

**HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Date: 24th January 2022

Application No:	HPK/2020/0334	
Location	Land south of Hollincross Lane, Glossop, SK13 8JH	
Proposal	Demolition of redundant buildings including partial demolition modern extensions to Redcourt and redevelopment of site provide 23 dwellings (Use Class C3) including the retention a conversion of Redcourt for together with access, parking a landscaping.	
Applicant	Glossop Eden Ltd	
Agent	WSP UK	
Parish/Ward	Glossop	Date registered: 03/09/2020
If you have a question about this report please contact: Rachael Simpkin rachael.simpkin@highpeak.gov.uk 01538 395400 extension 4122		

REFERRAL

The above planning application is a major development and is locally contentious.

1.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The 2.0ha site is comprised of a steep wooded valley slope which runs down towards Long Clough Brook. The site has significant mature tree coverage of different species of trees. The site is covered by a group Tree Preservation Order (TP061).

2.2 The vacant application site was previously a facility owned and operated by St Christopher's Trust offering supported living and residential care, which now takes place in the adjacent residential care facility. It is occupied by Redcourt (the former residential care facility). A former gym building is also located in the southern part of the site. All other structures have been previously demolished and cleared from the site.

2.3 The site falls within the St. James Conservation Area and is positioned close to St. James' Church, a Grade II Listed Building (together with separately Listed Lytch Gate and funerary monument). Redcourt is a non-designated heritage asset within the Conservation Area.

2.4 The main access into the site is via Hollincross Lane to the north and there is also a disused gateway from Slatelands Road to the west. It is bound to the north by Hollincross Lane and residential dwellings off Slatelands Road to the north-west corner of the site. St. James Church and residential streets bound the

site to the east. Long Clough Brook flows alongside the southern and south-western site boundaries of the site whereby levels appreciably fall towards the brook.

2.5 For the purposes of the Adopted Local Plan, the application site also falls within the Built up Area Boundary of Glossop within c.600 metres of the town centre. The part of the site adjacent to the brook falls within Flood Zone 2 and 3 whilst the remaining area falls within Flood Zone 1.

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 The amended scheme comprises of 23 properties, proposing the partial demolition and conversion of Redcourt into 4 dwellings and 19 new build properties (previously 26) expressed in two parcels.

3.2 The site shares an existing vehicular access point off Hollincross Lane with St. Christopher's Trust, which will be retained. Beyond this, to the east is St James Church, the vicarage and the church graveyard, which are close to the junction with the A624. Further along the northern boundary, the site has a second existing entrance point and gateway off Slatelands Road which would be widened and provide access to the lower areas of the site. The existing footpath link from Slatelands Road would be retained to provide access to the northern courtyard aspect of the scheme. In the southeastern corner of the site, there is a gated access point at the end of Ashton Street, which will be retained and footpath link from the site provided. Car parking provision is a combination of in-plot and parking courts.

3.3 Accommodation Schedule is as follows:

- Two-bedroom x 7 units
- Three-bedroom x 13 units
- Four-bedroom x 3 units

3.4 For the southern parcel, the proposed widened access from Slatelands Road leads to a linear row of nine properties culminating with a cul-de-sac of four more dwellings and parking court within the southeastern corner of the site. Within this development parcel, property types broadly consist of a three storey semi-detached Grand Villa typology set back from the road frontage to incorporate mostly in-plot carparking.

3.5 For the northern parcel, and from the existing Hollin Cross access point, the route leads into a courtyard arrangement, which proposes the conversion of Red Court into 4 dwellings. A 2.5 storey semi-detached Grand Villa semi-detached pair would be sited to the west of Redcourt with a traditional terrace of four, 2-storey properties broadly opposite with frontage car parking and a shared surface leading to a bookend detached garage to accommodate the bin store.

3.6 Natural stone and slate are proposed as facing materials for the scheme and a landscaping scheme provided.

3.7 The following revised documents supersede earlier versions as stated:

- Planning and Heritage Statement Addendum and Heritage Assessment (Including Affordable Housing Statement and Draft Heads of Terms)
- Drawings and Design Access Statement
- Design and Access Statement Addendum
- House types B01-B05 Proposed Plans + Elevations (ref: 5417_1101);
- Proposed Redcourt elevations (ref: 5417_1300 Rev E) and floor plans (5417_1201 Rev D)
- Site layout plan (ref: 5417_1100 Rev P15)
- Site section & street elevation (ref: 5417_1201 Rev P2 and 5417_1200 Rev P7)
- Boundary treatment plan (ref: 5417_1102 Rev P6)
- Bin store plan (ref: 5417_1101 Rev P1)
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement
- Tree Protection Plan (6004.02B)
- Landscape drawings (6004.03E)
- Transport Statement (August 2021)
- Updated Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy
- Drainage Plans (EDE01-101C, 103A, 105A, 105A)
- External Works and Impermeable Areas Plan (EDE01-102C, 301F).
- Hollin Cross Lane and Slatelands Road Visibility Review (VN201622-D103 Rev B)
- Swept Path Analysis - Large Refuse Vehicle (VN201622-TR102 Rev C)

3.8 The application and details attached to it, including the plans, supporting documents, representations and consultee responses can be found on the Council's website at:

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=241813>

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

HPK/2013/0388 "Redevelopment of the site to provide new care home (Use Class C2) and 21 dwellings (Use Class C3) together with access, parking and landscaping". Withdrawn October 2013.

HPK/2014/0064 "Redevelopment to provide new supported living facility (Use Class C2) and 22 dwellings (Use Class C3) including the retention and conversion of Redcourt". Approved August 2014 and Lapsed.

5. CONSULTATIONS

Expiry:

Site notice	Expired.
Press notice	8 th October 2020
Neighbours	8 th October 2020
Neighbours (Revised)	8 th September 2021

Public comments

16 neither:

- Request that the flat roofed extension on Redcourt is removed as part of the development as it currently blocks sunlight to adjacent properties
- Will trees be preserved where possible?
- Can trees overhanging gardens be cut back?
- Can the wall at the back at Hollincross Lane be preserved?
- Access should be via Earls Way to reduce traffic on Hollincross Lane
- Concern over pressure on road network
- Concern over pressure on schools
- What will be the impact on wildlife?
- Reopening the junction of Slatelands Road with Primrose Lane would create a rat run
- Heavy construction vehicles will have an impact on adjoining streets
- Has a traffic flow study been conducted?
- Replanting should take place and the community could benefit from green space creation
- Global warming concerns

342 objections:

- Newly built neighbouring housing not on plans
- Much of the information provided is from the 2014 application which may not be relevant as this proposal is much bigger
- It is dangerous to put more houses on a road to a school
- Glossop already struggles with traffic
- Pedestrian safety issues and problems with emergency vehicle access
- Proposed access is a steep blind bend
- The site is difficult for refuse vehicles to access
- No footpath on Slatelands Road
- Hollincross Lane is narrow when cars are parked
- The houses are not necessary
- Loss of natural woodland and protected trees
- Removal of TPO protected trees for a development will set a precedent
- Loss of wildlife – owls, bats and woodpeckers all live in the wood
- Has a bat survey been carried out?
- No noise impact assessment
- Previous plans required an archaeological assessment – why not this one? The site is believed to be on the path of a Roman Road
- Local infrastructure will not cope – schools are full
- The Redcourt woodlands should be a river walk and wildlife site
- This is the last remaining piece of old woodland in the area
- The previous 2014 application was approved prior to the Local Plan
- Huge disruption to residents at Redcourt
- No more major development until a bypass
- The speed survey was conducted during COVID-19 and is therefore not representative
- There is Japanese Knotweed in the woodland
- Redevelopment of Redcourt would be much less disruptive and more sustainable

- The Ecological Management Plan mentions a pond which is not shown on the drawings
- Discrepancy across documentation regarding numbers of dwellings
- The demolition of part of Redcourt will be disruptive and may pose asbestos risks to near neighbours – poor timing when most residents are at home for much of the time
- Queries over boundaries
- Townhouses are not what the area needs
- Works must not take place in wildlife breeding season
- Tree removal will destabilise land
- No clear plans for woodland management
- Widening access to Slatelands road will mean losing the pillars and gate that are a feature of the conservation area
- The site is described as brownfield and this is not accurate
- The full traffic impact of the development up Charlestown Road is yet to be felt
- The houses may not be affordable for local people
- Concerns about poor quality of modern developments
- There are vacant brownfield sites in Glossop that would be better used
- This is within a conservation area
- Increased air pollution from traffic
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Disturbance during construction
- The report imagery gives a false idea of the numbers of cars parked regularly on the carriageway
- No traffic figures appendix as cited
- The Charlestown and Turnlee works schemes will already have a large impact
- Local residents' traffic survey demonstrated significant use of the road
- The land should become a nature reserve for the town, or park
- Will HPBC adopt the road and public spaces?
- Creating a nature trail will destroy further woodland and poses a safety risk
- Anti-social behaviour risk in woodland area of development
- Some newly built homes elsewhere in the town are still empty
- Glossop water supply is already under pressure
- Public transport in Glossop is poor
- Biodiversity gain is required
- Flood risk – river runs along the back – increased runoff will cause risks
- The previous application on this land was partly for supported living – residents were less likely to be driving and it would have impacted less on the road network
- Lack of affordable housing
- If any housing is needed, it is bungalows for older people
- Loss of privacy for existing residents
- Developer name falsely implies local connection
- The applicants do not intend to develop it themselves – poor control of outcome
- The traditional character of the area will be damaged
- Will the Council use S106 for affordable housing?

- 48 TPOs on the site
- The wellbeing effects of nature should be prioritised on this site
- Concerns surrounding effect on consecrated ground in churchyard
- Lack of substantive accessibility commitment
- The transport statement is inadequate
- The site layout implies that refuse vehicles will have to reverse
- The proposed access road will have poor visibility and be dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists
- Accident data provided ignores a serious incident on Pikes Lane in 2017
- The site is not allocated for housing
- Excessive cul-de-sac development all served by one access
- Insufficient footways proposed
- The site red line varies across submitted plans and documents
- The previous application was approved partly for a new residential centre for the Trust
- Removal of the riverside path is disappointing
- Gated access is out of character
- Insufficient public engagement on this application

Robert Largan MP (08.10.20):

"I am writing to object to the above planning application on the Land South of Hollincross Lane, Glossop.

I have been contacted by a huge number of constituents, who are very concerned about this proposed development.

Although the site was granted planning permission for housing in 2014, the site is not approved in the Local Plan as a housing development site. The Local Plan was approved in 2016 with specific sites allocated to future housing development.

I am concerned about the loss of trees and habitat as this will have a negative impact on the character and amenities of the local area.

There will be a negative impact on local infrastructure, especially local roads that are already clogged up, and local schools which can barely be able to take enough pupils as it is.

The proposed access to the site on Slatelands Road will create more congestion on Pikes Lane and Hollincross Lane, particularly residents exiting from Slatelands Road.

My position on major developments in Glossopdale is clear. We currently lack the infrastructure to cope and the Council needs to prioritise the construction of the Mottram Bypass and Glossop Spur and sure that Glossopdale School's expansion is complete before any more major developments are considered.

There is large scale opposition to the development. Local people know it will have an impact on the local infrastructure. I hope that the points raised, along with the widespread local opposition will be taken into account when the application is considered.

I urge the Council to listen to local people and reject this application”.

Councillor Jean Wharmby (24.09.21):

“I am opposed to this application on the grounds of the congestion that already exists in the area and the additional difficulties that will arise with more properties on narrow lanes.

I am opposed to the access on Slatelands Avenue as this is a cul-de-sac and the sight line at the end of the cul-de-sac going onto Hollin Cross Lane and Pikes Lane will create even more congestion.

I am also concerned about the loss of trees and habitat on the proposed development site”.

Councillors Jean and George Wharmby (30.09.20):

“We are opposed to this application on the grounds of the congestion that already exists in the area and the additional difficulties that will arise with more properties on narrow lanes.

We are opposed to the access on Slatelands Avenue as this is a cul-de-sac and the sight line at the end of the cul-de-sac going onto Hollin Cross Lane and Pikes Lane will create even more congestion.

We are also concerned about the loss of trees and habitat on the proposed development site”.

Councillors Damien Greenhalgh (22.09.21):

“There are significant concerns that my constituents have about this development and its impact on them and the St James’ Conservation Area. My objections to these proposals fall into the following areas and are based on the considerable number of representations we have received:

TRAFFIC ISSUES – The proposed development’s parking spaces implies a significant increase in vehicular movements. The majority of these movement are via Slatelands Road, a cul-de-sac road with poor sight lines, with limited footpaths in a residential area that has narrow streets lined with parked cars which already has a significant impact on traffic and pedestrian safety.

SCALE AND COMMUNITY BENEFIT – Whilst we appreciate that the presumption of development has already been established by the approved application HPK/2014/0064 in 2014, which sought to provide new supported living facilities and 22 dwellings by the local charitable trust, St Christopher’s Trust. The current application under consideration is markedly different in terms of the increased harm caused principally by the increase in number and type of dwelling to 30 and the significant reduction in the wider benefits to the community. This application is commercially focused when compared to the 2014 application which sought to provide supported living for vulnerable adults with learning disabilities.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING – The applicant has not sought to achieve any element of affordable housing in this development, instead opting to make a financial contribution. This contribution would in no way be ‘broadly equivalent value’ to the number of homes affordable to local people if the ‘30% affordable houses on sites of 25 units or more’ policy was implemented as per Policy H4 in our Adopted High Peak Local Plan (2016).

