

**HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Date 2nd December 2019

Application No:	HPK/2019/0133	
Location	Land off Woolley Bridge, Hadfield, Glossop	
Proposal	Approval of all reserved matters relating to HPK/2017/0198	
Applicant	Mr Paul Freehan, Richard Lloyd Developments Ltd, 6 th Floor Cardinal House, St Marys Parsonage, Manchester, M3 2LG	
Agent	Mr Tom Riggall, HNA Architects	
Parish/ward	Hadfield South	Date registered 15/04/2019
If you have a question about this report please contact: Faye Plant -Email faye.plant@highpeak.gov.uk Tel: 01538 395400 Ext: 4995; Mob: 077775695346 (Mon-weds)		

REFERRAL

The application is referred to committee as it is a major development.

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The site is located on the eastern side of the A57 at Woolley Bridge; it is broadly rectangular in shape, tapering at the southern end and measures approx. 0.93ha. The land is undulating rough tree, scrub and grassland with a belt of mature trees long the eastern boundary adjacent to the public right of way and bridleway. This forms part of the Broadbottom to Hadfield section of the Transpennine Trail; a nationally significant coast to coast route for walkers and cyclists. The site generally falls from east to west by approximately 12m.

2.2 It is understood that there is a history of spoil tipping on the land, part of which was also used as a petrol filling station which has been removed. The site is located to the east (rear) of a row of predominantly terraced residential properties which face onto the A57, with semi-detached and detached properties to the southern end of the site. Beyond the eastern boundary is an area of open space/woodland, beyond which is a residential estate. To the north of the site is Travis Perkins building supplies and beyond this Glossop Caravans Service Centre. To the south west of the site, adjacent to the site entrance is a vacant site with an application for 2 dwellings submitted by the applicant (HPK/2019/0232, currently pending). It is

proposed that the site for 2 dwellings would be accessed via the estate road which forms part of this application.

2.3 The site is located within the built up area boundary of Hadfield, on the edge of the 'riverside meadows' landscape character area and within 250m of a landfill buffer, as defined in the Local Plan. The site entrance to the A57 is located within floodzones 2 and 3.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 The application seeks approval for all matters reserved for residential development of 31 dwellings, including details of appearance, layout, landscaping, scale and access. It follows the approval of HPK/2017/0198 "Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for residential development and associated works", which was determined by Members at the 8th October 2018 Development Control Committee Meeting, subject to relevant conditions and a completed S106 agreement.

3.2 The Section 106 legal agreement (signed on 30th January 2019) secured the following:-

- 6no. affordable units (which equates to 20% affordable housing as a result of the submission of viability assessment submitted at outline application stage)
- Education contribution to St Andrew's CE Junior School to be calculated in accordance with Schedule 2 of the agreement.
- Open Space off site contribution (to be calculated via formula in agreement and used for Council owned public open space to the east of the site for management and enhancement of biodiversity)
- Outdoor sports and recreation contribution towards the cemetery Road Playing Fields (to be calculated via formula in agreement)
- Management company to manage any unsold pieces of land on the site.

3.3 Access to the site was established although its design was not finalised as part of the previous application and is via a singular priority controlled T junction off the A57 (Woolley Bridge). This has been discussed and agreed with Highways England due to the proximity to the proposed Mottram Bypass Scheme. The proposed access road will run in a northerly direction with dwellings arranged in a linear format climbing upwards along the road. The road then bends and climbs to the east with a turning head at the far north eastern section of the site.

3.4 The proposals have been revised several times during the course of the application with the submission of 4 sets of revised plans which has amended house designs, housing mix, layout and landscaping. The applicant has attempted to address all concerns raised by Statutory Consultees and Officers throughout the course of the application. However, the number of dwellings and the general layout and approach to the design has remained unchanged

3.5 The proposals as submitted now comprise a mixture of 2 and 3 storey detached and semi-detached dwellings arranged in a linear format and a block of 4

apartments. The proposals include 7 house types and an apartment block and comprises:

15 no. 4 bed units
12 no. 3 bed units
2no. 2 bed apartments
2no. 1 bed apartments.

3.6 A footpath that was included during earlier revisions to connect the estate with the footpath to the east of the site has been removed and properties to the north east of the estate repositioned to provide a landscape buffer at the far north western corner of the site. Additional landscaped buffer areas have been included within the latest revised plans which seek to mitigate the impact of the development.

3.7 Originally proposed as a series of semi-detached properties, at the site entrance is now proposed to be a pair of semi-detached dwellings and an apartment block with pedestrian access from A57 and parking at the rear from the estate street. The proposals include 57 car parking spaces including integral garages which are present on 2 of the house types (the Huntingdon and Bayport).

3.7 The proposed development includes provision of 6 affordable units as agreed within the Section 106 (dated 30th January 2019) which comprises 2x 3 bed dwellings, 2x two bed and 2 x one bed apartments.

