

Good morning Inspector, thank you for giving residents the opportunity to speak at this Inquiry.

I am speaking today as a resident of Fauvel Road. I appreciate the opportunity to present my views, and I wish to express my continued support for the Local Planning Authority's decision to refuse the application.

The LPA's reasons for refusal are, in my view, robust, sound, and grounded firmly in adopted planning policy. My previously submitted written comments remain relevant, and I respectfully ask that these are reviewed in full, as part of your assessment. Today, I will focus on matters arising from the Appellant's Statement of Case and the updated Parameters Plan.

Acceptance of Development in Principle

To begin, I want to make clear that I accept the principle of residential development on the brownfield element of the Former Glossopdale School site. However, I continue to believe that Glossop would benefit greatly if part of the site were used for community facilities, such as a medical centre or leisure centre, to meet the growing needs of the town. Nevertheless, my comments today relate specifically to the appeal scheme before you.

Loss of Sports Fields

I support the LPA's Reason for Refusal 1. The appellant has not demonstrated that the loss of playing field land has been justified or mitigated through re-provision of equal or better quality elsewhere.

The playing fields at the former Glossopdale School remain as a lawful planning use. They were not lost by default of the school's relocation, they have not been abandoned or considered to be beyond reuse, nor have they been replaced by new or improved facilities elsewhere.

The Council's own evidence base highlights a lack of playing fields in Glossop and therefore any loss, such as this, must be justified and no such justification has been forthcoming from the appellant.

Both the Council and the residents contend that the playing fields on the appeal site are not considered to be surplus to requirements, nor have they been replaced by equivalent or better provision.

The Agronomy Report submitted by the appellant does not meet the requirements of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy. As a result, the development of much of the southern portion of the site is unacceptable in principle as it conflicts with policies S1, S5, H1, CF4 of the Local Plan, and paragraph 104 of the NPPF.

Scale and Density

Turning to the Council's second reason for refusal:

I strongly support the proposed cap of 100 dwellings, and respectfully request that this cap is written explicitly into the Description of Development. This is essential.

Throughout the application and appeal documents, the proposed density has been unclear and inconsistent, with references to:

- 100 units at 33 dwellings per hectare
- 105 units at 33 dwellings per hectare
- 110 units at 35 dwellings per hectare

This ambiguity makes it impossible for residents—and indeed the decision-maker—to understand the true scale of the development. I ask that the appeal process crystallises this matter so that a proper and thorough assessment can be undertaken.

Design Parameters and Local Character

I remain concerned about the potential height of dwellings, particularly feature buildings and corner turners, which often exceed standard heights and can appear incongruous. There are significant level changes across the site and it is essential that these are understood and considered in detail from the outset. To protect local character, I respectfully request that all dwellings are limited to two storeys by condition, should the appeal be allowed. This would ensure compliance with Local Plan Policy EQ6.

Density should also decrease towards the north and north east of the site. This reflects the established pattern of development in the area: where higher density exists closer to the town centre, with more spacious, linear, single-sided plots found to the north. The site sits between two Conservation Areas, and the design, materials, and layout must reflect this sensitive context.

The LPA's Reason for Refusal 2 relating to insufficient information on design quality and amenity remains entirely valid. Policies S1, S5, H1, H2, EQ6, the High Peak Design Guidance, Residential Guidance SPD, and the NPPF all require a level of design assurance that has not been provided.

Parameters Plan – Lack of Buffer to Fauvel Road

Turning to the updated Parameters Plan, I am extremely concerned that a green buffer has been applied around almost the entire site boundary—except along two sections of Fauvel Road.

A 6-metre buffer is provided behind properties on North Road. Yet no such buffer is proposed behind properties on Fauvel Road, including numbers 16-24 and numbers 36–42, the latter having significantly shorter rear gardens than those on North Road.

It is unclear and unjustified why a buffer is considered essential elsewhere but not here.

I respectfully request that the Parameters Plan is amended to include a commensurate green buffer along the eastern boundary of the site, ensuring equal levels of residential amenity are afforded to all existing properties surrounding the site and compliance with Policy EQ6, which requires development to avoid visual intrusion, overlooking and overbearing effects.

Need for a Design Code

If the appeal is allowed, I strongly urge the imposition of a condition requiring a comprehensive Design Code to be prepared and approved before any Reserved Matters application is submitted.

Such a Design Code should secure:

- Street layout and movement networks
- Single-sided roads with spacious plots
- Reduced density to the north
- Tree-lined streets
- Building typologies, heights, massing, and scale
- Architectural detailing and materials
- Victorian villa-style elevations
- Landscaping, public realm, and boundary treatments
- Green buffers
- Parking, refuse, and cycle storage
- SuDS integration

This is essential to ensure compliance with Policies S1, S5, and EQ6, and to deliver a scheme appropriate to this sensitive location.

Drainage and Flooding

In addition to the LPA's reasons for refusal, drainage remains a significant concern for residents. The site slopes steeply from north to south, and both North Road and Fauvel Road act as channels during heavy rainfall. Properties on Spire Hollin already experience flooding from runoff originating from higher ground in the north.

The Flood Risk Assessment acknowledges medium to high surface water flood risk. Increased hardstanding will worsen this. I therefore request a condition requiring a detailed drainage strategy to include land drains along the full eastern and western boundaries, connecting to the existing culvert, to prevent pooling of water at the bottom of gardens—a common issue in new developments and one likely to be exacerbated here.

Conclusion

Inspector, I respectfully request that you dismiss this appeal. The appellant has not provided any material justification to overcome the LPA's reasons for refusal, and the concerns raised by residents remain unresolved.

However, should you be minded to allow the appeal, I ask that:

1. The Parameters Plan is amended to include a green buffer of equal size along all of the site's boundaries; and
2. A condition requiring a comprehensive Design Code is imposed, ensuring compliance with the Local Plan, SPDs, and the NPPF.

Thank you for your time and consideration.