LOSS OF TREES – The site currently comprises “a selection of mature trees and informal grassed areas interspersed with more formal grassed layouts” as described in the St James’ Conservation Area’s Character Statement. The proposed development would result in the loss of a significant number of these mature trees, many having Tree Preservation Orders on them, which are a much loved and valued natural amenity for the local community and as the statement confirms forms an important southern boundary to the Conservation Area”.

Councillors Damien Greenhalgh and Rachel Abbots (30.09.20):

We are writing principally to reflect the significant concerns many of our constituents have shared with us about this development and its impact on them and the St James’ Conservation Area. Our objections to these proposals fall into the following areas and are based on the considerable number of representations we have received:

SCALE AND COMMUNITY BENEFIT – Whilst we appreciate that the presumption of development has already been established by the approved application HPK/2014/0064 in 2014, which sought to provide new supported living facilities and 22 dwellings by the local charitable trust, St Christopher’s Trust. The current application under consideration is markedly different in terms of the increased harm caused principally by the increase in number and type of dwelling to 30 and the significant reduction in the wider benefits to the community. This application is commercially focused when compared to the 2014 application which sought to provide supported living for vulnerable adults with learning disabilities.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING – The applicant has not sought to achieve any element of affordable housing in this development, instead opting to make a financial contribution. This contribution would in no way be ‘broadly equivalent value’ to the number of homes affordable to local people if the ‘30% affordable houses on sites of 25 units or more’ policy was implemented as per Policy H4 in our Adopted High Peak Local Plan (2016).

LOSS OF TREES – The site currently comprises “a selection of mature trees and informal grassed areas interspersed with more formal grassed layouts” as described in the St James’ Conservation Area’s Character Statement. The proposed development would result in the loss of a significant number of these mature trees, many having Tree Preservation Orders on them, which are a much loved and valued natural amenity for the local community and as the statement confirms forms an important southern boundary to the Conservation Area.

TRAFFIC ISSUES – The development is proposing 58 parking spaces which implies a significant increase in vehicular movements. The majority of these movement are via Slatelands Road, a cul-de-sac road with poor sight lines, in an

area that has narrow streets lined with parked cars which already has a significant impact on traffic and pedestrian safety.

We ask that the following be taken into consideration in making a recommendation to the Development Control Committee.

Consultees

AES Waste (27.09.20):

No issues raised in relation to waste collection.

DCC Archaeologist (21.09.21):

We previously commented on HPK/2014/0064 for the same site.

The site is crossed by the approximate route of the Brough to Melandra Roman road (HER 99040), based on the work of Peter Wroe ('Roman roads in the Peak District', in Derbyshire Archaeological Journal 1982). Wroe plotted the above-ground traces of Roman roads in the area, as well as excavating a number of sections through the roads to ascertain their construction.

The alignment of this road through Glossop is uncertain – it has not been traced between Hob Hill Farm, 650m to the south-east, and Adderley Place 1400m to the north-west. However, given these known points it seems certain that the true alignment is located somewhere to the south of Hollin Cross Lane and north of Long Clough Brook, which would inevitably bring the alignment across the current proposal site. Much of this area has been subsequently built up, and the proposal site represents the only sizeable 'window' of substantially undeveloped land along the alignment between Hob Hill and Simmondley Lane. Although the majority of the site has not been developed the archaeological potential is somewhat reduced by the scattered buildings and landscaping associated with the current care home, and by the substantial tree cover present from the early 20th century on. Nevertheless, there are significant areas of open ground which retain archaeological potential.

I recommend that this should be addressed through a conditioned scheme of archaeological work, secured by planning conditions in line with NPPF para 199. The scope of archaeological work will depend on groundworks proposals, but may include monitoring of site stripping, evaluation trenching and/or targeted area excavation.

Refer to public file for condition wording.

DCC Highways (11.01.22):

You may wish to note that according to the application form, Notice was served on Derbyshire County Council. It is unclear, however, why as records do not seem to indicate that this Authority is in ownership of any land in this vicinity. You may wish to consider whether the correct notice has been served.

Below are the last comments provided by the Highway Authority. Responses in respect of these comments are given in blue based on the latest drawing 5417_

1100 Revision P15.

Transport Assessment

Generally, I am happy that the text of the report is sufficient to make an informed decision regarding the revisions. However, I do have a few issues with some of the drawings provided and have added notes to each of the drawings (where applicable).

Drawing VN202622-D103 A

As pointed out in previous comments by Nick Knowles, the applicant must provide footways on both sides of the access road. **This comment has not been taken on board.**

NOTE 1 – The 2m footway on Hollin Cross Lane must be extended around the radius on both sides of the access. Pedestrian dropped kerb crossing points and tactile paving must be provided. **This comment has been taken on board.**

NOTE 2 - The 2m footway on Slatelands Road must be extended around the radius so that it connects with the proposed footway link between the access and Hollin Cross Lane. Pedestrian dropped kerb crossing points and tactile paving must be provided. **This comment has been taken on board.**

NOTE 3 - Existing vehicle crossing must be stopped up if they are no longer to be used and the footway fully reinstated with a full height kerb check. **Still applicable.**

The above items are necessary whether or not the access roads are adopted.

Drawing VN201622-TR02 B

NOTE 1 - The tracking of the refuse vehicle appears to collide with the bin storage area. This will need amending. **Still appears tight but on the assumption it will not be adopted and that the refuse / recycling collection Authority find the layout acceptable, no further comments.**

Drawing 5417_1100 P14

Comments relating to the access points onto Slaterlands Road and Hollin Cross Lane are provided with Drawing VN202622-D13 A

NOTE 1 – A 2m footway should be provided along the southern side of the access from Hollin Cross Lane. If for some reason, this cannot be provided, then a 1m service strip should be considered. This is a requirement so that street lighting and other services can be provided on this side of the road. Notwithstanding this, the carriageway has no clearance from the neighbouring boundary fence, so it will be necessary to move the access alignment further north. **This note not taken on board.**

NOTE 2 – The parking arrangement for Plot 5 is unsatisfactory. The only way for a driver to get into the spaces is to drive over the verge, which would need a 45 degree splay to be provided on either end, and the position of the space within the carriageway would attract visitor parking, which would compromise the parking for Plot 5. Parking should therefore be relocated within the curtilage of the property. **Whilst there has been some amendment, the parking has not been relocated to within the plot curtilage so the previously highlighted**

problem still exists.

NOTE 3 – The Highway Authority no longer accept shared surfaces within the highway because of the impact that this has on the blind and partially sighted. Therefore, footways will be required on both sides of the road and parking moved to the back of the footway. The provision of the footway ensures around the turning area ensures that it can be properly illuminated and that pedestrians using the pedestrian link from Slatelands Road are not forced onto the carriageway within the turning head. **This note does not appear to have been taken on board.**

NOTE 4 – On street residential parking within the highway is no longer allowed by the Highway Authority. Wherever possible, the parking spaces should be provided within the curtilage of the property. **Still applicable.**

NOTE 5 – The arrangement of parking for Plot 9 is likely to encourage the owner to utilise the turning head for parking if they own more than 2 vehicles. This can lead to the turn head being obstructed. We would request that the parking arrangement be modified to discourage parking within the turning head. **There does not appear to have been any amendment to this.**

NOTE 6 - The Highway Authority no longer accept shared surfaces within the highway because of the impact that this has on the blind and partially sighted. Therefore, footways will be required on that connect all the way to the frontage of the property.

NOTE 7 - A 2m footway should be provided along the northern side of the access from Slatelands Road. If for some reason, this cannot be provided, then a 1m service strip should be considered. This is a requirement so that street lighting and other services can be provided on this side of the road. **It would seem that a 1.0m margin has been provided on the southern side rather than the northern.**

The applicant fails to address all the previously highlighted layout issues the Highway Authority were seeking to achieve, to ensure an adoptable form of development. However, adoption of the estate streets is a purely voluntary act between the developer and the Highway Authority and acceptance of the proposals for planning purposes does not in any way compel the Highway Authority to enter into an adoption Agreement at a future date. In the absence of any further amendments to the layout and for the avoidance of doubt, it is unlikely the streets would be eligible for adoption and they would need to remain privately maintained by the road owner or street frontagers where applicable. Purely from a planning perspective, the Highway Authority would not be able to demonstrate that the development proposals would result in a highway safety issue or have a severe impact on the existing highway network, which would justify a recommendation of refusal from the Highway Authority, the tests to be met as identified in paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework document. Therefore, should the proposals be otherwise acceptable from a planning perspective it is requested that the following conditions, or similar based on the same, be included in any consent issued.

1. Before any other operations are commenced, space shall be provided within the site for storage of plant and materials, site accommodation, loading,

unloading and manoeuvring of goods vehicles, parking and manoeuvring of employees and visitors vehicles, laid out and constructed in accordance with detailed designs first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once implemented the facilities shall be retained free from any impediment to their designated use throughout the construction period.

2. Throughout the period of development vehicle wheel cleaning facilities shall be provided and retained within the site. All construction vehicles shall have their wheels cleaned before leaving the site in order to prevent the deposition of mud and other extraneous material on the public highway.

3. The carriageway and margins to the proposed roads shall be constructed in accordance with details first to be submitted and agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. In addition, the same shall be constructed up to and including at least road base level prior to the commencement of the erection of any dwelling intended to take access from that road. The carriageway and margins shall be constructed up to and including base course surfacing to ensure that each dwelling prior to occupation has a properly consolidated and surfaced carriageway and footway between the dwelling and the existing highway. Until final surfacing is completed, the margin base course shall be provided in a manner to avoid any upstands to gullies, covers, kerbs or other such obstructions within or abutting the margin.

4. Before any other operations are commenced a vehicular junction shall be formed to Hollin Cross Lane and Slatelands Road in accordance with drawing VN201622-D100 Revision A as submitted in the Transport Statement. The land in advance of the visibility sightlines shall be retained throughout the life of the development free of any object greater than 1m in height (0.6m in the case of vegetation) above ground level.

5. Prior to the occupation of any dwelling, any redundant vehicular and pedestrian accesses shall be permanently closed with a physical barrier and the existing crossovers reinstated as footway in accordance with a scheme first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

6. No dwelling shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the revised application drawing for cars to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in a forward gear.

7. There shall be no gates or other barriers on the accesses.

8. The proposed access to Hollin Cross Lane shall be no steeper than 1:30 for the first 10m and shall not exceed 1:20 thereafter. Individual driveways shall not exceed 1:14.

9. No development shall be commenced until details of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as a private management and maintenance company has been established].

In addition, the following notes shall be included for the benefit of the applicant.

1. Pursuant to Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980 and Section 86(4) of the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991 prior notification shall be given to the

Department - Place at County Hall, Matlock regarding access works within the highway. Information, and relevant application forms, regarding the undertaking of access works within highway limits is available via the County Council's website

<https://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/transport-roads/roads-traffic/licences-enforcements/vehicular-access/vehicle-accesses-crossovers-and-dropped-kerbs.aspx>

E-mail highways.hub@derbyshire.gov.uk or
Telephone Call Derbyshire on 01629 533190.

2.The Highway Authority recommends that the first 5m of the proposed access should not be surfaced with a loose material (i.e. unbound chippings or gravel etc.). In the event that loose material is transferred to the highway and is regarded as a hazard or nuisance to highway users, the Authority reserves the right to take any necessary action.

3.Pursuant to Sections 149 and 151 of the Highways Act 1980, steps shall be taken to ensure that mud or other extraneous material is not carried out of the site and deposited on the public highway. Should such deposits occur, it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that all reasonable steps (e.g. street sweeping) are taken to maintain the roads in the vicinity of the site to a satisfactory level of cleanliness.

4.The following clause shall be included in the deeds of the dwellings to ensure that at no time will adoption of any part of the access road be sought:

"The lessee or purchaser shall not at any time, either alone or jointly with others, seek adoption of any part of the driveway intended to serve the development as a highway maintainable at the public expense, it being the intention that same shall at all times remain private up to the point where the same abuts upon the publicly maintainable highway".

5.Pursuant to Section 127 of the Highways Act 1980, no work may commence within the limits of the public highway to close any redundant accesses and to reinstate the footway without the formal written Agreement of the County Council as Highway Authority. It must be ensured that public transport services in the vicinity of the site are not adversely affected by the development works. Advice regarding the technical, legal, administrative and financial processes involved in Section 127 Agreements may be obtained by contacting this Authority via email – highways.hub@derbyshire.gov.uk. The applicant is advised to allow approximately 12 weeks in any programme of works to obtain a Section 127 Agreement.

6.Construction works are likely to require Traffic Management and advice regarding procedures should be sought from Mr J Adams, Traffic Management, 01629 538628. All road closure and temporary traffic signal applications will have to be submitted via the County Councils web-site; relevant forms are available via the following link - http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/transport_roads/roads_traffic/roadworks/default.asp

7.The applicant is advised that to discharge condition 9 that the Local Planning Authority requires a copy of a Private Management and Maintenance Company confirming funding, management and maintenance regimes completed agreement between the applicant and the local highway authority under Section

38 of the Highways Act 1980 or the constitution and details of a Private Management and Maintenance Company confirming funding, management and maintenance regimes.

DCC Highways (07.12.21):

Referred to DCC for further consideration.

DCC Highways (07.09.21):

I have a few observations that need to be made regarding the revised information that has been provided. The notes have been added to the attached drawings for clarity.