3.8 The application is accompanied by the following plans and documents;

- Revised Planning , Design and Access Statement
- Affordable Housing Statement
- Revised Proposed Site Layout Plan
- Revised House type elevation and floor plans,
- Revised Proposed Site Strip Elevations,
- Revised Context Elevation from Woolley Bridge
- Statement of Compliance with NDSS
- Revised boundary treatment
- Revised Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and technical note
- Revised Proposed Site Sections
- Highway and drainage layout
- Proposed planting plans
- Temporary Access for Construction Purposes
- Traffic Management Plan
- External Materials schedule
- Building for life assessment
- Checklist fir sustainability
- CDM Plan
- Arboricultural Development Report
- Arboricultural Method Statement
- Piling Risk Assessment and Method Statement
- Ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement scheme
- Environmental Risk Assessments
- Written Scheme of Investigation

- Technical note on drainage
- Responses to Urban Design comments, highway officer, arboricultural officer
- Crime Impact Statement

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

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=231435>

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 There have been numerous applications on the site/parts of the site for residential development over the last approximately 19 years, the most relevant are:-

HPK/2012/0545 - Outline application for residential development and associated works - Approved in December 2012.

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=139504>

HPK/2017/0198 - Outline application with all matters reserved (except access) for residential development and associated works – Approved in January 2019.

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=215549>

Neighbouring site to the south

HPK/2019/0232 - 2no. Proposed new dwellings & associated site works – Pending

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=232631>

5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Adopted High Peak Local Plan 2016

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- S2 Settlement Hierarchy
- S3 Strategic Housing Development
- S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
- EQ1 Climate Change
- EQ2 Landscape Character
- EQ5 Biodiversity

- EQ6 Design and Place Making
- EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
- EQ8 Green Infrastructure
- EQ9 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
- EQ10 Pollution Control and Unstable Land
- EQ11 Flood Risk Management
- H1 Location of Housing Development
- H2 Housing Allocations
- H3 New Housing Development
- H4 Affordable Housing
- CF3 Local Infrastructure Provision
- CF4 Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities
- CF6 Accessibility and Transport
- CF7 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy

High Peak Design Guide 2018

Supplementary Planning Documents

- Residential Design
- Landscape Character
- Housing Needs Survey
- Planning Obligations

National Planning Policy Framework

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Achieving sustainable development
- 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 6. Building a strong and competitive economy
- 8. Promoting healthy communities
- 9. Promoting sustainable transport
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

National Design Guide 2019

National Planning Practice Guidance

6. CONSULTATIONS

Site notice	Expiry date for comments: 09.07.2019
Press notice	Expiry date for comments: 23.05.2019
Neighbours	Expiry date for comments on Revised Plans: 29.11.2019

Neighbours

No representations received

Consultees

Consultee	Comment	Officer response
Highways England	<p><u>Comments on revised plans awaited</u></p> <p>No objection</p> <p>We can confirm that Highways England does not object to the planning application in principle and that we have engaged with the applicant to resolve any potential issue regarding this development. I would however request that Highways England be kept informed of any changes to the development, as this has the potential to directly affect the proposed Mottram Bypass scheme. We also need confirmation of the proposed alignment at the junction of Woolley Bridge Road and request that before any works start onsite site that we are consulted to ensure that this fits with what we have agreed with the developer.</p>	7.37-7.43
DCC Highways	<p><u>Comments on revised plans – November 2019</u></p> <p>The layout is generally acceptable from a highway viewpoint, now that the turning head has been revised following the swept path analysis being carried out. The verge area opposite plot numbers 12 to 19 will still need the levels revising with the adoptable margin probably being reduced to a minimal width to assist in this. As previously highlighted, we can look at this as part of our separate technical approval process, subject to planning consent being granted.</p> <p>The issues with the swept path, garage sizes, parking provision and relocation of existing street lighting column and bus stop on Woolley Bridge Road, having all now been resolved as part of the latest details.</p>	7.37-7.43

Whilst the recommended conditions in my previous letter dated 16 May 2019 are still applicable, conditions 7 and 8 should be replaced with the following conditions based on the latest layout: -

7. No part of the development shall be occupied until new vehicular accesses have been formed to the new estate street in accordance with the application drawing No 1228/PR-001 N with accesses serving plot numbers 1 to 19 and 26 to 29 being provided with visibility sightlines extending from a point 2.4m from the carriageway edge, measured along the centreline of the accesses, for a distance of 17m in each direction measured along the nearside carriageway edge. 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) relative to adjoining nearside carriageway channel level.

8. No dwelling shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with drawing No 1228/PR-001 N for the parking of residents and visitors vehicles.

Additional comments - July 2019

With respect to the proposed garages, I note that some are shown measuring 2.85m x 5.5m and others at shown measuring 2.6m x 5.5, whereas the absolute minimum is 3m x 6m. Given that the majority of plots are only shown with 2 parking spaces, including the garages, the garage dimensions should be increased to the minimum 3m x 6m.

Original comments – May 2019

The proposed new estate street junction will be provided with 2.4m x 40m emerging visibility splays on the A57. However, in the absence of speed reading data minimum emerging visibility splays of 2.4m x 68m will need to be provided. Given the width of the footway fronting the site and the straight alignment of the A57 at this location, these visibility splays are achievable within highway limits.

No details have been provided relating to the necessary relocation of the existing bus stop and street lighting column fronting the site, which will need to be done so at the applicant's expense.

