:

- Yes.

Sport England:

- The policy CS18 regarding open space and recreation needs to take into account the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Par 73, which requires policies to be based on robust and up to date assessments of needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities. These assessments should identify deficits or surpluses and be used to determine what is required in the Borough, inform what community/social facilities are required to deliver sustainable communities in terms of sport and then inform the policy, the infrastructure delivery plan and CIL charging schedules appropriately.
- The background evidence base to the Local Plan makes no reference to any such assessment or Playing Pitch Strategy and therefore any development of local plan policy going forward needs to be underpinned by such an evidence base and then the appropriate detail and delivery mechanisms can be provided/supported through the Local Plan.

National Trust

CS1 Sustainable Development Principles

- In the 'National Policy changes' column it would be more correct to say: "**Sustainable** development can only be refused...". Particular attention is drawn to paras 8 and 9 of the NPPF and specifically the statement that "*...to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system*"

CS2 Settlement Hierarchy

- It is agreed that there is a potential policy 'deficit' in relation to the approach taken to brownfield land. Whilst sites need to be assessed on an individual basis, e.g. on occasion brownfield sites can have important environmental benefits such as providing habitat for important species, the Trust would support an overall approach that sought to take a sequential approach to the location of new development and favoured brownfield sites first, especially those within the main settlements first and then those in other settlements – such locations generally being more sustainable having regard to considerations such as access to services, transport etc.

CS3 Landscape Character

- National Trust would particularly support an approach that considered the historic dimension of landscape character assessment.

CS4 Biodiversity

- Agreed that this will need to address the NPPF issue identified.

CS6 Built and Historic Environment

- It is agreed that the Plan will need to ensure consistency with the advice in the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 156 and 157 relating to plan making and 169 and 170 on the historic environment. The policy should also have regard to the advice in Section 12 of the NPPF relating to historic environment considerations more widely and, in the Trust's view, especially recognise the importance of 'settings' and their important contribution to the understanding and appreciation of the historic environment.

CS7 Green Infrastructure

- National Trust would support the Local Plan including the approach to be taken to the creation of green infrastructure assets – this is often a matter of principle that it would be relevant to address at this strategic level, for example where contributions to new green infrastructure are required in relation to new residential (or indeed other) development.

CS11 Promoting Peak District Tourism and Culture

- It is noted that there are no comments in the final column of the table about the scope for changes to address the issues arising from previous consultations. The consideration of tourism development is important because whilst at present the Best Practice Guide to Tourism remains active guidance it is likely that it will be culled before too long. The difference between support facilities (hotels, B&Bs etc) and more particularly 'location free' tourism attractions that can be situated in sustainable locations with good public transport access, and those which are 'site specific' and can only be where they exist (which generally applies to heritage and nature conservation assets) is an important distinction that should be reflected in policy.

CS17 Climate Change

- Intended approach agreed.

English Heritage

CS1: Sustainable Development Principles

- We would agree with the need to review the wording of this policy to ensure compliance with the NPPF. Paragraphs 7-9 of the NPPF are relevant here and set out the three dimensions of sustainable development, and states that these should be sought jointly and simultaneously. Specifically under the environment strand, paragraph 7 cites the need for planning in protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment and paragraph 9 cites the need to seek positive improvements if the quality of the built,

natural and historic environment.

- In light of this, we would suggest that the review should consider the inclusion of an additional bullet point making reference to the historic environment.

CS3: Landscape Character

- We agree with the need to consider historic landscape character as part of this policy as part of an integrated approach to landscape assessment. Paragraph 170 of the NPPF cites the use of landscape character assessments integrated with historic landscape characterisation as part of the evidence base and we consider it to be crucial to reflect this in the relevant policy.

CS5: Design Quality

- We consider that the policy should be more positively worded in order to ensure compliance with the NPPF. Chapter 7 of the NPPF deals with 'Requiring Good Design' and paragraph 57 cites the need to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all developments. More specifically, paragraph 58 states the need for robust and comprehensive policies which will establish a strong sense of place and respond to local character and history and reflect local identity. Paragraph 61 cites that policies should address connections between people and places and the integration of development into the natural, built and historic environment.
- This section of the NPPF also makes reference to advertisements – it may therefore also be beneficial to include something on this topic as part of this policy.