Transport Assessment Generally, I am happy that the text of the report is sufficient to make an informed decision regarding the revisions. However, I do have a few issues with some of the drawings provided and have added notes to each of the drawings (where applicable).

Drawing VN202622-D103 A As pointed out in previous comments by Nick Knowles, the applicant must provide footways on both sides of the access road.

NOTE 1 – The 2m footway on Hollincross Lane must be extended around the radius on both sides of the access. Pedestrian dropped kerb crossing points and tactile paving must be provided.

NOTE 2 - The 2m footway on Slatelands Road must be extended around the radius so that it connects with the proposed footway link between the access and Hollincross Lane. Pedestrian dropped kerb crossing points and tactile paving must be provided. NOTE 3 - Existing vehicle crossing must be stopped up if they are no longer to be used and the footway fully reinstated with a full height kerb check. The above items are necessary whether or not the access roads are adopted. Drawing VN201622-TR02 B NOTE 1 - The tracking of the refuse vehicle appears to collide with the bin storage area. This will need amending. Drawing 5417_1100 P14 Comments relating to the access points onto Slatelands Road and Hollincross Lane are provided with Drawing VN202622-D13 A

NOTE 1 – A 2m footway should be provided along the southern side of the access from Hollincross Lane. If for some reason, this cannot be provided, then a 1m service strip should be considered. This is a requirement so that street lighting and other services can be provided on this side of the road. Notwithstanding this, the carriageway has no clearance from the neighbouring boundary fence, so it will be necessary to move the access alignment further north.

NOTE 2 – The parking arrangement for Plot 5 is unsatisfactory. The only way for a driver to get into the spaces is to drive over the verge, which would need a 45 degree splay to be provided on either end, and the position of the space within the carriageway would attract visitor parking, which would compromise the parking for Plot 5. Parking should therefore be relocated within the curtilage of the property.

NOTE 3 – The Highway Authority no longer accept shared surfaces within the

highway because of the impact that this has on the blind and partially sighted. Therefore, footways will be required on both sides of the road and parking moved to the back of the footway. The provision of the footway ensures around the turning area ensures that it can be properly illuminated and that pedestrians using the pedestrian link from Slatelands Road are not forced onto the carriageway within the turning head.

NOTE 4 – On street residential parking within the highway is no longer allowed by the Highway Authority. Wherever possible, the parking spaces should be provided within the curtilage of the property.

NOTE 5 – The arrangement of parking for Plot 9 is likely to encourage the owner to utilise the turning head for parking if they own more than 2 vehicles. This can lead to the turn head being obstructed. We would request that the parking arrangement be modified to discourage parking within the turning head.

NOTE 6 - The Highway Authority no longer accept shared surfaces within the highway because of the impact that this has on the blind and partially sighted. Therefore, footways will be required on that connect all the way to the frontage of the property. NOTE 7 - A 2m footway should be provided along the northern side of the access from Slatelands Road. If for some reason, this cannot be provided, then a 1m service strip should be considered. This is a requirement so that street lighting and other services can be provided on this side of the road.

Should the applicant choose not to incorporate the above amendments, the Highway Authority will not be in a position to consider these roads for adoption

DCC Highways (28.01.21):

It's noted that the current application is for a proposed development of 30no. residential units on the same, but slightly smaller area of, site as that for which Consent has been previously granted for overall development of, from a highways viewpoint, a similar nature and scale. This being the case, it's considered that the principle and potential impact on the wider highway network has been already accepted.

The main difference between the Consented development and the current proposal is means of vehicular access serving the site. Apart from a single unit, the former was to be served in entirety from Hollin Cross Road whereas it's now proposed to modify an existing dropped kerb crossing of the footway access with Slatelands Road to take the form of a junction to serve 17no. of the proposed dwellings. It's considered that the latter will result in a significant increase in vehicular use of the existing access with Slatelands Road and, consequentially, an increase in vehicular activity at the junction of this road with Hollin Cross Lane.

A Transport Statement has been submitted in support of the proposals in which it's stated that, based on OS survey data, exit visibility at the junction of Slatelands Road with Pikes Lane/ Hollin Cross Road is 2.4m x approximately 43m to the east and 2.4m x approximately 30m to the west. Requisite sightlines to be commensurate with recorded vehicle approach speeds are 2.4m x 29m and 2.4m x 32m respectively. Whilst it's recommended that the actual extents of visibility available should be determined by accurate site measurement, given

that the predicted 2-way trip generations at this junction would equate to one vehicle every 8 minutes and one every 7 minutes in the am and pm peak hours respectively and that the extant use of the site may also have generated vehicle activity via this route, it's considered that any objection on the Grounds of intensification in vehicular activity in this location would be likely to prove unsustainable.

Acceptable exit visibility sightlines have been demonstrated at each of the proposed access points to the existing public highway although it will need to be confirmed that the proposed junction layouts are on an accurate topographical survey base plan (rather than OS), include all existing highway features (e.g. dropped kerbs, street furniture, etc.) and have suitability for use by a Large Refuse Vehicle demonstrated by means of swept paths.

Any lengths of existing vehicular access made redundant by the proposals will need to be identified to be formally closed by reinstatement of the kerb and footway to the appropriate height.

Given the proposed geometry, and significant lengths of undeveloped frontage, the Highway Authority would not seek to adopt the proposed internal road layouts to be maintained in future at public expense. However, as advised at pre-application stage and included within Appendix A of the Statement, it is suggested that the internal layout should still generally comply with the recommendations contained within the Delivering Streets and Places design guide. Therefore, the following are issues that the future street manager may wish to give consideration to:-

The submitted site layout isn't dimensioned although the Transport Statement advises that the roads have a minimum carriageway width of 5 – 6m with a 2.0m width footway on each side. This does not appear to be the case for the full extent of the proposed roads, i.e. there are proposed lengths of shared surface (that should have a minimum corridor width of 7.5m).

Swept paths for a Large Refuse Vehicle of 11.6m length are demonstrated within the proposed turning heads although the layouts of these would not meet adoptable criteria. Manoeuvring in the vicinity of Plot 12 is considered to be tight particularly given the lack of margin on the proposed shared surface. It's recommended that the views of the local refuse collection service are sought with respect to accessing the proposed private access roads and general suitability of the proposals for their purposes.

For the benefit of future pedestrian users, it's recommended that areas for standing of waste bins are provided clear of the footways for use on refuse collection days and measures are installed to prevent surface water run-off from any plots at a higher level onto the proposed roads/ footways.

All proposed dwellings should be located within the maximum recommended mancarry distance of 25m of a turning facility suitable for use by a typical supermarket delivery type vehicle e.g. Plots 26, 27 & 28 would appear to be in excess of this.

It's stated that the proposed level of off-street parking satisfies your own Authority's standards and I trust that you will ensure that this is the case as any

under provision would be likely to result in vehicles being parked on the proposed roads or footways, potentially in areas dedicated to manoeuvring thereby negating them for their designated use, each situation considered to be against the best interests of safety for other users of the streets. Please note that, in order to comply with current recommendations, off-street parking spaces should be of 2.4m x 5.5m minimum dimension with an additional 0.5m of width to any side adjacent to a physical barrier e.g. hedge, wall, fence, etc. They should also be located at, or close to, 90° to the nearside carriageway channel to remove the need for awkward manoeuvring e.g. Plot 25, and be provided with adequate aisle width to the rear e.g. Plots 20 & 21 appear to be deficient in this respect.

Exit visibility sightlines based on perceived 85thile vehicle approach speeds should be demonstrated from all private driveways/ parking spaces/ etc. to the nearside carriageway channel in each direction, the areas in advance identified to be maintained clear of all obstructions greater than 1.0m in height (600mm in the case of vegetation) relative to the same channel level. This may impact individual curtilages behind the proposed footway (e.g. on the inside of bends in alignment) and includes locating designated parking spaces behind sightlines from adjacent spaces that may be of concern where there is no proposed margin.

DCC Landscape Architect (05.11.20):

Site character

The existing entrances to Redcourt are highlighted by metal railings/ brick piers and these create good sense of arrival and appropriate setting along with the mature parkland trees. Whilst historical changes have been detrimental to the setting I consider that a strong character remains and needs reinforcing.

The Slatelands Road entrance has ornamental gates and brick piers. The Boundary Treatment Drawing shows this to be modified to accommodate the new access, this is an important entrance and feature on the street and I consider that a more detailed drawing is required including an elevation to illustrate the proposed changes. A Yew tree (T42 category B1) and two Lime trees (43T and 45T both category A2) are proposed to be removed that make a good contribution to the street scene. These are proposed to be replaced by Cherry trees, however, I would prefer a more formal approach would be appropriate to highlight the entrance with Lime trees. Whilst it is understood that this entrance will serve a new function to provide access to housing I consider that its historical connection to Redcourt should not be severed. The existing route is partly picked up as a footpath but does not connect to Redcourt.

The group of Lime trees (1G category A2) along Hollins Cross Lane are an important feature relating to the grounds of Redcourt, whilst several are shown to be retained it is not clear how many are proposed to be removed to widen the existing access and this needs confirmation. A hedge is proposed behind the existing metal railings along Hollins Cross Lane. Much of Hollins Cross Lane is narrow and enclosed with little vegetation, the view of the lawn through the metal railings and under the trees is a pleasant relief from the enclosure and creates intriguing views in towards Redcourt and I consider it preferable to remain open and not to include a hedge.

I consider that the parking area and general arrangement to the frontage of Redcourt is detrimental to creating an appropriate frontage and sense of arrival. In particular I consider that the parking areas dominate and Block 05 is at an arbitrary angle detracting from creating a space that responds to Redcourt. A multipurpose space with a focal tree would be more appropriate. Better use needs to be made of the shared surface paving to reinforce this space.

Trees and Planting

A good proportion of the trees proposed for removal are species that would be associated with a Parkland setting, including Beech, Horse Chestnut and a good number of Limes. Whilst some replacement Limes are included, the replacement tree planting proposals predominantly contains smaller street tree species, particularly Birch. I consider these detract from the Parkland character and fewer large growing species more commonly associated with Parkland would be preferable.

These specimens should be well placed to act as focal points with the street scene arranged to complement them rather than smaller trees in filling in available spaces within a road access / parking layout.

Whilst it is welcome that native planting is proposed, the site is well wooded and the introduction of blocks of woodland planting in some areas seems unnecessary. Generally I would prefer native shrub planting in hedgerows as screens to boundaries and rear garden fences and the introduction of understory native shrub planting in areas further from Redcourt. A block of woodland planting is shown to the southern boundary of 15 Slatelands Road, whilst vegetation would be a welcome screen, I consider that a native hedge would be preferable so as not to increase shade to the property and that the hedge should run along the complete length of the chainlink fencing to be replaced up to the garden boundary of plot 12. A block of native shrub planting is proposed to the west of plot 12, I consider that the planting should create more of a Parkland character here.

The rear garden fences to plots 26, 27, 28, 29, 06, and 05 are close to the footpath to the east of the site and will create a poor experience. This has the potential to be a pleasant walk amongst the mature trees and I consider more distance is required to provide separation and a native hedge as a buffer.

The rear garden fencing to plots 21 to 25 need screening from Long Clough Brook with native shrub planting.

In many places, due to the existing well wooded nature of the site, there is conflict between rear garden fences and trees which is of concern. Details are included on the Tree Protection Plan to safeguard trees during installation, however there will still remain a long-term conflict with trees overhanging and shading gardens and being susceptible to lopping by residents.

Footpath Links

There are several areas where I consider that pedestrian circulation needs improving in the proposals.

No footpaths are included on the proposed layout to allow the experience of walking along Long Clough Brook. The Brook is a great resource and I consider that the development turns its back on it. The Design and Access Statement

(page 30) shows a layout with additional footpaths to the west of the site linking Hollins Cross Lane to Turnlee Road and along Long Clough Brook, however these are omitted on the proposed site plan. Long Clough Brook could make a valuable contribution to local amenity. There is a great potential to sensitively introduce footpaths and seating areas along Long Clough Brook for the benefit of local residents.

There is no link footpath to the proposed Woodland Play Area from Redcourt and the adjacent houses or from Redcourt to Slatelands Road.

Conclusion

Generally the approach and response to the retained Redcourt building needs to be greatly improved. In particular the proposals need to address the frontage to Redcourt in a more sensitive way. The proposed planting could be employed more effectively to screen garden boundaries and needs to reinforce the existing Parkland Character more strongly.

DCC Policy (15.09.21):

The local County Councillor Jean Wharmby and Councillor Damien Greenhalgh has been consulted for their respective views on the potential infrastructure requirements that may require contributions from developers.

At the time of writing, no comments have been received with regard to items covered in this response, however, I will forward any relevant comments received at a later date for your consideration.

£210,770.08 towards the provision of additional education facilities at Glossopdale School.

Refer to public file for detailed consultation wording.

DCC Policy (30.09.20):

Further to the DCC response dated 30th September 2020, comments have now been received from the local County Councillors, Councillor George Wharmby and Councillor Jean Wharmby. The Councillors have expressed their opposition to this proposed development on highways grounds and have provided their comments direct to High Peak Borough Council with regard to the detail. In addition concerns have also been expressed regarding the loss of trees and habitat on the proposed development site.

DCC Policy (30.09.20):

Education

The NPPF clearly sets out that the purpose of planning is to help achieve sustainable development. With regard to education, paragraph 94 of the NPPF (2018) reiterates this:

'It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement and to

development that will widen choice in education They should:

a) give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and

b) work with schools promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted'

The proposed development falls within and directly relates to the normal area of Whitfield St James' CofE (VC) Primary School. The proposed development of 30 dwellings would generate the need to provide for an additional 6 primary pupils.

