

Planning Committee 29th July 2025

SUMMARY OF LATE COMMENTS/REPORT UPDATE

The aim of this report is to seek to avoid the need for lengthy verbal updates that Planning Officers have sometimes needed to provide in the past at the Planning Committee. In consultation with the Chair, it has been decided that on the evening before committee a summary of all the late comments/representations received so far will be emailed to the Committee Members by the Governance Team.

It is possible that verbal updates will still be required at the meeting as sometimes comments are received at the last minute or Officers may wish to amend their recommendations: however Officers will seek to keep verbal updates to a minimum.

At the meeting Officers will only refer briefly to any key points of the case in the summary that has been emailed, as well as providing the usual verbal update for any additional last minute items.

If Members have any queries about the comments or the application itself please feel free to contact the relevant case officer given beneath the title of each summary below.

PARISH: Tupton

APPLICATION: 25/00415/FL

CASE OFFICER: Colin Wilson

1. SOURCE OF COMMENTS: Cllr David Hancock

DATE RECEIVED: 23/07/2025

SUMMARY:

Late Representation: Application 25/00415/FL – Retrospective Application for InPost Parcel Locker at Unit 5, Ankerbold Road, Tupton Committee Date: 29 July 2025

Dear Members of the Planning Committee,

It is my intention to address the committee on 29th July. However, as my objection relies on photographic evidence, proving clear and ongoing impacts on highway safety and residential amenity (both of which are acknowledged planning considerations in the Local Plan and in national policy), I have taken the opportunity to submit this as a late representation so that members may acquaint themselves with that evidence ahead of determining the application.

1. Highway Safety (Policy ID3 / NPPF para 116)

The officer report relies heavily on theoretical assessments and two limited site visits, one of which occurred on a Wednesday afternoon when nearby businesses were closed. This does not reflect the actual usage patterns of the site.

I have submitted photographic evidence showing:

- Vehicles routinely parking within the carriageway, reducing the road to a single lane.
- Cars stopping abruptly in unsafe positions to access the locker.
- Drivers using residents' private driveways on the opposite side of the road as parking and turning, causing intrusion and danger at all times of the day and night.
- Mobility scooters and pedestrians forced onto the live carriageway due to blocked pavements.

These are not speculative concerns — they are happening regularly and pose a clear and demonstrable danger.

It is important to emphasise that Ankerbold Road is already under pressure due to cumulative development, and the parcel locker introduces new, unmanaged vehicle movements that undermine highway safety in the immediate vicinity of the junction with Station New Road — especially outside of business hours when parking is limited.

2. Residential Amenity (Policy SS7(c), SDC12(e))

Although the locker is located within a commercial frontage, its operation is entirely unregulated and unstaffed, accessible 24/7. This leads to:

- Frequent stopping, idling, and turning across the residential side of the street.
- Headlights, noise, and privacy intrusion for homes opposite the site, especially at night.
- Light pollution from the locker's integrated lighting.
- Drivers mounting kerbs and using residential driveways as part of their access or exit manoeuvres.

This is not simply a matter of visibility or minor disruption — it represents a material and ongoing harm to the quiet enjoyment of nearby homes.

3. Lack of Justification or Control

The site has:

- No designated parking, no markings, and no enforcement.
- No physical separation from the pedestrian footway.
- No restrictions on use or access times.
- Other InPost lockers already operate within a one-mile radius.

This development was implemented without consultation and now relies on retrospective permission despite its incompatibility with local conditions. Officers acknowledge some harm but appear to dismiss it as minimal — this does not match the lived experience of residents who now contend with constant disruption. However, the retrospective nature of this application means that members can determine it with the legitimate benefit of evidence rather than speculation and theory.

Conclusion

The site is inappropriate for a 24/7 publicly accessed facility, with no parking, no surveillance, and no management. It is causing real-world safety hazards, evidenced

in the photographs and videos submitted, and has led to repeated encroachment on private property and pavement obstructions. These concerns meet the threshold for refusal under **Policy ID3 (Highway Safety)** and **Policy SDC12 (Amenity and Design)**.

I respectfully urge the Planning Committee to **reject this retrospective application**. This facility is not a suitable or safe addition to the streetscape of Ankerbold Road.

This development was implemented without consultation and now relies on retrospective permission despite its incompatibility with local conditions. Officers acknowledge some harm but appear to dismiss it as minimal — this does not match the lived experience of residents who now contend with constant disruption. However, the retrospective nature of this application means that members can determine it with the legitimate benefit of evidence rather than speculation and theory.

PHOTOS



Figure 1, showing a service user parked, protruding at a 90 degree angle into the carriageway



Figure 2, showing service user obstructing the pavement



Figure 3 shows the density of parking, obstructing visibility for users entering the business' car park.



Figure 4 shows the lack of available parking at the site, with stock for the business having to be offloaded onto the highway.



Figure 5 shows the density of parking impacting the carriageway – in the immediate vicinity of the junction with Station New Road.



*Figure 6, as above –
evidencing the fact that
these are ongoing issues.*



*Figure 7, as above. This
also ties in with Figure 4 –
evidencing the real day-to-
day highway dangers being
caused by the additional
traffic*



*Figure 8 – again providing
further evidence*



Figure 9. Service user having obstructed neighbouring residential driveway.



Figure 10. Service users turning onto residential driveway, while a further vehicle obstructs neighbouring drive.



Figure 11 evidences that there is no parking provision when the site owner's business is closed.



Figure 12. Egress from residential drive completely blocked by service user.



Figure 13, shows the view entering Ankerbold Road from the Station New Road junction.



Figure 14 clearly evidences the danger to highway safety.



Figure 15, as above – the impact on road safety approaching the Station New Road junction



Figure 16, as is clearly visible from the distance of the rear passenger wheel to the kerb, service users are leaving insufficient room for vulnerable users to access the pavement, forcing them into the carriageway – nearing a busy road junction.



Figure 17, following on from that – users of mobility scooters and wheelchairs are then unable to return to the pavement as the parking extends all the way to the junction; and the pavement on the opposite side of the road terminates well in advance of this point.



Figure 18, again evidences the impact of the additional traffic on residential amenity.

I am in possession of video footage of several of these incidents; which, subject to the Chair's approval, could be made available to members.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

Officers note the comments and photographs submitted. Having reviewed the submitted representations, Officers retain the view that the development that this application seeks to retain represents an acceptable form of development within the defined Settlement Development Limits of Tupton. In the context of the wider site's functional commercial appearance, the parcel locker would represent an acceptable visual addition to the area. Whilst Officers accept that the proposed development would result in increased levels of activity within the vicinity of the site (and some of the above photographs may be illustrative of this), it is not considered that such activity would result in overriding significant harm to the existing residential amenity levels of properties in the locality. Moreover, for the reasons set out in the Officer Committee Report, Officers consider that the development which this application seeks to retain would not result in any unacceptable impacts on highway safety in the vicinity of the site. This Officer view is supported by the consultation response from DCC Highways Officers, in which no objections were raised from a highway safety perspective.