CS6: Built and Historic Environment

- We have previously made detailed comments with regard to the specific policy wording of Policy CS6 and raised concern at that time with regard to compliance with the then PPS5.
- We consider that in terms of the scope for the potential direction for change of the policies, requirements of the NPPF are not fully met by the existing wording. Chapter 12 of the NPPF deals with conserving and enhancing the historic environment with paragraph 126 citing the need for a positive strategy relation to the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment (including those heritage assets most at-risk through neglect, decay or other threats). Please note this requirement is broader than a strategy for the conservation of heritage assets as identified within the table under the 'National Policy Changes' column as it relates to the historic environment as a whole.
- There is also a requirement of local plans to include strategic policies to conserve and enhance the historic environment of the area in paragraph 156. Any such policy should be derived from the overall strategy and could be a succinct synopsis of the strategy and include broad expectations for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.
- In response to the NPPF, English Heritage has produced guidance entitled 'Heritage is Local Plans: How to Create a Sound Plan under the NPPF' this can be downloaded from our website, along with PPS5 comparison guides at: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/advice/government-planningpolicy/national-planning-policy-framework/> This information may be useful for you as part of formulating a strategy and policies for the historic environment within High Peak.
- We would also question at this stage the saved policies of the previous local plan that this policy is intended to replace and consider that these should be carefully reviewed on formulation of a new policy. At present we are concerned that the policy in the previous draft joint Core Strategy would not adequately replace specified adopted local plan policies.
- We would be happy to work with you to develop a strategy and in formulating a strategic policy on that basis.

Policy CS9: Regenerating an Industrial Legacy

- The title of this policy alludes to the industrial character of the District. Given the important industrial legacy within High Peak, which includes a number of mills etc, many of these areas in need of regeneration are likely to include designated and non designated heritage assets (including the Grade II* listed Torr Vale Mill which is currently 'at-risk'). In light of the requirement of the NPPF for local plans to contain a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including those heritage assets most at-risk through neglect, decay or other threats, this policy is likely to need reviewing following the formulation of this strategy and we disagree with the assertion that no further policy changes are considered necessary.

CS11: Promoting Peak District Tourism and Culture

- No details are given in the table with regard to scope for potential direction of change and as such we are unable to provide detailed comments at this time. We have previously made comment in support of this policy although we highlighted the need for the policy to apply across the whole of the plan area, rather than just the Peak District.

Natural England

Policy CS1: Sustainable Development

- Natural England support the changes, provided that the existing emphasis set out in the policy in relation to protecting and enhancing the natural environment (including the Peak District, areas of nature conservation and/or landscape value and designated European sites) is retained.

Policy CS3: Landscape Character

- Natural England welcome the proposal to consider the new evidence base set out in the Derbyshire County Council Areas of Multiple Sensitivity document and how this impacts on the direction of the policy. The purpose of the Areas of Multiple Sensitivity document is to identify those areas that are sensitive due to their historic, ecological and landscape value. This should enable clear text to be included within the policy in relation to protecting parts of the High Peak Borough that are identified as being in areas of multiple environmental sensitivity.

Policy CS4: Biodiversity

- Natural England acknowledges the proposed changes set out for this policy to ensure it conforms with the NPPF. However, the high level of protection afforded to biodiversity features that are set out in the existing policy wording ought to be retained.

CS7: Green Infrastructure

- Natural England welcomes the proposed changes to this policy in terms of introducing the need to create new areas of green infrastructure. This will have a positive effect in terms of creating opportunities to protect and enhance the natural environment throughout the High Peak Borough. The creation of new green infrastructure provision would also increase opportunities for people to partake in recreational activities, which in turn would increase health and well being within the Borough.

CS10: Countryside Environment

- Natural England acknowledges the proposed changes set out for this policy to ensure it conforms with the NPPF. However, the NPPF also sets out the important role that Green Belts can play in terms of providing opportunities for outdoor recreation and retaining and enhancing landscapes, visual amenity and areas of biodiversity value. This ought to be acknowledged when considering the potential direction of change to this policy.

Friends of the Peak District

CS 1 Sustainable development principles

- Changes to national policy are summarised as '*development can only be refused where harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh benefits*'. This summary does not represent the NPPF's view on sustainable development. The NPPF policies in paragraphs 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.