Whitfield St James' CofE (VC) Primary School has a net capacity for 315 pupils, with 262 pupils currently on roll. The number of pupils on roll is projected to decrease during the next five years to 230.

An evaluation shows there are no recently approved residential developments of 11 or above units or over 1,000 square metres of floorspace within the normal area of Whitfield St James' CofE (VC) Primary School.

Analysis of the current and future projected number of pupils on roll, together with the impact of approved planning applications shows that the normal area primary school would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 6 primary pupils arising from the proposed development.

Secondary Level

The proposed development falls within and directly relates to the normal area of Glossopdale School. The proposed development of 30 dwellings would generate the need to provide for an additional 4 secondary and 2 post 16 pupils. Glossopdale School has a net capacity for 1,200 pupils with 1,099 pupils currently on roll. The number of pupils on roll is projected to increase to 1,244 during the next five years. An evaluation of recently approved residential developments of 11 or above units or over 1,000 square metres of floorspace within the normal area of Glossopdale School shows new development totalling 279 dwellings, amounting to an additional 42 secondary and 17 post16 pupils.

Analysis of the current and future projected number of pupils on roll, together with the impact of approved planning applications shows that the normal area secondary school would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 4 secondary and 2 post 16 pupils arising from the proposed development.

Mitigation

The above analysis indicates that there would be a need to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on school places in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms as the secondary school would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional pupils generated by the proposed development.

The County Council therefore requests financial contributions as follows: **£159,666.48** towards additional education facilities at Glossopdale School for to accommodate the 4 secondary and 2 post 16 pupils arising from the development.

Refer to public file for detailed consultation wording.

DCC Urban Design (24.11.20):

The application site falls within St James Conservation Area and is close to St James Church. Redcourt House is a non-designated heritage asset and is a prominent, large building set in expansive wooded grounds sloping down to Long Clough Brook.

I welcome the retention of Redcourt House as a landmark building in the area, however I have concerns regarding the detailing of the entrances and the changes to its setting with respect of the close bordered fencing around it, the positioning of car parks, and the closeness of proposed housing. This all has an impact on the stately park-like setting of the building within this woodland setting. I am not convinced that the parking spaces at the front and on arrival present a good sense of arrival.

The site access of Hollin Cross lane is to be altered and I would need to see the frontage detail to ensure the correct frontage character is retained. There is also a relationship to St Christopher's house and the detail needs to be clear. Will the direct visual relationship be maintained as it is now or will there be a boundary fence or wall. The red line boundary runs along the boundary adjacent to St Christopher's House.

I also welcome the demolition of inappropriate extensions to Redcourt House but agree with the Heritage Officer that a more informed approach should be taken to the changes. The use of UPVC windows and the enclosing of the gardens to the rear with close bordered fences rather than hedges are relatively unsympathetic alterations and we would wish to restore the building to a condition which would enhance the character of the conservation area.

Plots 05/06 seems to be strangely offset and angled. This does not work well in the otherwise rectilinear layout and rather than an intentional design solution gives the impression of tweaking the design rather than solving a design issue. I would like to understand the design rationale behind this.

Plot 12 and 13 detract from the garden space of Redcourt House and potentially diminishes the status of the building, whereas Plot 11 appears isolated and floating within the group.

The layouts within the lower platform areas tend to be curvilinear and clustered in two distinct groups. However, the semi-detached villa typology is out of character and too suburban for this 'estate' parkland character. My concern is the individual buildings blocks look too large. The appearance is more loose and scattered which doesn't quite match the formality of this style of house. Whereas the individual Plots 20 and 21 do little to relate to the streetscape and appear isolated and a poor termination of the group. The overall result is a rather discordant layout resulting in awkward leftover spaces in an attempt to fit houses where possible between tree groups.

Plot 28 feels uncomfortable and wedged in and ill grouped. The grouping of plots 26 to Plot 30 around a parking lots appears unresolved with overcomplicated footpaths.

The boundary between the upper plots at 05-10 backing on to the lower plots of 29 and 30 needs to be looked at carefully in terms of level changes. The stepped

access to lower gardens and the transition to the lower plots will require some retaining and return walls which needs to be clearly shown on the plan. I would like any retaining walls within the scheme to be clearly marked.

I would like to see a pedestrian link through the site between Slatelands Road and Hollin Cross Lane.

The boundary fences to plots 21 to 25 I consider a poor aspect to the Brook frontage.

Rather than Close bordered fences throughout the site I would prefer hedges, especially around the Redcourt building. The rear garden fences are a poor experience.

Removal of trees and replacement should reflect the Parkland setting with mature native focal trees. Blocks of planting are unnecessary in the woodland area. The views into the site from Hollin Cross Lane should not be blocked out by enhanced planting, but glimpsed views of Redcourt should be maintained to add to character of the Conservation Area.

In townscape, terms my original pre-application comments suggested that Redcourt be maintained as a landmark building in the area with smaller more subservient development of traditional terraced properties within the site expected within a stately parkland setting. The proposed development fails to achieve the right balance between preserving the character of the conservation area, the context of the setting within a parkland landscape and the townscape/streetscape and placemaking qualities required.

A larger amount of properties are served off Slatelands Road with pillars, gates and fencing changed to accommodate the access. This would be detrimental to the character of this corner on Slatelands Road and I would worry about the affect on the Conservation Area.

This is a sensitive and complex site to achieve the right balance between the demands of the wider conservation area sloping woodland setting and built development. The previous 2014 approval generally showed houses with a smaller footprint with more space around Redcourt House, and a series of houses stepping down the slope towards Long Clough Brook. Overall, there were 12 buildings. The previous approval also had a road mainly serviced of Hollin Cross descending through the site to a much larger building used for a supported living centre, with a single-story office unit and proposed lodge house at the gate to Slatelands Road. The character of this approval worked well with the topography and trees within the site, the space around Redcourt House and the contextual relationship to Slatelands Road which is a much more secondary road within the townscape than Hollin Cross Road. Redcourt House maintained its prominence and the housing footprints were generally smaller and less prominent. The supported living centre on the lower part of the site did not compete and fitted well in this lower platform without the need to remove more trees.

This proposal involves a similar overall footprint of buildings within the same area, but the internal layout has changed to show three distinct clusters and 16 buildings. Redcourt House is still the largest building but has more houses around it in a rectilinear arrangement with these houses forming a backdrop to Redcourt

house when viewed from Hollin Cross Road. These houses are generally larger in scale and massing than the previous scheme.

The layout also differs in that the lower part of the site is serviced of Slatelands Road. There is a separation between the upper part of the development and the lower part with a distinct change in levels to the rear of Plots 05 -10. This separation on the two parts of the scheme leads to a less legible and accessible layout.

The loose arrangement within the rest of the proposal doesn't quite work as the type of houses look more formal. I am happy that there are no garages and the parking is generally well placed in part at the sides of the houses. However, the parking in front of plots 26 to 30 needs to be detailed to work well as it feels too formal and parking lot like and despite the attempt to add in amenity planting the houses still appear arranged around a parking lot. This arrangement depending on landscaped verges is not contextual to this site and will result in overuse of inappropriate ornamental planting that does not reflect the natural woodland setting.

The house types are grander and less subservient. The previous house types were more domestic in scale with less prominent gables and smaller dormers, except for the proposed gatehouse. In my pre-application comments, I suggested that house types needed to reflect the context of a stately home with subservient traditional dwellings. Whilst I am happy with the improved quality of materials, I still think the building form should reflect a more traditional 'worker's terrace cottage style than a Victorian Villa style.

There are still areas for improvement within the scheme. A better sense of arrival into the frontage at Hollins Cross. More connectivity between both parts of the site and less dominant house types around Redcourt House. I would suggest villa style houses may be acceptable in the lower part closest to Slatelands Road, returning to a smaller less dominant courtyard arrangement area around the clustered parking area in the south-east of the plan. This all depends on ensuring a stately parkland setting with removal and replacement of native trees stock where possible in line with landscape officers' comments.

Recommendation.

At this point in time I am unable to recommend the scheme which requires to achieve a more balanced arrangement between the competing townscape, conservation area, and woodland setting.

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (14.09.21)

A greater number of trees will be retained, which we welcome and protection measures have been provided. We advise that the Ecological Management Plan (Rachel Hacking Ecology, 2020) and the Management Plan for the Woodland and Open Space Rev. A (TBA Landscape Architects, 2020) are updated to reflect the changes. We do not wish to make any additional comments. I have repeated our suggested conditions below for ease of reference (taken from letter ref: DWTHPK576a dated 7th January 2021) – please update the report references once updated.

Management Plans

The development shall proceed strictly in accordance with the [*Ecological Management Plan Rev. C (Rachel Hacking Ecology, 2020)*] and the [*Management Plan (Woodland and Open Space) Rev. A (TBA Landscape Architects, 2020)*]. These documents shall be implemented in full, including all mitigation, enhancement and monitoring requirements.

Lighting

Within three months of the planning decision, a detailed lighting strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA to safeguard bats and other nocturnal wildlife. This should provide details of the chosen luminaires, their locations and any mitigating features such as dimmers, PIR sensors and timers. A lux contour plan shall be provided to demonstrate acceptable levels of lightspill to any sensitive ecological zones/features (woodland and watercourse). Guidelines can be found in Guidance Note 08/18 - Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK (BCT and ILP, 2018). Such approved measures will be implemented in full.

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (07.01.21):

We have reviewed the revised versions of the Ecological Management Plan and the Management Plan (Woodland and Open Space). All of our comments have been addressed with the relevant amendments made in each document. We have updated the suggested condition wording below:

Management Plans

The development shall proceed strictly in accordance with the Ecological Management Plan Rev. C (Rachel Hacking Ecology, 2020) and the Management Plan (Woodland and Open Space) Rev. A (TBA Landscape Architects, 2020). These documents shall be implemented in full, including all mitigation, enhancement and monitoring requirements.

Lighting

Within three months of the planning decision, a detailed lighting strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA to safeguard bats and other nocturnal wildlife. This should provide details of the chosen luminaires, their locations and any mitigating features such as dimmers, PIR sensors and timers. A lux contour plan shall be provided to demonstrate acceptable levels of lightspill to any sensitive ecological zones/features (woodland and watercourse). Guidelines can be found in Guidance Note 08/18 - Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK (BCT and ILP, 2018). Such approved measures will be implemented in full

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (07.01.21):

We have reviewed the Bat Survey of Trees report, Bat Activity Survey report and the two Management Plans submitted with the application and have the following comments:

Bat Activity Surveys (Rachel Hacking Ecology, 2019)

This document provides sufficient detail and survey work is considered recent enough to support the planning application. We would always recommend undertaking three bat surveys when buildings are considered to display high roost potential, in accordance with standard guidelines (Collins, 2016), particularly when surrounded by good habitat. The consultants decided in this instance that two

surveys of Building 1 were sufficient, based on the results of the first two and no evidence of bats recorded internally. Whilst we do not support deviating from guidelines without good reason, on balance and taking into consideration the two transect surveys that were also undertaken, the survey work undertaken is likely to be sufficient to determine presence/absence of bats and likely impacts.

Bat Survey of Trees (Rachel Hacking Ecology, 2020)

This document provides sufficient detail and we have no specific comments.

Ecological Management Plan (Rachel Hacking Ecology, 2020)

We advise that this document should refer to the Woodland and Open Space Plan (see below), which provides specific details on planting mixes, species and locations.

The specified protection fencing along the brook should be shown on the Plan at the end of the document.

This specifies 10 x 1B bird boxes or similar. We advise that a variety of boxes should be provided, including boxes suitable for tree creeper, nuthatch and owl, as well as general nest boxes.

Management Plan (Woodland and Open Space) (TBA Landscape Architects, 2020) Section 5.4.5 specifies controlling Himalayan balsam through pulling. It should state that this should be undertaken before flowering in July so as not to cause more spread of seeds.

Section 6.10 refers to wildflower planting in the woodland, however on the plan this is specified as different types of amenity grassland seed mix. This should be amended to appropriate shade tolerant woodland ground flora to enhance the woodland habitat.

Section 6.13 specifies the monitoring of woodland ground flora, however the optimal time for this is in spring rather than late summer as stated. This should be amended.

Conclusion

We advise that sufficient information has been provided to determine the application. The amendments advised above should be incorporated and the Management Plans secured through suitable condition wording. We also advise a condition for sensitive lighting to safeguard the woodland and watercourse habitats for wildlife. We have suggested condition wording below to be amended as necessary.

Management Plans

The development shall proceed strictly in accordance with the Ecological Management Plan (Rachel Hacking Ecology, 2020) and the Management Plan (Woodland and Open Space) (TBA Landscape Architects, 2020). These documents shall be implemented in full, including all mitigation, enhancement and monitoring requirements.

Lighting

Within three months of the planning decision, a detailed lighting strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA to safeguard bats and other

nocturnal wildlife. This should provide details of the chosen luminaires, their locations and any mitigating features such as dimmers, PIR sensors and timers. A lux contour plan shall be provided to demonstrate acceptable levels of lightspill to any sensitive ecological zones/features (woodland and watercourse). Guidelines can be found in Guidance Note 08/18 - Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK (BCT and ILP, 2018). Such approved measures will be implemented in full.

