



**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA**

**Date: Monday, 22 April 2024**

**Time: 1.30 pm**

**Venue: Pavilion Arts Centre, Pavilion Gardens, Buxton**

You can view the agenda online by using a smart phone camera and scanning the code below:



**12 April 2024**

**PART 1**

4. Update Sheet (**Pages 3 - 6**)

**MARK TRILLO**

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND MONITORING OFFICER**

Membership of Development Control Committee

Councillor R McKeown (Chair)

Councillor A Barrow

Councillor S Gardner

Councillor A Hopkinson

Councillor P Roberts

Councillor G Scott

Councillor D Lomax (Vice-Chair)

Councillor C Farrell

Councillor P Hardy

Councillor I Huddleston

Councillor J Todd

This page is intentionally left blank

22<sup>nd</sup> April 2024

## HPBC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

### UPDATES REPORT

#### HPK/2023/0337 - SHIRE HILL HOSPITAL, Bute Street, Glossop - Reserved matters application for 40 dwellings (use class C3) together with associated access, parking and landscape works.

Late comments on the application have been received from the Council's Conservation Officer (dated 18<sup>th</sup> April 2024) who has concerns about the scheme for several reasons, many of which have already been the subject of detailed consideration and discussion by officers with the applicant, and also detailed in the officer report to committee. However, they can be summarised as:

#### *Comments on the retained heritage asset (the admin block):*

- The additional punctuation of the building to provide additional windows and doors, would undermine the simplicity of the elevations and lead to it looking domestic rather than reflecting its historic character.
- That the scale and mass of the adjacent new build properties is larger than the scale of the retained heritage asset, and as a result the new development is not subservient to the heritage asset, and that the retained building will be 'lost' within the street scene.
- The boundary features that have been proposed – wall and railings – appear to be 'ostentatious and gentrified' against the simpler architecture of the main building and would detract from the simple design aesthetic.

#### *Wider design, character and vernacular comments:*

- Overall, the design approach taken on this site appears to overscale and is incongruous to the surrounding townscape which is essentially a series of modest housing enclaves.
- That there appears to be an irregular hierarchy and scale across the site, which is not necessarily informed by the historical character of the site.
- That the building range that replaces the 'ward block' has squeezed windows that are out of character for this area of Glossop and are not considered an appropriate design response.
- The garages appear to be oversized and have a steeply pitched roof which appears incongruous.
- That all the joinery on the site (including design of windows and doors) should be consistent and simple to reflect the historical context – the current variation between the lower and upper portions of the site is not supported.
- The design of the houses to the north of the site (the contemporary character areas) do not reflect the local built form and vernacular and appear out of scale for this location and are not reflective of the historical development of this part of Glossop.

*The conservation officer has also suggested several additional conditions:*

- That permitted development rights be removed from the converted administration block to do not permitted alterations to the roof (including provision of rooflights) or form of the building, or the installation of solar panels (N.B this would require removal of Part 1 Class B, C and D, and Part 14 Class A of the GPDO 2015 as amended).
- That all finishing and facing materials be conditioned (N.B – note that this has already been proposed under condition 4 as set out in the officer report to committee)

#### Case Officer:

The case officer has considered the comments raised by the Conservation Officer and makes the following comments and observations.

The importance of maintaining the building's simplicity of architecture and design is recognised, however, this needs to be effectively balanced against the need to bring this building back into a viable economic and active use. In this instance, amended window and door apertures have been kept to a minimum - significantly reduced in number over the original submission and standardised in form reflecting those already on the building.

Care has been taken to protect the overall character and appearance of the building's principal frontage (the subject of detailed discussions between the case officer and the applicant) in order to ensure that the building still reads as a number of constituent parts which reflect its history. However, it is acknowledged that the suggested condition to remove permitted development rights would be appropriate to assist in retaining this in perpetuity and suggest expanding this to include the creation of new openings (removal of Part 1 Class A also). It is not considered by that the inclusion of the walls and railings undermines the overall aesthetic of the building.

Turning to the scale and setting points raised, it is noted the new buildings that are on the rough footprint of the former ward block are taller, however, this approach reflects the historical scale and mass of the buildings which are to be replaced. The ward building is a much larger, substantial, and elaborate building than the administration block. It is therefore considered appropriate that the replacement building reflects this existing hierarchy and relationship. The setting from most public vantage points retains the landscaped parkland to the front of the scheme, retaining many of the mature trees.

The buildings to the rear of the site are within a different setting and character, within an area that has previously been dominated by ancillary structures associated with the hospital and car parking. As noted in the officer report to committee, the approach here has been to develop a character area that is contemporary and reflects the landscape edge, although many of the details and materials used are reflective of the High Peak vernacular. This area would never be visually 'read' in conjunction with the primary views of the retained heritage asset and therefore the proposed design approach remains is considered to be acceptable and is not considered to impact on its setting.

The previous paragraphs (and the original officer report to committee) have demonstrated how the hierarchy of scale across the site has been delivered, and that the materials used will reflect those found locally. Garage sizes simply respond to guidance from the Local Highway Authority to make sure that garaging is suitable for a modern vehicle, with pitches that are designed to reflect those on the host dwellings.

The housing to the north of the site has been considered in detail (through three design iterations) and now the scale and mass is consistent with those larger detached properties found throughout northern urban edge of Glossop – especially larger housing on Kilmory Fold and new dwellings off Hope Street. The split-level unit is a typical response to the topography in this location, and the proposed dwellings in the upper portion of the site are a distinct improvement on those similar examples on Blackshaw Road and Shire Way.

Therefore, it is considered that the design of this scheme offers the most appropriate planning balance between safeguarding the unique characteristics of the retained non-designed heritage asset on the site and bringing both that building, and this large previously developed site, back into economic use. This approach is consistent with guidance in paragraph 209 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the approach outlined in local plan policy EQ7.

**NO CHANGE TO OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION), subject to an additional planning condition concerning the removal of householder permitted development rights.**

**HPK/2024/0055 – Land at Forge Road, Chinley - Permission in principle for the construction of one dwelling**

Case Officer:

This item has been withdrawn from the agenda following legal advice.

**HPK/2023/0521 & HPK/2023/0522**

Case Officer:

No update.

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

This page is intentionally left blank