CS 2 Settlement hierarchy

- Although gravely concerned by the levels of development promoted in the Local Plan Options and its impact upon local infrastructure and the environment (see Appendix A), FPD has no objection to the hierarchy of settlements and the prioritisation of development within the Market Towns. We support the restrictions on development outside the built up area of the larger settlements and limitation of development in the countryside to that which is essential in the countryside and delivers affordable housing. However, FPD request that within the villages, development is also restricted to sites within the built up area. We do not agree with a reassessment of settlement hierarchy.
- Although the requirement for a brownfield target has been removed by national policy, HPBC should retain one. '*Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land*' (NPPF para 111). In view of what we say later about housing and employment land we believe that a target should be set for 70% of all new development to be on brownfield land.
- We agree that it is essential that within this policy reference is made to maintaining the distinctive character, vitality, tranquillity and role of market towns.

CS 4 Biodiversity

- The proposed amendments fail to adopt the landscape scale approach to developing resilient and coherent ecological networks that was laid down in the Natural Environment White Paper¹ and in the NPPF para 117, and is now being progressed by Local Nature Partnerships and through Nature Improvement Areas. In order to reflect these policy documents we would expect the HP Local Plan to:
 - plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale, including across the local authority boundaries; this requires setting out a strategic approach in the Local Plan, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure;
 - identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation;
 - promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan;
 - aim to prevent harm to geological conservation interests; and
 - identify the Dark Peak Nature Improvement Area in the Local Plan, specifying what types of development, if any, may be appropriate in this area.

CS 7 Green Infrastructure

¹ The Natural Choice: Securing the value of Nature 2011

- This policy needs to set out a strategic approach in the Local Plan, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure (NPPF para 114).

CS 8 maintaining and creating an economic base

- FPD welcomed the Joint Core Strategy's recognition in paragraph 6.8 that *'the retention of what makes the Peak District unique [local environment and quality of life] is essential for both its environment and economic wellbeing.'* This must be at the forefront when determining employment land targets and allocating sites.
- In order to determine the appropriate level of employment land, FPD believe that High Peak Borough Council must undertake a thorough assessment of the area's environmental capacity and address the conflict between accommodating growth in the local economy (Joint Core Strategy Strategic Objectives 6 and 7) and the desire to protect and enhance the environment (Joint Core Strategy Strategic Objectives 2, 4 and 5). Doing this will require a thorough assessment of the environment's capacity and its ability to accommodate 35 hectares of employment land.

CS 10 Countryside Development

- We believe this policy does not require any change in the context of the NPPF.

CS 13 strategic housing development

- The abolition of the East Midland's Regional Plan creates an ideal opportunity to reassess and determine locally generated housing need and the environment's capacity to absorb this need. FPD believes that High Peak is already living beyond its environmental capacity and that the amount, scale and location of development proposed in the Options papers appears to further compromise the capacity of the area and reduce its environmental capital. Consequently the Local Plan should only deliver levels of affordable housing which are needed by the local community (see Appendix A). We respond more fully to these issues below.

CS 14 affordable housing

- FPD believe that, due to the limited environmental capacity to absorb further housing, especially at the levels proposed, new housing in the High Peak must be restricted to local needs housing. However, if significant numbers of open market housing is retained in the Local Plan, it must deliver as much affordable housing as possible. Policy CS14 should stipulate separate percentages for each sub area. Sixty per cent affordables should be required in schemes above 5 dwellings. Developers who cannot achieve set targets for each sub-area must justify to the LPA why this cannot be met.

CS 15 exception sites

- The 2010 public consultation on the draft Joint Core Strategy suggested amendments to ensure that exception sites within built up areas should be considered first. We would support this.

CS 19 Accessibility

- CS 19 is about supporting travel choices and should explicitly refer to influencing/changing travel behaviour, which should be the focus of the policy and would accord with the Government's approach in 'Creating Growth Cutting Carbon' (DfT 2011). Accessibility issues should be taken seriously by HPBC and DCC. The average minimum travel time in minutes to nearest key services between 2007 to 2011 by walking or public transport has increased, a trend which must be reversed. Overall accessibility to key services in High Peak has not improved over the last five years and is marginally worse in High Peak than the average for Derbyshire as a whole (SA Scoping Update para 8.4). The rate of road injuries & deaths are significantly worse than

the average for England (SA Scoping Update Tables 17 and 35).

