DC Admin

From:
Sent: 30 July 2025 17:58
To: DC Admin
Subject: Castle Hill - planning - 2024/93494

Planning application: 2024/93494

My first observation must be to state that this application is both confusing and difficult to understand. The drawings appear to predate the previous expired application and leave unanswered, many of the questions raised on the prior application. This proposed development is just as inappropriate for the site and its access as the previous versions.

The national heritage consultees both firmly state that the development should be refused. Given they are the experts, I can add little to their arguments but support their position 100%.

The access works appear to be less than were proposed in the last application. The introduction of a schematic showing how it is proposed an articulated delivery vehicle will turn round, underlines the inappropriate nature of the development for this site. The access was never designed for, and is incapable of, handling this sort of vehicle on a frequent basis. It cannot be safe, for other road users, for such vehicles to be regularly traversing up and down the access – after all, it is the only access for anyone other than healthy adults able to walk up the steep, stepped footpaths.

The parking is reported as reducing from 66 down to 37. This level of parking is unlikely to service the demand of the proposed development leaving no parking for those who want to visit, take a picnic and enjoy the natural setting of the listed tower and Scheduled Ancient castle Hill.

As a retired head teacher, I have to say I foresee many difficulties with utilising the proposed development for school educational visits. The access introduces significant health and safety issues. With only 7 toilets available for the children, shared with customers, I see this as significant under provision. Where is the parking provision for the school minibuses?

Information on the site and its heritage assets needs to be distributed around the site if children are to relate the information to the location.

The recent fire on the hill highlights the heightened risks associated with the introduction of large numbers of individuals on the hilltop visiting a food and drink venue more appropriately sited in an urban environment served by regular public transport, parking etc. This is a heritage site that should be treasured.

This development should ‘finally’ be refused.