

20<sup>th</sup> May 2024

**HPBC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**UPDATES REPORT**

**HPK/2022/0474 – Land at Charlestown Works, Glossop**

Applicant:

*Affordable Housing*

We disagree that insufficient information was provided in regard to the level of affordable housing provision required. We have accepted that a number of affordable housing units are required, and had previously offered 20% of the development, a total of 5 Units. The viability study does quantify that 7 Units, 30% of the development is justified and therefore are happy to condition this within a S106 Agreement, in order to satisfy Policy H9.

We have also agreed to all sums stated within the Summary of Recommendation and again we are happy to condition this within any S106 Agreement.

*Housing Types*

A schedule of accommodation confirms that the proposed dwellings are both accessible and adaptable' to standard in Part M4(2) of Building Regulations / NDSS space standards. We disagree that the proposal doesn't provide a range of housing types.

As noted within the summary of recommendation there are a lack of 1 Bedroom Apartments, and therefore for us to create a number of 3 Bedroom Apartments, would reduce the number of smaller 2-bedroom properties on each floor. The ideology of some of the smaller 2-bedroom properties was that nine of the apartments could be used as one bedroom apartment plus a home style office.

The schedule of accommodation has been updated to make this more transparent. We could in principle reduce the number of 2 Bedroom properties to just 1 Bedroom, however this reduces the market for people wanting to either homework or study. We have taken advice from a housing provider who is interested in both blocks; however, 3 and 4 Bed Apartments were not suitable, for their target audience.

Price point was taken into consideration in incorporating a 3 Bedroom Flat, which would have Resulted in a pricing point marketed at a higher price than the majority of 3 Bedroom Homes within the local area. The average housing types being chimney pots and therefore a 3-or 4-Bedroom Flat would not be aimed at the right demographic.

We have accommodated for either elderly or disabled residents on the ground floor, with access to a number of disabled parking.

We have updated our floor plan drawings Block 1, Reference 2022/027/PEAB1/D, & Block 2, Reference 022/027/PAB2/C, to reflect these changes.

### *Design*

We do not agree that the proposed development does not provide for a sense high quality design. The design is both in keeping with the previous application, and in keeping with other neighbouring flat conversions within the local area. The only addition to this, is the residents garden incorporated within the roof of the development. During the planning process, it was noted a discussion had been raised from one of the flat owners in the converted building adjacent. In conjunction with comments raised from the council, in that we could/should remove a number of side elevation habitable windows. Revised Plans removing identified, side windows to the lounge and bedrooms were adjusted to make the scheme compliant in respect of any overlooking or privacy issues.

### *Highways*

We have adjusted the site-plan drawings, drawing reference 023/021/PSP/E, to satisfy the Highways Officers objection. To date there has been no discussion that the design to the external design was inappropriate, and at no time was it offered for a discussion with a Urban Design Manager or equivalent.

### Environment Agency:

Awaited.

### Case Officer:

Clearly, the applicant's submitted Financial Viability Appraisal (FVA) only relates to the office (formerly B1) of the application site and therefore is not a site wide appraisal of the former Charlestown Works consent. Accordingly, the applicant would need to provide an FVA in relation to the entire approved scheme with evidence regarding sales information to date and construction costs expended to establish the affordable housing needs of the proposed development.

Apartment Block 1 (Rev C) has now been submitted, which has removed the Council's amenity 'privacy' objection. Accordingly, it is recommended reason for refusal no.6 can be omitted.

Planning Officers have worked proactively with the applicant to secure a development that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The principle of the development, however, is unsustainable and does not conform with the provisions of the NPPF. Accordingly, the applicant is unable to overcome such principle concerns and thus no further amendments to the application have been requested following the receipt of additional information on the 17<sup>th</sup> May 2024, particularly in relation to the amended site layout plan.

Notwithstanding this, the accommodation schedule and revised floor plan information does not sufficiently evidence that the scheme would meet with NDSS (National Described Space Standards) and delivered to meet accessibility standards set out in the Optional Requirement M4(2) of Part M of the Building Regulations.

Delegated authority by the Head of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman of Development Control Committee is sought in relation to any matters arising concerning the receipt of outstanding consultation comments from the Environment Agency.

**NO CHANGE TO OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION).**

**HPK/2024/0085 - Spring Gardens, Buxton**

No updates.

**HPK/2023/0374 – New Mills Heritage and Information Centre**

No updates.

**HPK/2024/0154 21 The View, Glossop**

No updates.