CS 20 Infrastructure

- Policy CS 20 aims to secure new transport infrastructure to encourage modal shift and where relevant address traffic congestion but it does not contain the two key principles – making the best use of existing infrastructure and behavioural change – that should underpin it. This would accord with the NPPF which requires that:
 - The transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel (para 29);
 - Local planning authorities should support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport (para 30);
 - Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development (para 31);
 - Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (para 34);
 - Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people (35).
- We do not support major road building to solve the traffic congestion in Glossopdale and Longdendale. The majority of traffic creating the congestion, including the HGV traffic, is locally induced (see Annual Average Daily Traffic flows below). The two trans-Pennine feeder roads (A628T Woodhead Pass and A57 Snake Pass) together introduce only 41% of total traffic into the area, leaving 59% generated locally. Of the traffic on Mottram Moor 37% is to/from Stalybridge. Local trips to schools and shops contribute 27% of traffic in the area.
- As the majority of both car and lorry traffic is locally generated, particularly by Glossop, new road capacity in the form of a bypass would not address the solution. By contrast smarter travel choice measures – with Glossop at the heart of these as a Sustainable Travel Town – and investment in public transport, walking and cycling would bring immediate benefits to the area if coupled with measures to address road freight. Such an approach is in line with the Government’s approach in ‘Creating Growth Cutting Carbon’ (DfT 2011).

Environment Agency

- In principle we are of the opinion that the changes are relevant and required in light of relevant policy changes.

Question 2 - Do you have any suggestions for other amendments to any existing policies? Please include relevant Policy Number with your suggestions.

Chapel Vision:

- We have noted that a number of villages are listed as having local facilities and services, albeit of a limited nature. It is suggested that this list is looked at further. Tunstead Milton for one has no facilities or services.

United Utilities:

- United Utilities PLC would like to see the following comments to be taken into consideration and incorporated into your future policies:

Surface Water

- Site drainage should be a major consideration for LPA and developers when selecting

possible development sites; ground conditions; local flooding issues; development layout; design and planning policy.

- The treatment and processing of surface water [storm water; rainwater] is not a sustainable solution; the sites' current natural discharge solution should be continued and/or mimicked; if the existing surface water does not have an existing natural solution, United Utilities PLC questions the development of a flooded site.
- Surfacewater should be managed at source and not transferred; if not this will only transfer the issue to another location; generally to a single pinch point, generating further problems in that location.
- Developments must drain on a separate sewerage system, with only foul drainage connected into the foul sewerage network.
- Every option should be investigated before discharging surface water into a public sewerage network.
- Connecting surface water to the public sewerage network is not a sustainable solution and LPA should discourage this practice.
- The priority options for the management of surface water discharges are:
 - Continue and/or mimic the site's current natural discharge process
 - Store for later use
 - Discharge into infiltration systems located in porous sub soils
 - Attenuate flows into green engineering solutions such as ponds; swales or other open water features for gradual release to a watercourse and/or porous sub soils
 - Attenuate by storing in tanks or sealed systems for gradual release to a watercourse
 - Direct discharge to a watercourse
 - Direct discharge to a surface water sewer
 - Controlled discharge into the combined sewerage network ~ this option is a last resort when all other options have been discounted.
- Development on greenfield sites shall not discharge surface water into the public combined sewerage network and shall not increase the rate of run-off into the public surface water network ~ this statement does not replace the priority options for surface water management above.
- On previously developed land, a reduction of at least 30% will be sought, rising to a minimum of 50% in critical drainage areas ~ this statement does not replace the priority options for surface water management above
- Any discharge to the public sewerage system must be via approved SuDS and will require an approved discharge rate.
- Consideration should be given for green infrastructure, low carbon, soft engineering SuDS solutions, such as ponds; swales; wet land areas and detention basins etc.
- <http://www.ciria.com/suds/index.html>
- A discharge to groundwater or watercourse may require the consent of the Environment Agency.

[Reason: To ensure that the surface water is properly discharged to prevent flooding or the overloading of the public sewerage network]

John Herington Associates:

- Policies CS2 and CS13. The need to define a sustainable approach to the development of brownfield sites is agreed. If settlement boundaries are to be shown when site allocations are considered, I think they should be drawn flexibly to include appropriate brownfield land. Development needs should be met on brownfield land where possible both within and adjacent to existing communities.
- Policy CS2. Any reassessment of settlement hierarchy should be avoided if it implies watering down the 'semi-dispersed' Core settlement strategy, which has obvious advantages in terms of a sustainable development strategy (as HPBC have previously argued), namely:
 - a) locating moderate levels of new development in settlements with good access to employment, schools and community facilities, therefore providing the opportunity to minimise car journeys;

b) enabling a significant proportion of development on previously developed land and;
c) in larger rural communities having an appropriate provision for local housing needs relative to the Market Towns.