HPBC Arboricultural (25.12.21):

On the most basic level the individual tree planting plus the woodland type planting does provide for more than the 2:1 replacement required by local plan EQ9.

I do note however that the landscaping in the vicinity of Redcourt does not enhance the setting of this building.

The proposed layout leads to the loss of several mature trees of species with a significant stature such as Beech and Horse Chestnut

The replacement planting in this area with exception of a solitary Lime tree is of trees of a lesser stature and a shorter life expectancy such as Whitebeam, Rowan and Magnolia. The layout of this area does restrict locations for planting and has not been designed with replacement planting in mind. The trees appear to have been added as an afterthought.

The ideal is to retain more of the mature tree cover in this area and where this is not viable, the mitigation landscaping needs to provide a sustainable legacy.

HPBC Arboricultural (23.09.21):

Additional comments layout 5417-PAL-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1100 P14 Dated 23-7-21 2021:

2.3 A revised layout 5417-PAL-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-1100 V P14 July 2021 has been submitted with a revised arboricultural report which accommodates the retention of several groups G41, G40 and one tree from G20 and the retention of T43 T45 T7 and T8.

Some impact has been reduced by removing woodland paths and minor alterations to the layout.

2.4 The magnitude of tree loss and impact is greater than previous proposals in particular the development window has increased in the following areas:

2.4.1 Plots 12 and 13 to west of Redcourt require the removal of 23T category B Sycamore, this was previously avoided by locating these plots further to the east. Now plots 9 and 10 no change

2.4.2 Plot 11 requires the removal 26T a category A beech, 26T and 28T limes (category B), to allow access and the partial removal of 40G and 41G to accommodate the footprint. This plot has a modest garden area and will be heavily shaded by trees to the west and south which will put pressure in retained trees. Now plot 9 No change to tree removal

2.4.5 Plots 18 to 23 encroach further into the wooded area than previous proposals requiring the removal of most 119G and 115G. Group 119G comprises 18 mature category B sycamore trees which were retained in previous proposals. Now plots 11-19 Alteration of the layout in this area gives some improvement with G115 being retained

2.4.7 Plots 14-17 also have modest gardens and will also be impacted in by the woodland and shaded in the late afternoon and evening/ Plots 19 and 18 have larger garden and the impact of shading may be less in these cases. Now 11-13.

6. Summary

6.1 The magnitude of tree loss and impact is greater than previous approved proposals. Largely caused by the location of plots 11-12* and associated access and greater development to the west of the site in particular plots 19-23** which encroach further into the wooded area. The higher density of residential properties and the additional access off Slatelands also leads to addition tree loss and pressure on remaining trees for inappropriate pruning and/or removal felling.

* The layout has changed here but plots 5-10 and associated hardstanding and car parking have a significant impact on the loss of mature trees.

** These plots have been changed and the impact on the woodland reduced in this area. Now plots 11-19, 11, 12, 13 and 19 will be particularly impacted on by the shading of the woodland.

6.2 There is greater loss of higher quality category A and B trees many of which were to be retained in previous proposals. Amendments all for 2 more category A trees to be retained T43 and T45, but there is still significant loss of higher quality trees.

6.3 The tree loss will adversely impact on the Conservation Area. It will be noticeable outside the site and will impact on the parkland setting of Redcourt.

6.4 The mitigation will replace some of the tree loss, but it is inadequate to compensate for the impact on the woodland areas or the loss of amenity trees. Much of the planting is of short-lived species and often located under or near established trees and therefore may not in itself be sustainable. There will be a net loss of tree cover which will be compounded by the poor relationship between the properties and retained trees.

6.5 A scheme more sensitive to the tree constraints on the site has previously been approved but the current proposals will have a more significant impact. The site constraints make it difficult to mitigate for the tree cover loss within the current scheme. The main areas of concern are the impact in the vicinity of plots 11-13, ideally plot 11 would be omitted. Also the access off Slatelands and plots 18-23 which encroach significantly in to the wooded area to the west previously to be retained. Some of these amendments have been included which is welcomed but the impact on the mature trees and setting of Redcourt has not been addressed

6.6 Local plan policy EQ9 states that the Council will protect existing trees and woodlands by

requiring that existing woodlands, healthy, mature trees and hedgerows are

retained and integrated within a proposed development unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh their loss

6.7 In the case whilst a balance was previously reached this application represents an increased magnitude of impact that needs to be considered as part of the overall planning balance.

The same policy requires that

new developments where appropriate to provide tree planting and soft landscaping, including where possible the replacement of any trees that are removed at a ratio of 2:1.

In this case the mitigation offered does not meet this requirement.

HPBC Arboricultural (19.11.21):

1. Background

Application for Demolition of redundant buildings including partial demolition of modern extensions to Redcourt and redevelopment of site to provide 30 dwellings (Use Class C3) including the retention and conversion of Redcourt together with access, parking and landscaping.

1.2 The site is within the St James Conservation Area and Derbyshire County Council Tree Preservation Order No 61 /A26 DCCTPO made in 1960 which covers trees more than 60 years old. The vast majority of the remaining trees are protected by virtue of being within in the Conservation Area.

1.3 The principal of development for this site has been established in previous applications (HPK/2014/0064, HPK/2015/0673). All previous proposals have required some tree removal balanced against mitigation in the form of new tree planting and woodland management.

1.4 The most recent proposals has raised significant local concern and objections to the proposal include the impact the current proposals will have on the trees and woodland.

1.5 This assessment of this proposal is focused on the following
Is the magnitude of impact on the tree cover greater than previous approved proposals?
What is the balance of impact between the higher amenity good quality trees and those in poor condition or of a lesser amenity?
Will the loss of trees adversely impact on the Conservation Area?
Is the mitigation adequate?

Arboricultural impact

2.1 122 individual trees or groups are recorded. 38 individual trees are to be removed and 9 groups of trees are to be entirely or partially removed to accommodate the proposals. The tree survey does not give the numbers of trees in each group but it is estimated that around another 50 individual trees including 4 Category A lime trees (1G) and approximately 18 category B sycamores (119G) are to be removed to accommodate the proposals.

2.2 A further 39 individual trees or groups are impacted on by development either by Encroachment into the recommended minimal Root Protection Area (RPA) as recommended by BS5837:2012

- Potentially negatively affected by demolition
- Poor relationship to new dwellings

2.3 It is noted that Group 122 is a large area of woodland the majority of which is to be retained and is part of the woodland management plan area. Nevertheless around 20% of the existing canopy cover on the site is to be removed directly to accommodate the proposals. With further trees being impacted on that may lead to their removal in the short and medium term.

2.4 The magnitude of tree loss and impact is greater than previous proposals in particular the development window has increased in the following areas

2.4.1 Plots 12 and 13 to west of Redcourt require the removal of 23T category B Sycamore, this was previously avoided by locating these plots further to the east.

2.4.2 Plot 11 requires the removal 26T a category A beech, 26T and 28T limes (category B), to allow access and the partial removal of 40G and 41G to accommodate the footprint. This plot has a modest garden area and will be heavily shaded by trees to the west and south which will put pressure in retained trees.

2.4.3. New access of Slatelands. Previously the western part of the site was accessed from Hollin Cross Road and the existing entrance. The introduction of the new access point requires the removal of 4 healthy mature trees 42T Yew (category B) 43T and 45T Limes (category A) and 44T Sycamore (category B). The access also impacts on the Root Protection Area (RPA) of several trees in the woodland area separating the west and eastern parts of the site.

2.4.4 Woodland buffer. The proposals include informal access to the Woodland area between east and west parts. There are plans for the construction of an informal path network. This is briefly mentioned in the Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) but there is not substantive detail at this stage. This combined with the Informal woodland play area will put pressure on the retained trees to be managed to reduce actual and perceived risk.

2.4.5 Plots 18 to 23 encroach further into the wooded area than previous proposals requiring the removal of most 119G and 115G. Group 119G comprises 18 mature category B sycamore trees which were retained in previous proposals.

2.4.6 Plots 20 -25 will be dominated by the woodland area to the south and the garden areas will be shaded.

2.4.7 Plots 14-17 also have modest gardens and will also be impacted in by the woodland and shaded in the late afternoon and evening/ Plots 19 and 18 have larger garden and the impact of shading may be less in these cases.

2.5 It should also be taken into account that there will be additional tree loss due to ash dieback disease. National guidance and research indicates that 90% of ash trees will be infected and assessment and observation of trees in the local

area indicates that this will be the case within Glossop. The tree survey identifies 16 individual Ash trees 7 are to be felled to accommodate the proposals and 9 are to be retained but will be retained for the time being but are under threat from Ash Dieback and it is very probably these trees will be removed or heavily pruned within 5 years or so to manage risk. Particularly if near residential properties, roads and other public areas. In addition to individual trees ash comprises is part of the composition of some of the larger groups and woodland. This will compound the tree loss required to accommodate the proposals.

Other associated impacts

3.1 The trees are important in terms of the wider landscape and as part of the heritage of the site and parkland setting for Redcourt.

3.2 Landscape

Derbyshire county Council landscape officer has assessed the site in a wider landscape scale and concluded:

Generally, the approach and response to the retained Redcourt building needs to be greatly improved. In particular the proposals need to address the frontage to Redcourt in a more sensitive way. The proposed planting could be employed more effectively to screen garden boundaries and needs to reinforce the existing Parkland Character more strongly.

3.3 Conservation and Heritage

The Conservation Officer notes that:

the number, siting, form and detail of the buildings, as well as loss of trees, will impact significantly on the historic estate. And that the design of the conversion can be improved to more closely respect the building's historic significance and the new dwellings will detrimentally impact on the historic character of the landscaped grounds, compounded by loss of mature trees and screening.

3.4 The mature trees are clearly important for the setting of the building and contribute to the Character of the Conservation Area. In addition, the mature trees and woodland clearly provide local habitat and biodiversity opportunities.

Tree Protection

4.1 The proposals included in The Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) provides an outline of the type of tree protection and supervision. This would need further detail before it could be approved particularly in relation to the location and impact of services, site levels, informal pathways and the woodland and other construction elements within the Root Protection Areas of the retained trees. The provision of a more comprehensive AMS would be the condition of any approval.

4.2 The existing TPO is now relatively dated (1960) and protects the most mature trees on the site. The Conservation Area affords protection for almost all other trees on the site. When development plans for the site are finalised there is a case for considering making a new HPBC Tree Preservation Order, which is up to date more specific and includes the replacement planting. This will better protected to the evolving landscape of the site. In the meantime the existing protection is adequate.

Mitigation

Woodland Management Plan

A woodland management plan has been provided This is for 10 years – the greatest benefit would be from a longer-term plan. It is not entirely clear how this will be funded or who will be responsible for its implementation and review after 10 years.

The plan provides limited detail in terms of the existing structure and species diversity of the woodland areas.

The plan will enable some positive management to take place such as management of invasive species, improving ground conditions for some trees. There is potential to improve and enhance biodiversity

There is proposed thinning of 122G, or zone D as it is called in the plan, this will include felling up to 20% of the trees. But without an assessment of the structure and species composition of the existing woodland area there is no clear justification for this work or evidence that it is required

There is some woodland planting proposed this may help to improve the structure and diversity but, again it's not clear that is needed other than to replace the trees that are thinned out as specified in the same plan and to offer some tree planting mitigation. The woodland planting mixes proposed are heavily weighted towards the smaller understorey species with little or no replacement of high canopy species such as Oak, which would be a substitute for the declining ash population in this instance.

Whilst a woodland management plan is welcome and has the potential to add some biodiversity and sustainability to the retained landscape areas as it stands it will at best maintain the status quo, but unless sustainably secured and with the additional pressures from close proximity to residential properties it is possible the condition of the woodland could decline.

Amenity landscaping

The plan includes 55 standard trees to be planted across the site, some within proposed amenity space and the occasional tree in garden/parking areas. Local plan policy EQ9, requires that a 2:1 replacement is achieved where possible in this case the replacement is less than 1:1 as it is estimated in section 2:1 that 88 trees will be removed within the main sure. There will be additional tree loss within the woodland which is dealt with in section 5.1

The species proposed for replacement planting are from a limited range of species and as noted by the County landscape Officer

Whilst some replacement Limes are included, the replacement tree planting proposals predominantly contains smaller street tree species, particularly Birch. I consider these detract from the Parkland character and fewer large growing species more commonly associated with Parkland would be preferable.

A good diversity of species is important to provide a robust tree planting scheme we would normally expect a scheme to follow the 30:20:10 rule so that there is not more than 30% of the species from one botanical family, 20% from a genus and

10% form any one species.

Summary

6.1 The magnitude of tree loss and impact is greater than previous approved proposals. Largely cause by the location of plots 11-12 and associated access and greater development to the west of the site in particular plots 19-23 which encroach further into the wooded area. The higher density of residential properties and the additional access off Slatelands also leads to addition tree loss and pressure on remaining trees for inappropriate pruning and/or removal felling.

6.2 There is greater loss of higher quality category A and B trees many of which were to be retained in previous proposals.

6.3 The tree loss will adversely impact on the Conservation Area. It will be noticeable outside the site and will impact on the parkland setting of Redcourt.

6.4 The mitigation will replace some of the tree loss but it is inadequate to compensate for the impact on the woodland areas or the loss of amenity trees. Much of the planting is of short-lived species and often located under or near established trees and therefore may not in itself be sustainable. There will be a net loss of tree cover which will be compounded by the poor relationship between the properties and retained trees.