- Policy CS10. I support any amendments to Rural Exceptions policy if this were to be extended to some market housing to facilitate provision of affordable housing, in line with the NPPF, para 54.

Ms Siobhan Spencer, DGLG:

- CS16 - Although traveller pitch allocation is not needed in High Peak District according to the GTAA, Policy CS16 should be retained as future review of the GTAA may establish a need and, in the meantime criteria for assessing planning applications will still be required. Although "forthcoming" change to national policy guidance is referred to as a reason for review, that guidance has already been published and the policy is still in broad accord with national policy. The commitment to joint working with Derbyshire Dales DC and the Peak District NPA should be retained
- CS16 - The motivation for a change to this policy is said to be "forthcoming guidance." That guidance (presumably the recent national planning policy guidance on provision for Travellers) is already published and does not justify any change in policy CS16, which remains in broad accord with national guidance. What has changed is the Traveller pitch requirements as set out in the GTAA; firstly because the need to allocate sites for provision up to 2012 only applied to Derbyshire Dales District and, secondly because the GTAA is now out of date and the need for provision beyond 2012 has not been established. The potential need for future sites, based on a future review of the GTAA should be acknowledged in the policy. A criteria based policy remains necessary to guide decision making on any planning applications and Policy CS16 remains sound in this respect.

Daniel Sellers:

- I fully agree with all the comments raised in the public consultations.

Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service

- It is vitally important that new housing is well-designed and addresses safety and the needs of vulnerable people. Houses must provide adequate safety for the occupant throughout the occupiers' lifetimes. Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service should be consulted on all pre-application discussions and planning applications so that the implications for fire safety can be considered.
- Sprinkler systems are exceptionally effective through their ability to control a fire before it develops to life threatening proportions. New residential development should incorporate domestic sprinkler systems and 32mm mains water risers (associated water supply infrastructure). The cost of installing a 32mm mains water riser is approximately £26 per dwelling. The cost of installing a domestic sprinkler system is approximately £1500 although this varies depending on the type of dwelling and distance from the property to the water mains. The cost of installing sprinkler systems and associated water infrastructure should be seen in the context of alternative approaches including the 'do nothing' approach and the installation of fire protection measures, both of which have significant cost implications.
- The cost of installing fire protection measures in order to meet Building Regulation requirements is around £1200 per dwelling for fire doors plus additional costs for compartment walls and ceilings. Installation of a domestic sprinkler system provides additional flexibility to developers in meeting Building Regulation requirements at a lower cost to traditional fire protection measures. In addition, where change of use is anticipated, domestic sprinkler systems are often the only practical way to meet means of escape requirements.
- The 'do nothing' approach and consequential economic cost of a fire must also be considered. The Association of British Insurers (ABI 2009) stated the cost of fire damage to homes was £408 million, which equated to an average cost of £8000 per property. The Department for Communities and Local Government report published in March 2011

'The economic cost of fire: estimates for 2008 fire research report' has put the full cost of a fire in a domestic property at £44,523. Costs arise not only from fire damage but also as a result of a requirement for alternative accommodation and, in the case of rented accommodation, lost income.

- The cost of doing nothing is therefore well in excess of installing sprinkler systems as part of new developments or retrofitting existing properties. To give a real-life example, a fire in a single flat which did not have a sprinkler system in Glasgow in 2009 resulted in an overall cost in excess of £2 million as a result of repair costs and the need to provide alternative accommodation for tenants. In comparison, the cost of retrofitting Callow Mount in Sheffield was £55,124 or just £1148 per flat.
- Where necessary, local authorities should therefore consider the use of conditions and information notes/recommendations on planning permissions to secure the provision of sprinkler systems and associated water supply infrastructure. The local planning authority could adapt and use the following example wording as a condition on a planning permission to ensure a development is appropriately designed to provide adequate safety.

Policy CS20

- It is noted that health and social care facilities are referenced in the policy, however in my opinion there is a clear opportunity to broaden the scope of the policy and plan for appropriate references to be drawn in policy CS20 in relation to the role of Derbyshire Fire & Rescue Service. In particular this should relate to the ability to respond to new housing growth and the additional community orientated benefits provided by Community Fire Stations. This is also pertinent in terms of future DFRS capital programmes where new or improved Community Fire Stations may be envisaged through the plan period.

Woodland Trust

- We support the changes suggested in the table under public consultation comments: "Focus on creation of new biodiversity sites and increasing biodiversity"
- The current policy is quite strong on protection of biodiversity but we would like to see more emphasis on how new habitats can be created, including tree planting and woodland creation.
- CS6 Built and Historic Environment - We welcome inclusion in this section of a reference to historic parks and gardens. We would like to see recognition also that ancient, veteran and notable trees can form an important part of the heritage of the area. Such trees may be found in historic parks and gardens but may also be found in other locations (eg in the wider countryside).
- CS7 Green Infrastructure - We support the direction of change proposed towards more creation of new green infrastructure assets. The current policy does not mention trees and woodland as a GI asset and we would like to see this omission corrected. We would like to see the Council set targets for creation of different types of green infrastructure, including tree and woodland planting, based on use of standards to measure people's current level of access to GI and need for new GI assets to alleviate any deficiencies. The Woodland Trust has developed an Access to Woodland Standard, which shows that currently only 21% of people in High Peak District have access to a wood of at least 2 hectares within 500 metres of their home (ie easy walking distance). We can supply statistics on request which compare this level of provision with that of neighbouring councils and suggest how woodland creation targets can be derived from the data.
- CS17 Climate Change - We agree with the public comments on this policy in the table that there needs to be greater emphasis in the policy on adaptation including ways in which both people and wildlife can adapt to the climate change which is inevitably going to happen in the UK over the next few decades. Creation of new woodland and tree planting can play a crucial role in enabling adaptation through reduction of urban temperatures in the summer, through helping to alleviate certain types of flooding and through provision of shade for farm animals and protection of crops from extremes of climate. Wildlife can be helped to move and adapt to a changing climate through buffering and extending existing semi natural habitats, relinking those which have become fragmented and creation of wildlife corridors.

Peak District National Park Authority

- In the policy review section, the comments to policy CS2 Settlement Hierarchy identify a potential policy gap if the RSS is abolished which relates specifically to the requirement in law (Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995) to have regard to statutory purposes of the National Park. The National Park Authority suggest that reference to Section 62 of the 'Environment Act 1995' and the 'National Parks Vision and Circular 2010' should be able to plug that perceived gap. Therefore if the RSS is abolished this should not weaken any protection High Peak Borough Council's policies intend to provide, with regard to national park purposes for the Peak District National Park, so long as the above references are inserted.
- It may be beneficial if Policy CS3 Landscape character acknowledges that where the National Park's landscape setting is impacted by a proposal in the High Peak area then the Peak District National Park Authority's 'Landscape Strategy and Action Plan 2009' is a relevant evidence base to take into account. The Authority suggest that it would be of strategic benefit to require, in policy CS3, that this is taken into account when determining such applications. CS10 Countryside Development could also have regard to Peak District National Park Authority's 'Landscape Strategy and Action Plan 2009' where the National Park's landscape setting may be affected.
- CS17 Climate Change this ought to include reference to Peak District National Park Authority's 'Landscape Strategy and Action Plan 2009' being a relevant considerations in assessing any impact on the setting of the National Park, and where harm to the National Park's landscape setting is identified then this should carry significant weight in the decision making process. The Peak Sub-region Climate Change Study is also useful in understanding the potential for renewable energy in the area. The Authority suggest that reference should be made to this in the preamble of the policy.

National Farmers Union

- On page 16, draft policy CS1 the fifth bullet point on public transport will be difficult, if not impossible, for on farm development to meet in the Council's area. There has to be an acceptance that the relatively small amounts of development allowed on farms by the local development framework will not be compromised by this policy which appears to want all development near a bus stop,.
- On page 22 we support the second bullet point encouraging farm diversification. We would also like to see support for new farm buildings which were essential to the business and for conversions of vernacular farm buildings into houses for farmworkers or the farmer's family where there is a need for this. We support the seventh bullet point of policy CS11 on farm diversification.
- On page 27, policy CS17 on climate change we would like to see more encouragement in the second bullet point of CS17 for renewable energy installations on farms, be it wind power, pv, ground source heat pump, hydro power, anaerobic digestion or biomass or biofuels. This would be in line with the National Policy Planning Framework. Every Council can say that it's nice to have renewables, but in other areas, but we have an obligation to have 15% of our energy as renewable by 2020 and so far we have only 3% in this country - infraction proceedings and swingeing fines await unless the rate of renewable energy installation accelerates vastly.

National Trust

See response to question 1 above.