6.5 A scheme more sensitive to the tree constraints on the site has previously been approved but the current proposals will have a more significant impact. The site constraints make it difficult to mitigate for the tree cover loss within the current scheme. The main areas of concern are the impact in the vicinity of plots 11-13, ideally plot 11 would be omitted. Also the access off Slatelands and plots 18-23 which encroach significantly into the wooded area to the west previously to be retained.

6.6 Local plan policy EQ9 states that the Council will protect existing trees and woodlands by

requiring that existing woodlands, healthy, mature trees and hedgerows are retained and integrated within a proposed development unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh their loss

In the case whilst a balance was previously reached this application represents and increased magnitude of impact that needs to be considered as part of the overall planning balance

6.7 The same policy requires that

new developments where appropriate to provide tree planting and soft landscaping, including where possible the replacement of any trees that are removed at a ratio of 2:1.

In this case the mitigation offered does not meet this requirement

HPBC Conservation Officer (19.10.21):

Updated comments following revised scheme (to be read in conjunction with the existing comments)

The photographic schedule of Redcourt is useful and should be used to condition the retention of the main internal features (which I would assume that the architects would wish to do anyway) and external features in the estate.

I still remain concerned by the dominance of car parking throughout the site. Cars are pushed to the road frontage which will increase the urban feel and expanse of hard landscaping. It is unfortunate that we still have a pair of semi-detached buildings (units 9 7 10) on the former formal gardens to the west of Redcourt which will impact on its sense of isolation and not the type of building you would expect to see in this location. Redcourt should be given more green space around it, not impacted by parked cars and buildings. The new footpath link between Redcourt and Slateland's Road is an improvement.

The conversion of Redcourt is now more sympathetic – reinstating features, including chimneys which will enhance significance. My only concern now with this element is the subdivision of the gardens and the impact of these on the building's setting. We absolutely don't want to see solid boarded fences and any gardens should be well screened from the road. Is there any opportunity for more communal space?

The terrace block facing Redcourt (units 5-8) is improved in its siting and design. I would question whether the semi opposite could be removed and linked onto the terrace to create an L-shape or courtyard – to reflect a mews-style of housing or stable courtyard which you might expect to see in this area.

Levels remain a concern between the terrace (units 5-8) and units 22 & 23 – this change in level will require extensive engineering and not reflective of a parkland landscape.

Overall, I don't feel that the overall scheme gives Redcourt the space and setting that it needs to reflect its status, and the new dwellings and infrastructure in the parkland grounds take too much away from the setting of Redcourt and the quality of the designed landscape. I consider that the scheme still represents less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

HPBC Conservation Officer (03.11.20):

Heritage Significance

The site falls in the St James Conservation Area and close to St James' Church, a Grade II Listed Building (together with separately Listed Lytch Gate and funerary monument). I note that the application site is now smaller than the 2014 scheme and the exclusion of the adjacent building on Hollin Cross Lane means that there is now more of a buffer between the church and application site. Redcourt is a non-designated heritage asset in the Conservation Area and this is a prominent and striking, large building set in expansive, wooded grounds sloping down towards Long Clough Brook. The character of the Conservation Area in this location is dominated by tightly packed stone and slate terraced housing with some larger villas, on almost a grid-pattern layout, and the application site is particularly noted for its mature woodland and historic estate character, together with views through to Redcourt. The adopted character appraisal provides further detail.

Redcourt dates from the 1900s, built in an Arts and Crafts style, and was one of the last large buildings of the period to be built in this area and the only one to be constructed out of brick. It has been made even more prominent because of the painting of the brick and stone detailing. The entrance gates and wall off Slatelands Road provides evidence of what the materials would have looked like before they were painted. The building was constructed for a local doctor, later lived in by Sir Edward Partington and then became a hostel for mill workers before being taken over by the St Christopher's Trust in 1954. After this date, the building had a series of unsympathetic additions and several functional buildings were constructed in the grounds. Historic maps show the network of paths and landscaped grounds and its close relationship to the church and vicarage. The historic maps also show that the more modern buildings were placed outside the landscaped grounds to Redcourt.

Permission was given in 2014 (HPK/2014/0064) for a new apartment block of 18 units for supported living, and the construction of 22 houses, including the conversion of Redcourt into 4 dwellings, vertically split.

Current Proposal: The application proposes the conversion of Redcourt into 4 town houses (vertically split) and the construction of 26 dwellings in the grounds. All outbuildings and later extensions to Redcourt will be demolished.

Redcourt

The main external changes to Redcourt involve:

South elevation: Removal of upvc conservatory, entrance veranda with glazed canopy (no construction details) and external metal stairs. Removal of upvc conservatory, replacing it with grey aluminium window. Removal of entrance porch, install flat roof over and metal window.

North elevation: Large, flat-roof extension removed and gable made good. Install four independent access doors to flats with metal doors, steps and metal canopies over. Ground levels modified.

West elevation: Revised doorway with metal stairs and canopy over. Restore gable

East elevation: Insert door in place of window, metal door and stairs

The Heritage Statement notes that internal, external and original features and fabric contributing to significance will be retained and restored where possible, brick will be reinstated, painted or replaced. It also notes that scheme will reintroduce footpaths and public access into woods and reinstate the parkland character.

Comments:

Whilst it is encouraging that Redcourt is now to be retained and unsightly additions are to be removed, we need to understand the heritage asset to assess significance and ensure changes work with that significance. We need a more appraisal of Redcourt – identifying phasing, historic detailing and negative elements. Historic and annotated modern photos would be useful. The application proposes some significant changes to this building, and we need to be assured that they are appropriate for the heritage asset. The Heritage Statement mentions that internal features will be restored where appropriate, but we have no information and I note that there will be substantial internal changes including the main staircase is to be removed. I acknowledge that the building is not Listed but an understanding of the historic floor plan and key features will assist

understanding the building's significance.

We also require an assessment of other buildings and structures on the site to identify features of interest – such as boundary walls, historic paths, historic landscaping, designed views, gates, railings etc. This must include photos.

At this stage I have concerns regarding the loss of (I assume) the building's historic entrance which is to be replaced by a metal window and flat roof over and the proposed covered veranda with very dominant steps and railings. This will greatly affect the legibility of the historic building. I have concerns regarding the prominence of the separate entrances with their steps and metal canopies, particularly on the north elevation which is visible from the road. These changes will be obtrusive and will not don't work use design details that respect the language of the building. I feel that the architect needs to step back and try as far as possible to work with the historic façade and its legibility. Consideration should be given to reinstating some of the chimneys (truncated remains are still visible externally) as the building appears unfinished and diminished in stature without them. The application should consider using metal, double glazed windows rather than upvc to allow slimmer frames to get more light into the building and the inserted windows should follow the historic design.

New Build

I have not assessed the new housing in detail at this stage because the number, siting, form and detail of the buildings, as well as loss of trees, will impact significantly on the historic estate. The scheme is denser than the approved scheme and most properties are three storeys with high ridges, wide gables and dormers. The buildings, particularly because of their scale, form and massing are not characteristic of the area. It is encouraging, however, that natural stone and slate are proposed for building materials. Chimneys should be considered for some of the more prominent buildings.

I note that a new vehicular access is to be provided off Slatelands Road, utilising the existing historic access but no details are provided.

Other issues such as boundaries, landscaping, fenestration and lighting all need to be carefully considered at a later stage.

Conclusion

The Heritage Statement acknowledges that the proposal will cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area but it argues that one of the public benefits will be the retention of the Redcourt building, removal of later extensions and poor alterations and the historic part will be sensitively restored. I agree that the proposal will constitute less than substantial harm but at this stage I feel that the design of the conversion can be improved to more closely respect the building's historic significance and the new dwellings will detrimentally impact on the historic character of the landscaped grounds, compounded by loss of mature trees and screening.

HPBC Environmental Health (01.10.20):

Conditional Response:

The phase 1 land contamination desk study report (Hydrock, ref: 12804-HYD-XX-

XX-RP-GE-1001-S0-P01.01, dated 5th July 2019) submitted in support of the application recommends that the assessment progress to a phase 2 intrusive investigation. For this reason and to protect the health of the public and the wider environment a Phase 2 contamination condition is recommended. The construction/demolition stage of the development could lead to an increase of noise and dust etc. experienced at sensitive premises and subsequent loss of amenity and for this reason further conditions are suggested.

Refer to public file for detailed condition wording.

HPBC Regeneration (11.11.21):

The application is for 30 dwellings on a site which already has presumption of development already been established by the approved application HPK/2014/0064 in 2014, which sought to provide new supported living facilities and 22 dwellings by the local charitable trust, St Christopher's Trust. In the 2014 application, the site would have been used in part to support jobs associated with supported living, which provides an economic activity in the community. As this is now a fully residential proposal, I would refer you to my colleagues in planning policy to confirm if this change is acceptable in policy terms without evidence to show that site is no longer viable for its established use class.

New housing building generates an economic uplift during construction and the future occupiers will also generate uplift to the local economy via local spend. The Council has adopted a multiplier, based on evidenced research on economic uplift generated through new housing. My colleagues within housing development team (Kate Hall/Jo Brooks) are best placed to provide evidence on this, alongside any commentary on social housing contribution/provision.

HPBC Service Commissioning (21.10.21):

In terms of the open space contributions on 23 units, these would be as follows:-

Play - £192 x 23 = £4,416

Parks and Gardens - £571 x 23 = £13,133

Outdoor Sports - £489.40 x 23 = £11,256.20

Allotments - £76.95 x 23 = £1,769.85

HPBC Service Commissioning (28.01.21):

From an Active Design perspective there are two access points which link routes to Philip Howard School at one end, and Whitfield Rec at the other.

There are several footpaths through the on-site open space providing links through the site from both ends. One is onto Ashton Street at the southeast end, and then onto Turnlee Drive – this does provide access through the site from existing housing at this end, for children attending Philip Howard School.

The footpath at the eastern edge of the site which links to the new access road and then onto Hollin Cross Lane, does run quite close to the back of the corner plot property which may cause nuisance issues in the future.

Lead Local Flood Authority (08.09.21):

Refer to response below.

Lead Local Flood Authority (26.01.21):

Conditional Response:

1. No development shall take place until a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of the surface water drainage for the site, in accordance with the principles outlined within: a. Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Management Strategy, Document Ref No: HYD512-HOLLIN.CROSS.LANE-FRA & DMS, Revision 2, Date of issue: 12/08/2020, Author: Kirsty Williams and “including any subsequent amendments or updates to those documents as approved by the Flood Risk Management Team” b. And DEFRA’s Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (March 2015), No objections in principle Conditions Recommended X Objection Recommended PUBLIC have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

2. No development shall take place until a detailed assessment has been provided to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to demonstrate that the proposed destination for surface water accords with the drainage hierarchy as set out in paragraph 80 reference ID: 7-080-20150323 of the planning practice guidance.

3. Prior to commencement of the development, the applicant shall submit for approval to the LPA details indicating how additional surface water run-off from the site will be avoided during the construction phase. The applicant may be required to provide collection, balancing and/or settlement systems for these flows. The approved system shall be operating to the satisfaction of the LPA, before the commencement of any works, which would lead to increased surface water run-off from site during the construction phase.

4. The attenuation ponds should not be brought into use until such a time as it is fully designed and constructed in line with CIRIA SuDS manual C753 and to the agreed specifications on documents to be provided by the applicant and an associated management and maintenance plan, in line with CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

5. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls).

Refer to public file for detailed consultation wording.

Lead Local Flood Authority (21.10.20):

Objection:

The applicant has not provided any drainage related documents and it is not possible to provide an informed comment until such a time that the applicant has submitted the required information

As a statutory consultee for surface water the minimum details required on all major planning applications are as follows:

- Site plan and impermeable area
- Topographic survey of the site
- Appropriate evidence to support how the site will drain, including confirmation of where the surface water will outfall to (photographs / maps / a confirmation letter from a water company)
- Basic calculations of the greenfield/brownfield runoff and discharge rates, (refer to Point J in the Advisory Notes)
- A quick storage estimate to show the required storage volume of surface water on site and an indication of the likely location
- Calculations should include allowances for the current Environment Agency guidance for climate change and urban creep (Refer to Point J in the Advisory Notes)
- Basic ground investigation (desktop survey as a minimum)
- Major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate (as per National Planning Policy Framework 165).

These details are required at the early planning stage to demonstrate that the proposed site is able to drain and that due consideration has been given to the space required on site for surface water storage.

Refer to public file for detailed consultation wording.

United Utilities (13.10.20):

Conditional Response:

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way. We request the following drainage conditions are attached to any subsequent approval to reflect the above approach:

Condition 1 – Surface water

No development shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme must include:

- (i) An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water;
- (ii) A restricted rate of discharge of surface water agreed with the local planning authority (if it is agreed that infiltration is discounted by the investigations); and
- (iii) A timetable for its implementation.

The approved scheme shall also be in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacement national standards.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved drainage scheme.

Condition 2 – Foul water

Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.

The culverted watercourse that crosses the site is not a United Utilities Asset and contact should be made with the riparian owner who is responsible for the watercourse.

Refer to public file for detailed consultation wording.

6. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

High Peak Local Plan Adopted April 2016

Policy S1 Sustainable Development Principles

Policy S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy S2 Settlement Hierarchy

Policy S5 Glossop Sub-area Strategy

Policy EQ1 Climate Change

Policy EQ5 Biodiversity

Policy EQ6 Design and Place Making

Policy EQ7 Built and Historic Environment

Policy EQ9 Trees, Woodlands and hedgerows

Policy EQ10 Pollution Control and Unstable Land

Policy EQ11 Flood Risk Management

Policy EQ6 Promoting Peak District Tourism & Culture

Policy H1 Location of Housing Development

Policy H3 New Housing Development

Policy H4 Affordable Housing

Policy CF5 Provision and Retention of Local Community Services and Facilities

Policy CF6 Accessibility and Transport

Policy CF7 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 (as revised)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

High Peak Design Guide 2018 SPD (Supplementary Planning Document)

Glossop Conservation Areas Character Appraisal

7. POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Planning Policy Context

7.1 The determination of a planning application should be made pursuant to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which is to be

read in conjunction with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

7.2 Section 38(6) requires the Local Planning Authority to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material considerations which 'indicate otherwise'. Section 70(2) provides that in determining applications the Adopted Local Planning Authority "shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application and to any other material considerations". The Development Plan for the borough consists of the Adopted High Peak Local Plan dated April 2016.

7.3 Achieving sustainable development sits at the heart of the NPPF. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF outlines that achieving sustainable development requires the consideration of three overarching and mutually dependant objectives being: economic, social and environmental where they are to be applied to local circumstances of character, need and opportunity of each area. These objectives are interdependent and should be pursued in mutually supportive ways and comprise;

- a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of the present and future generations; and by fostering well designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well being; and,
- c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making the effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

7.4 Section 5 of the Framework relates to delivering a sufficient supply of homes. Paragraph 60 identifies that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.

7.5 LP (Local Plan) Policy S1a establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development as contained within NPPF paragraph 11. It requires decision makers to apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision makers this means that when considering development proposals which accord with the development plan they should be approved without delay or where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, grant planning permission unless:-

i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

7.6 The Council can currently demonstrate 5.22 years supply of housing land (as at 1st April 2020) including a 5% buffer and meeting the shortfall within the next five years using the agreed Liverpool Method approach. Accordingly, for decision makers this means that when considering development proposals which accord with the development plan they should be approved without delay within the context of NPPF paragraph 11.

Principle of Development

7.7 Development will be directed towards the most sustainable locations in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out at LP Policy S2 'Settlement Hierarchy'. In accordance with the settlement hierarchy, Glossop is regarded as a 'Market town' where a moderate scale of development may be acceptable, consistent with meeting local rural needs and maintaining or enhancing their role, distinctive character or appearance whilst also maintaining existing facilities and services.

7.8 In particular, LP Policy S5 'Glossop Sub-area Strategy' seeks: "to promote the sustainable growth of the Central Area such that it reflects the historic character of the settlements, provides increasing range of employment opportunities, promotes the growth of a sustainable tourist economy and meets the housing needs of the local community".

7.9 LP Policy H1 'Location of Housing Development' seeks to ensure provision is made for housing taking into account all other policies in the Local Plan. This will be achieved by, amongst other mechanisms, promoting "the effective reuse of land by encouraging housing development including redevelopment, infill, conversion of existing dwellings and the change of use of existing buildings to housing, on all sites suitable for that purpose".

7.10 HPK/2014/0064 "Redevelopment to provide new supported living facility (Use Class C2) and 22 dwellings (Use Class C3) including the retention and conversion of Redcourt" was approved August 2014, however, has lapsed and also predates the Adopted Development Plan to carry any material weight to the determination of the application in these regards.

Local Community Services and Facilities

7.11 LP Policy CF5 'Provision and Retention of Local Community Services and Facilities' seeks to maintain and improve the provision of local community services and facilities, supporting proposals which protect, retain or enhance existing community facilities. Proposals which involve the loss of community assets and facilities (including health facilities) will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the existing use is no longer financially or commercially viable and there are no other means of maintaining the facility or an alternative is

available in an accessible location. If permission is given for change of use or redevelopment, preference will be given to premises retaining some form of community or employment use so long as it does not affect traffic, amenity, environmental or conservation problems.

7.12 The applicant sets out that the site has been vacant for a number of years and is currently overgrown. It is occupied by Redcourt (the former residential care facility) and a former gym building located in the southern part of the site but all other former structures have been previously demolished and cleared. Planning consent was previously granted for a supported living facility and 22 homes on the site ref. HPK/2014/0064 in 2014, however, has now lapsed.

7.13 The site was formerly owned by St. Christopher's Trust, which offered domiciliary care, supported living and residential care to adults. The Trust vacated the site in 2019 following consolidation of their existing assets, including the adjacent building on Hollincross Lane as a residential care facility, and purchase by the applicant. The Trust will continue to operate from this site alongside the proposed development to retain the facility for residential care.

7.14 Correspondence from St. Christopher's states: *"The Trust's preferred strategy for retaining a presence in Glossop is to sell the adjacent land and reinvest in our existing portfolio rather than redeveloping the whole site and building a replacement facility as per the 2014 planning permission. The sale of the land also secures the improvements to the boundary treatment and access arrangements on the retained site which will enhance the facility"*.

In addition, the Trust's website states that it *"has applied for planning permission to build 18 one bedroom apartments in Glossop for adults with learning disabilities. We are currently compiling a register of interest for potential users of these custom-built apartments"*. This matter will be clarified via the Update Sheet.

7.15 In these regards, there is consideration of LP Policy CF5 whereby the scheme seeks to protect, retain and enhance existing community facilities both within the wider site and local context to achieve compliance in these regards both with local and national planning policy seeking healthy, inclusive and safe places.

Housing Type / Size

7.16 LP Policy H3 requires all new residential development to provide for a range of market and affordable housing types and sizes that can reasonably meet the requirements and future needs of a wide range of household types including for the elderly and people with specialist housing needs as based on evidence from the SMHA (Strategic Housing Market Assessment) 2014. As well as providing a mix of housing that contributes positively to the promotion of a sustainable and inclusive community taking into account the characteristics of the existing housing stock in the surrounding locality.

Strategic Housing Market Assessment:

SHMA recommendations	Property type and
-----------------------------	--------------------------

	size
1-bed	10%
2-bed	45%
3-bed	35%
4-bed	10%
Semi-detached House	30%
Detached House	25%
Terraced House	15%
Flat / Maisonette	10%
Bedsit / Studio / Room Only	0%
Bungalow / Elderly Housing	20%
Caravan or temporary structure	0%

Ward Census Data

2011 census merged ward	All categories: Number of bedrooms	1-bed	2-bed	3-bed	4-bed	5 or more bed
Howard Town	1,961	149	1017	627	141	27
% of housing stock	100%	8%	52%	32%	7%	1%

Scheme Comparison::

	SHMA	Ward Census (Howard Town)	Scheme Units
1-bed	10%	8%	0
2-bed	45%	52%	7 (30%)
3-bed	35%	32%	13 (57%)
4-bed	10%	7%	3 (130%)

7.17 The applicant justifies a higher proportion of 3-bedroom properties to ‘future proof’ the scheme with reference to the SMHA being 7 years old. As well, that the Covid-19 pandemic has fundamentally affected the way that people use their houses i.e. more people are working from home and require larger houses with flexible office space and this cultural shift in working patterns is expected to continue.

7.18 Appeal Decision ref. APP/H1033/W/21/3274517 for residential development was recently dismissed. In terms of the applicant’s aforementioned comments, the following Inspector comments are of relevance: *“It is suggested that demand for larger houses with home working space has increased during the Covid-19 pandemic, but no substantive evidence of this has been provided, nor can it be certain that any such demand that may have arisen would be continued in forthcoming years. This consideration therefore carries only limited weight in favour of the proposed development”.*

7.19 In respect of housing mix, it would be expected that there would be a greater proportion of 1-bedroom properties than is proposed. However, the higher percentage of 3-bedroom properties offers some modest rebalancing when comparing the existing stock as identified in the Ward Census data with the recommended levels from the SHMA. Furthermore, the scheme does not appear to provide for any specialist housing need including its scoring against accessibility standards as set out in the Optional Requirement M4 (2) of Part M of the Building Regulations.

7.20 Notwithstanding scheme house types meeting with NDSS (National Described Space Standards), the lack of 1-bedroom / specialist accommodation causes some friction with LP Policy H3 and will be returned to in the planning balance below.

Affordable Housing

7.21 LP Policy H4 also requires all new residential development to meet the requirements of local people by providing affordable housing within the overall provision of new residential development and for sites between 5-24 units (or larger than 0.16ha) the requirement is 20%. If the affordable housing requirement is not provided on site then a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing elsewhere will be sought by the Council.

7.22 The applicant has applied VBC (Vacant Building Credit) to the calculation of affordable housing provision onsite in relation to the two vacant buildings on site: Redcourt and a building which was previously utilised by St. Christopher's Trust as a gym.

7.23 NPPF paragraph 63 defines VBC as follows: *"Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount * (*Equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of the existing buildings. This does not apply to vacant buildings which have been abandoned).*

7.24 The VBC calculation demonstrates that the contribution in lieu of onsite affordable housing should be applied to 2.25 affordable units based 23 units, which has been accepted. The applicant, however, is proposing to provide an off-site financial contribution in lieu of onsite provision with further evidence submitted to demonstrate a lack of interest from registered providers. This matter will be concluded via the Update Sheet as to whether exceptional circumstances exist to recommend securing an off-site financial contribution.

Design and Heritage

7.25 The amended scheme is for a total of 23 properties, proposing the partial demolition and conversion of Redcourt into 4 dwellings as well as 19 new build properties (previously 26) expressed in two parts and connected by a woodland walkway. A Heritage Statement has also submitted and latterly an addendum including a photographic schedule of Redcourt in an attempt to address concerns raised.

7.26 LP Policies S1 'Sustainable Development Principles, EQ6 'Design and Place Making' and EQ7 'Built and Historic Environment' all seek to secure high quality design in all developments that responds positively to its environment and contributes to local distinctiveness and a sense of place by taking account of the distinct character, townscape and setting of the area.

7.27 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF advises: *Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design (Contained in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code), taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:*

- a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or*
- b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.*

7.28 With regard to heritage significance, the application site falls in the St James Conservation Area and close to St James' Church, a Grade II Listed Building (together with separately Listed Lytch Gate and funerary monument). Redcourt is a non-designated heritage asset in the Conservation Area and the Council's Conservation Officer notes it as a prominent and striking, large building set in expansive, wooded grounds sloping down towards Long Clough Brook. Furthermore, the character of the Conservation Area in this location is dominated by tightly packed stone and slate terraced housing with some larger villas, on almost a grid-pattern layout, and the application site is particularly noted for its mature woodland and historic estate character, together with views through to Redcourt. The adopted Character Appraisal provides further detail.

7.29 Redcourt dates from the 1900s, built in an Arts and Crafts style, and was one of the last large buildings of the period to be built in this area and the only one to be constructed out of brick. It has been made even more prominent because of the painting of the brick and stone detailing. The entrance gates and wall off Slatelands Road provides evidence of what the materials would have looked like before they were painted. The building was constructed for a local doctor, later lived in by Sir Edward Partington and then became a hostel for mill workers before being taken over by the St Christopher's Trust in 1954. After this date, the building had a series of unsympathetic additions and several functional buildings were constructed in the grounds. Historic maps show the network of paths and landscaped grounds and its close relationship to the church and vicarage. The historic maps also show that the more modern buildings were placed outside the landscaped grounds to Redcourt.

7.30 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker, in considering whether to grant planning permission for the development, which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In addition Section 72(1) also requires the decision maker, when considering any

planning application that affects a conservation area to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Accordingly, the Council has a statutory duty to consider the scheme's effect on the Grade II Listed St James' Church and Conservation Area.

7.31 Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

7.32 In detail, LP Policy EQ7 seeks to protect the historic environment and conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance with particular protection being given to Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas. It requires authorities to prevent the loss of buildings and features which make a positive contribution to the character or heritage of an area through preservation or appropriate reuse and sensitive development, including enabling development, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss or other relevant provisions of the NPPF apply. Policy E7 also requires development proposals in Conservation Areas to demonstrate how the proposal has taken account of the distinctive character and setting of individual Conservation Areas including open spaces and natural features and how this has been reflected in the layout, design, form, scale, mass, use of traditional materials and detailing, in accordance with Character Appraisals where available.

7.33 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: *"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance"*.

7.34 Whilst Paragraph 207 of the NPPF states: *"Not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 200 Page 52 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 201, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole"*.

7.35 Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states: *"Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification"*.

7.36 Following revisions, the conversion of Redcourt is more sympathetic by reinstating features, which will enhance significance. The Conservation Officer, however, remains concerned with the subdivision of gardens and resultant impact on the building's setting and advises additional communal space. The

dominance of car parking throughout the site, with cars pushed to the road frontage is considered to increase the urban feel and expanse of hard landscaping within the site. Whilst the pair of semi-detached buildings on the former formal gardens to the west of Redcourt would impact on its sense of isolation, be out of keeping within its parkland setting and should be omitted from the scheme. In addition, levels remain a concern between the units 5-8 and 22 & 23 requiring extensive engineering and would not be reflective of a parkland landscape. The revised footpath link between Redcourt and Slateland's Road is an improvement to the scheme. Further details are required regarding the new vehicular access off Slatelands Road utilising the existing historic access. Other issues such as boundaries, landscaping, fenestration and lighting all need to be carefully considered at a later stage and site-wide.