English Heritage

- Please see comments made under question one for suggested amendments.
- In relation to Policy CS6, any strategic local plan policy for the historic environment should be based on a positive strategy. It is therefore likely that this policy will be

significantly altered from its present form. As existing, the policy is unsound as it not justified, effective or consistent with national policy.

- As previously stated, we would be happy to work with you to develop a strategy and in formulating a strategic policy on that basis. Our guidance note (link cited above) should also aid you in addressing this issue.

Natural England

See response to question 1 above.

Question 3 - Are there any other strategic policies you would like to see in the Draft Plan?

Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service

- It is vitally important that new housing is well-designed and addresses safety and the needs of vulnerable people. Houses must provide adequate safety for the occupant throughout the occupiers' lifetimes. Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service should be consulted on all pre-application discussions and planning applications so that the implications for fire safety can be considered.
- Sprinkler systems are exceptionally effective through their ability to control a fire before it develops to life threatening proportions. New residential development should incorporate domestic sprinkler systems and 32mm mains water risers (associated water supply infrastructure). The cost of installing a 32mm mains water riser is approximately £26 per dwelling. The cost of installing a domestic sprinkler system is approximately £1500 although this varies depending on the type of dwelling and distance from the property to the water mains. The cost of installing sprinkler systems and associated water infrastructure should be seen in the context of alternative approaches including the 'do nothing' approach and the installation of fire protection measures, both of which have significant cost implications.
- The cost of installing fire protection measures in order to meet Building Regulation requirements is around £1200 per dwelling for fire doors plus additional costs for compartment walls and ceilings. Installation of a domestic sprinkler system provides additional flexibility to developers in meeting Building Regulation requirements at a lower cost to traditional fire protection measures. In addition, where change of use is anticipated, domestic sprinkler systems are often the only practical way to meet means of escape requirements.
- The 'do nothing' approach and consequential economic cost of a fire must also be considered. The Association of British Insurers (ABI 2009) stated the cost of fire damage to homes was £408 million, which equated to an average cost of £8000 per property. The Department for Communities and Local Government report published in March 2011 'The economic cost of fire: estimates for 2008 fire research report' has put the full cost of a fire in a domestic property at £44,523. Costs arise not only from fire damage but also as a result of a requirement for alternative accommodation and, in the case of rented accommodation, lost income.
- The cost of doing nothing is therefore well in excess of installing sprinkler systems as part of new developments or retrofitting existing properties. To give a real-life example, a fire in a single flat which did not have a sprinkler system in Glasgow in 2009 resulted in an overall cost in excess of £2 million as a result of repair costs and the need to provide alternative accommodation for tenants. In comparison, the cost of retrofitting Callow Mount in Sheffield was £55,124 or just £1148 per flat.
- Where necessary, local authorities should therefore consider the use of conditions and information notes/recommendations on planning permissions to secure the provision of sprinkler systems and associated water supply infrastructure. The local planning authority could adapt and use the following example wording as a condition on a planning permission to ensure a development is appropriately designed to provide adequate safety.

Jeremy Poulter

- As part of its Strategic Housing Market assessment has the council made any assessment of the need for self build housing. In particular on larger development sites setting an allocation of self build plots (as with the 35% affordable requirement) whose infrastructure will be provided as part of the wider development. This would give local people the opportunity to build their own properties to suit their specific needs and should help people buy into the idea of development in their local area rather than opposing it. Other council are doing this such as Teignbridge who are placing a 5% allocation for self build housing. See http://www.guardian.co.uk/housing-network/2012/oct/10/self-build-housing-teignbridge-council?utm_medium=twitter&utm_source=twitterfeed

Daniel Sellers

I already agree with the Sustainability Appraisal document and also that green infrastructure should be protected, as should the natural, built and heritage environment and all new development should seek to preserve / enhance the character of the areas. I'm in particular favour of the suggested heritage-led regeneration of sites such as the Crescent in Buxton and the old mill buildings in Glossop / New Mills.

English Heritage

- We consider that it would be useful to include sub-area strategies, for example at Buxton, and Glossopdale where there is a sensitive historic environment and as part of positive planning for those areas.

Friends of the Peak District

- Sub area strategies for Glossopdale, Central Area and Buxton Area were presented as strategic policies CS 21, 22 and 23 in the Joint Core Strategy but they are missing from the Strategic Policy document and no feedback is provided on them with respect to previous consultations or national policy changes. They should be restored. Their omission meant that there was no context in which to assess the development options for each sub area. We appreciate that all three policies require amendment in the context of the results of this consultation but it would have been helpful to have presented the broad principles and most appropriate locations for development in the three sub areas which resulted from the previous consultation.

Environment AgencyCS1 – Sustainable Development Principles

- Whilst we agree with the direction of change for this policy, we would wish specific reference from the NPPF technical guidance on flood risk avoidance. You should note that the requirement for previously developed land (bullet point 10) is not a requirement in the NPPF with regard to flood risk. The key issues should be that the development is not at unacceptable flood risk and the risk (including surface water) is reduced for all development. We request that this principle is rewritten to add greater clarity.
- We also recommend that protection of the water environment is given a stronger emphasis and additional text could be added to ensure that development does not have a detrimental impact on the integrity of watercourses (river, lakes, streams, ditches & wetlands) and achieve biodiversity enhancements.

CS4

- We welcome the inclusion of Biodiversity as a strategic policy in the and overall, we agree with the potential direction of change to the policies. We would recommend amending the first point to include the *creation* of biodiversity sites so that it reads “*Conserving, enhancing and creating biodiversity and geodiversity sites and features*”. We would also like to recommend the inclusion of an additional point which specifically references the need to protect and enhance watercourses. We also feel it would be appropriate to highlight the need to preferentially develop biodiversity sites

where they have the potential to create corridors between habitats (both terrestrial and freshwater).

CS5 – Design Quality

- The design quality relates to climate change, however it is not until bullet point 10 that climate change is mentioned. This policy is directly concerned with mitigating against climate change so this emphasis should be before issues of local distinctiveness & sense of place. As currently stated, this policy could imply climate change falls below the appearance of buildings.
- Reference to the Building for Life framework should be reviewed as the 20th criteria (Do buildings or spaces outperform statutory minima, such as building regulations) still mentions that the Code for Sustainable Homes is the relevant reference point for design standards. This is what your emerging Local Plan should be aiming for in terms of energy & water efficiency. Also Energy & water efficiency should be applicable to all new development, not just proposals for 10 dwellings and also affordable housing.

CS17 – Climate Change

- Energy & water efficiency should be based next to the bullet point Code for Sustainable homes (8th bullet) as they are interlinked.
- The 8th bullet talks about the Code for sustainable homes, but then states *as a minimum to building regulations*, this undermines the initial requirement to reach the highest level. This will promote aiming higher than existing Building Regulations.

CS16 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People

- This strategic policy will also need to reflect the requirements of the NPPF Planning policy for traveller sites. Paragraph 11(g) advises that these sites should not be located in areas at high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains, given the particular vulnerability of caravans.

7. General Comments

The following general comments were made not specifically relating to any of the questions in the consultation.

Friends of the Peak District

Lack of clarity over relationship between joint DD and HP core strategy and emerging HP local plan

FPD understands that work on what was to have been a draft Joint Core Strategy with the Derbyshire Dales has now ceased. The new High Peak Local Plan now being prepared in its place '*will build on the work undertaken during the preparation of the Joint Core Strategy whilst providing the opportunity to review the previous proposals*'. However there is no indication as to the status of the Joint Core Strategy and in particular the Core Strategy Vision and Objectives. The only single reference to those objectives occurs on the final page of the Strategic Policy document where we are told that in implementing policy CS27 (developers contributions) regard will be had to economic viability considerations, consistent with meeting the Core Strategy Objectives. Does this statement apply to all the other policies? We are being asked to give our views on the policies in an up-to-date context but are given no guidance as to what objectives they would be required to fulfil.

Instructions to respondents are confusing

The introduction states '*The table in Chapter 2 does not set out detailed wording changes to policies or supporting text as these are more appropriate to consider as part of any subsequent agreed preferred option for the Local Plan after consultation on the scope of the policies to be reviewed has been concluded.*' Yet Question 2 asks '*Do you have any suggestions for other amendments to the existing policies? (Please indicate policy reference)*'. FPD has already through previous consultations suggested wording changes to a number of policies. We have therefore not answered question 2 and expect our 2010 comments to be taken into consideration as the policies are amended.

Inadequate feedback from previous 2010 joint DD and HP Core Strategy

If we accept that detailed wording changes to policies or supporting text would come later we would expect key points raised during the previous consultations to be expressed. Overall we are disappointed at the approach taken towards the response to previous public consultation in Chapter 2. As presented the comments are so succinct as to be virtually useless.