7.37 Overall, the number, siting, form and detail of the buildings, as well as the loss of trees, would impact significantly on the historic estate. The majority of new build properties would be 3-storeys with high ridges, wide gables and dormers and are not characteristic of the area. The design and layout of the larger villa-style properties are too suburban in context and raise concerns regarding the impact on the Conservation Area. Whereas, houses sited within the context of Redcourt should be more traditional and subservient to the main building and the entire site should better reflect the the building's historic significance, including woodland setting.

7.38 The applicant's Heritage Statement acknowledges that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, it argues that a public benefit of the scheme would be the retention of the Redcourt, removal of later extensions / poor alterations and the sensitive restoration of the historic part of the building. Despite this, the Conservation Officer concludes that the new dwellings would detrimentally impact on the historic character of the landscaped grounds, compounded by loss of mature trees and screening as confirmed by the Council's Aboricultural Officer in the relevant consultation section above.

7.39 In conclusion, the scheme is harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and harmful to the setting of Redcourt, a non-designated heritage asset. The scheme would represent less than substantial harm which is a substantial planning objection. In accordance with the NPPF the harm would need to be assessed against the planning benefits of the scheme.

7.40 Paragraph 202 of the NPPF is therefore triggered which states: *"Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The Council is required to assess whether the harm to heritage assets is outweighed by any 'public benefits' deriving from the scheme, including where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use"*.

7.41 Paragraph 203 of the NPPF also states: *"The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset"*.

7.42 The NPPG advises: “Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit. Examples of heritage benefits may include: sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting, reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset and securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation”. Such scheme benefits would neither sustain or enhance the significance of the identified heritage assets nor contribute to their setting.

7.43 In these circumstances, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the optimum viable use of Redcourt cannot be secured through appropriate redevelopment of site and / or the public benefits of the proposals would outweigh the heritage harm that has been identified contrary to LP Policies SS1, S5, EQ6, EQ7 and EQ9 and NPPF.

Amenity

7.44 LP Policy EQ6 ‘Design and Place Making’ stipulates that development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and should not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity. Similarly NPPF para 130(f) requires a high standard of amenity for existing and future users’.

7.45 The adopted SPD on ‘Residential Design’ states that the distance between habitable room windows should be 21m and for every change in level of 0.5m increase the increase in distance between the properties should be 1.0m. The guidance in the SPD allows for variation in distances in order to accommodate particular site circumstances. The interrelationship between existing residents and proposed scheme dwellings is satisfactory to provide for a good standard of amenity with regard to LP EQ6.

7.46 Notwithstanding this, the Council’s Aboricultural Officer has confirmed there are many instances within the site, owing to its well-wooded nature where there would be conflict between rear garden fences and trees. As well, there would be a long-term conflict with trees overhanging and shading gardens and being susceptible to lopping by residents raising conflict with local and national amenity policy.

Highway Safety

7.47 LP Policy CF6 ‘Accessibility and Transport’ sets out the need to ensure that development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner, whilst minimising the need to travel particularly by unsustainable modes of transport.

7.48 Section 9 of the NPPF states transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of development proposals to identify and pursue opportunities from existing or proposed walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure and patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the scheme design and contribute to making high quality places with priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements within the scheme and with neighbouring areas.

7.49 NPPF paragraph 110 states development proposals should meet with the criteria: *“appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location; safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code 46; and any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree”*.

7.50 NPPF paragraph 111 states *“development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”*.

7.51 The site shares an existing vehicular access point off Hollincross Lane with St. Christopher’s Trust, which would be retained. Beyond this, to the east is St James Church, the vicarage and the church graveyard, which are close to the junction with the A624. Further along the northern boundary, the site has a second existing entrance point and gateway off Slatelands Road, which would be widened to provide access to the lower areas of the site. The existing footpath link from Slatelands Road would be retained to provide access to the northern courtyard aspect of the scheme. In the southeastern corner of the site, there is a gated access point at the end of Ashton Street, which would be retained and footpath link to the site provided. Car parking provision is a combination of in-plot and parking courts and would meet with Local Plan Parking Guidance regarding level of parking.

7.52 The Highway Authority’s response is based on revised drawing ref. 5417_1100 Revision P15. Regarding the Transport Assessment, they confirm the report content is sufficient to make an informed decision regarding the revisions to ensure an adoptable form of development. The applicant, however, has failed to address all of the previously highlighted layout issues the Highway Authority were seeking to address. They have stated that, the applicant must provide footways on both sides of the access road and the existing vehicle crossing must be stopped up (if they are no longer to be used) and footway fully reinstated. This is necessary whether or not the access roads are adopted and planning conditions have been recommended in these regards.

7.53 Other matters highlighted by the Highway Authority, include:

- The tracking of the refuse vehicle appears too tight to avoid collision with the bin storage area. However, the assumption is the scheme would not be adopted and the Refuse Authority finds the layout acceptable;
- A 2.0m footway should be provided along the southern side of the access from Hollin Cross Lane and along the northern side of the access from Slatelands Road or if unfeasible, a 1.0m service strip. (Notwithstanding this, for Hollin Cross Lane the carriageway has no clearance from the neighbouring boundary fence, so it will be necessary to move the access alignment further north);

- The position of the space within the carriageway would attract visitor parking, which would compromise the parking for Plot 5 and parking should therefore be relocated within the curtilage of the property;
- The Highway Authority no longer accept shared surfaces within the highway because of the impact that this has on the blind and partially sighted. Therefore, footways would be required on both sides of the road and parking moved to the back of the footway. The provision of the footway around the turning area ensures that it can be properly illuminated and pedestrians using the pedestrian link from Slatelands Road are not forced onto the carriageway within the turning head. Footways would also be required on that connect all the way to the frontage of property, and;
- On street residential parking within the highway is no longer allowed by the Highway Authority. Wherever possible, the parking spaces should be provided within the curtilage of the property;
- The arrangement of parking for Plot 9 is likely to encourage the owner to utilise the turning head for parking if they own more than 2 vehicles and the parking arrangement should be modified to discourage parking within the turning head;

7.54 The Highway Authority state the adoption of the estate streets is a purely voluntary act between the developer and their acceptance of the proposals for planning purposes does not in any way compel the Highway Authority to enter into an adoption Agreement at a future date. If the streets are not eligible for adoption they would need to remain privately maintained by the road owner or street frontages where applicable to be secured via a planning condition or s106 legal agreement.

7.55 Fundamentally, the Highway Authority confirm they would not be able to demonstrate that the development proposals would result in a highway safety issue or have a severe impact on the existing highway network, which would justify a recommendation of refusal in the context of NPPF paragraph 111 and have provided a schedule of conditions should planning permission be granted.

7.56 As such, the proposal complies with LP Policy CF6 and Section 9 of the NPPF in these regards.

Environmental Matters

7.57 LP Policy EQ10 broadly seeks to protect people and the environment from unsafe, unhealthy and polluted environments. NPPF paragraph 174(e) of the NPPF states “*new and existing development should not contribute to, or be put at an unacceptable risk from, or be adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability*”.

7.58 The Council’s Environmental Health Department have assessed the potential environmental impacts of the scheme. The conclusions of the submitted Phase 1 Land Contamination Desk Study Report (Hydrock, ref: 12804-HYD-XX-XX-RP-GE-1001-S0-P01.01, dated 5th July 2019) recommending the assessment progress to a Phase 2 Intrusive Investigation has been accepted, but secured by planning condition.

7.59 Overall, no objections are raised to the scheme subject to planning conditions intended to ensure the protection of public health and the wider environment in relation to site contamination matters as well as the protection of local amenity during the construction stage of the proposal.

7.60 As a consequence, the application site would be suitable for residential development to accord with LP Policies S1, EQ6 and EQ10 and the NPPF.

Local Flood Risk / Drainage

7.61 LP Policy EQ11 'Flood Risk Management' states that the Council will support development proposals that avoid areas of current or future flood risk and which do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, where this is viable and compatible with other policies aimed at achieving sustainable patterns of development. NPPF 159 states development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk.

7.62 The 1.975ha wider site is located within an area susceptible to flooding being located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, the main development areas at 0.912ha are described as falling within Flood Zone 1. The nearest main river is Long Clough Brook which flows adjacent to the southern and south-western site boundaries to outfall into Glossop Brook. This watercourse is culverted upstream of the site beneath Turnlee Drive and then again downstream of the site beneath Slatelands Road / Earls Way.

7.63 A revised FRA (Flood Risk Assessment) has been submitted during the course of the application, which seeks to address issues as raised by the LLFA (Lead Local Flood Authority). The document outlines that the primary method to deal with surface water run-off would be to drain to ground where at all practical through appropriate levels design and incorporation of permeable surfacing. Otherwise, Long Clough Brook would provide an alternative option for draining surface water run-off from the site should infiltration not provide a full or part drainage solution. This would, however, would be subject to consent from the Environment Agency and LLFA.

7.64 The LLFA do not object to the revised FRA and scheme subject to pre-commencement conditions including the approval of a detailed drainage scheme. Environment Agency comments are awaited and the Update Sheet should be consulted in these regards.

Ecology

7.65 LP Policy EQ5 'Biodiversity' advises that biodiversity and ecological resources should be conserved. It states that development will not be permitted which would have an adverse impact upon protected species. NPPF para 180 (a) states if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused" and (c) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate".

7.66 The c. 2.0ha site is comprised of a steep wooded valley slope which runs down towards Long Clough Brook. The site has significant mature tree coverage of different species of trees. The site is covered by a group TPO (Tree Preservation Order) ref. TP061. There are, however, no statutory or non-statutory designated nature conservation sites associated with the site and local context.

7.67 DWT (Derbyshire Wildlife Trust) have reviewed the submission of further information from the applicant, with particular reference to the revised version of the Ecological Management Plan and Management Plan (Woodland and Open Space), which has now addressed concerns in relation to: the protection fencing along the brook is now shown on the plan; the provision of a variety of bird boxes; the pulling of Himalayan balsam prior to flowering in July; shade tolerant woodland ground flora to enhance the woodland habitat, and, the monitoring of woodland ground flora during the spring. Accordingly, DWT recommend a positively worded LEMP (Landscape Ecological Management Plan) planning condition to ensure the relevant documents are implemented in full, including all mitigation, enhancement and monitoring requirements.

7.68 The applicant has undertaken survey work to determine the presence / absence of bats and likely impacts with no evidence of bats recorded internally within Redcourt (Building 1). The conclusions are considered to be sufficient by DWT subject to a further planning condition securing a detailed lighting strategy to demonstrate acceptable levels of light spill to any sensitive ecological zones / features (woodland and watercourse) in accordance with Guidance Note 08/18 - Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK (BCT and ILP, 2018).

7.69 Subject to these matters being secured through suitably worded planning conditions, the scheme is considered to accord with LP Policy EQ5 and the NPPF.

Planning Obligations

7.70 LP Policy CF7 'Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure' requires development proposals to provide planning obligations where relevant and necessary to mitigate the impact of the development. The consultation responses above have identified that the following contributions are required:

Offsite Public Open Space:

Play - £192 x 23 = £4,416
Parks and Gardens - £571 x 23 = £13,133
Outdoor Sports - £489.40 x 23 = £11,256.20
Allotments - £76.95 x 23 = £1,769.85
Total =

Vacant Building Credit (Affordable Housing Provision)

To be confirmed via the Update Sheet.

County Education (School Facilities)

£210,770.08 towards the provision of additional education facilities at Glossopdale School.

7.71 The applicant is willing to enter into a Section 106 to comply with LP Policy CF7 and the NPPF.

8.0 PLANNING BALANCE & CONCLUSIONS

8.1 The starting point for the determination of any planning application is section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which is to be read in conjunction with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Section 38(6) states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material considerations which indicate otherwise.

8.2 The proposal would increase the supply and choice of housing in the Glossopdale Area within a sustainable location. The omission of single unit and specialist residential accommodation within the proposal, and therefore failure to provide wholly for housing needs of local people would reduce scheme benefits in these regards. Jobs would be created during the construction phase of the proposal and addition revenue created through Council Tax, and together with residents local spend would support the local economy. As well, the vacant building, 'Redcourt' would be suitably restored for residential purposes.

8.3 'Redcourt' is a non-designated heritage asset that falls within and makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area, which is a designated Heritage Asset. The scheme for site wide, new-build development, would have a significant adverse effect on the setting of the Conservation Area to materially harm the significance of these assets. The resulting effect would amount to a 'less than substantial harm' in the terms of the NPPF.

8.4 A finding of 'less than substantial harm' should not be equated with a less than substantial planning objection. In the case of the scheme proposal, the public benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the heritage harm as has been identified.

8.5 In conclusion, the scheme proposal would not be a sustainable form of development as it would conflict with the development plan and the NPPF when taken as a whole, and as there are no other material considerations that indicate planning permission should be granted. Neither would the scheme be made acceptable through the imposition of reasonable planning conditions.

8.6 Accordingly, the scheme is recommended for refusal.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. REFUSE for the following reasons:

The scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the undesignated heritage asset building 'Redcourt'. In addition, the scheme would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the St. James Conservation Area or the setting of the undesignated heritage asset 'Redcourt'. In these regards, the scheme would represent 'less than substantial harm' and therefore a substantial planning objection. In turn, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the scheme would achieve the optimum viable use of the site or that the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the heritage harm which has been identified. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policies S1, S5, H1, EQ6, EQ7 and EQ9 of the Adopted High Peak Local Plan 2016; Conservation Area Areas Appraisal, High Peak Design Guidance 2018 and NPPF.

B. In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Development Control Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

Location Plan