A swept path analysis will need to be provided to demonstrate that a large (11.6m long) refuse vehicle can easily manoeuvre with the proposed turning head at the closed end of the street without over-running the footway or over hanging outside the adoptable estate street limits.

The proposed road layout shows a short spur fronting plot numbers 5 and 6. However, this would not be considered for adoption as it only serves as access to these 2 plots and would not provide any useful highway purpose.

The submitted layout drawing shows the grass verge margin opposite plot numbers 15 to 19 sloping away from the carriageway. This will not be acceptable from an adoptable viewpoint, where the margin will need to fall towards the carriageway channel and not discharging surface water onto private land.

If the Authority is minded to approve the proposals conditions are recommended [and summarised] below;

1. Details of construction compound,
2. Wheel cleaning facilities to be provided during construction,
3. Creation of estate junction with 2.4m by 68m visibility in each direction prior to occupation.
4. Details of
 - i) Relocation of the existing bus stop
 - ii) Relocation of the existing street lighting column
5. Construction details of the residential estate road and footway,
6. Scheduling of construction of estate streets,
7. Details of accesses to plot numbers 3, 4, 19, 20 and 21,
8. Laying out of parking spaces prior to occupation,
9. Removal of permitted development rights for garage conversions,

10. The first 5m of the proposed access driveways shall not be surfaced with a loose material (i.e. unbound chippings or gravel etc.).

Recommend [and summarised] informatives;

a Pursuant to Section 38 and the Advance Payments Code of the Highways Act 1980, the proposed new estate roads should be laid out and constructed to adoptable standards and financially secured.

b Pursuant to Sections 219/220 of the Highways Act 1980, relating to the Advance Payments Code, where development takes place fronting new estate streets the Highway Authority is obliged to serve notice on the developer, under the provisions of the Act, to financially secure the cost of bringing up the estate streets up to adoptable standards at some future date.

c Pursuant to Section 163 of the Highways Act 1980, where curtilages slope down towards the new estate street, measures shall be taken to ensure that surface water run-off from plots is not permitted to discharge across the footway margin. This usually takes the form of a dish channel or gulley laid across the access immediately behind the back edge of the highway, discharging to a drain or soakaway within the site.

d Highway surface water shall be disposed of via a positive, gravity fed system (i.e. not pumped) discharging to an approved point of outfall (e.g. existing public sewer, highway drain or watercourse) to be sanctioned by the Water Authority (or their agent), Highway Authority or Environment Agency respectively. The use of soakaways for highway purposes is generally not sanctioned.

e 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.

f The application site is affected by a Public Right of Way (Footpath number 177Glossop on the Derbyshire Definitive Map). The route must remain unobstructed on its legal alignment at all times and the

	safety of the public using it must not be prejudiced either during or after development works take place.	
Manchester Airport Aerodrome Safeguarding	No aerodrome safeguarding objections to the proposal.	
Housing Strategy	<p>The applicant is proposing to provide 6 units, equating to 20% as agreed within the S106 agreement. My main concerns are as follows;</p> <p>The applicant is proposing to provide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x 3 bed 93sqm 2 x 2 bed apartments 70Sqm 2 x 1 bed apartments 50sqm & 64sqm <p>I'm concerned about the provision of 2 bed apartments, as in my opinion these do not meet an identified housing need in the area. It would be my preference that the applicant to revise the mix to deliver more 1 bed apartments or 2 bed houses rather than the proposed 2 bed apartments.</p> <p>The applicant is proposing to provide the 4 apartments for affordable rent and the two 3 bed dwellings as shared ownership, this equates to a 66% rent and 33% shared ownership. The policy requires that 70% of the units be delivered as rent, but given the small number of units secured through the S106 agreement the developer is unable to meet this split. As per the applicants AHS I would agree with the revised tenure split.</p>	
United Utilities	<p>Comments awaited on revised plans.</p> <p><u>Original Comments – May 2019</u></p> <p><u>Drainage</u></p> <p>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. The NPPG clearly outlines the hierarchy to be investigated by the developer when</p>	7.53– 7.60

considering a surface water drainage strategy. We would ask the developer to consider the following drainage options in the following order of priority:

1. into the ground (infiltration)
2. to a surface water body;
3. to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;
4. to a combined sewer.

Following a review of the flood risk assessment/drainage strategy the proposals are unacceptable in principle to United Utilities as they do not follow the hierarchy of drainage options.

Management and Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems

Without effective management and maintenance, sustainable drainage systems can fail or become ineffective. We therefore recommend the Local Planning Authority include a condition in their Decision Notice regarding a management and maintenance regime for any sustainable drainage system that is included as part of the proposed development.

Recommend the Local Planning Authority consults with the Lead Local Flood Authority regarding the exact wording of any condition. Below is a useful example:

Prior to occupation of the development a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development shall be submitted to the local planning authority and agreed in writing. The sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan shall include as a minimum:

- a. Arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, or, management and maintenance by a resident's management company; and
- b. Arrangements for inspection and ongoing maintenance of all elements of the sustainable drainage system to secure the operation of the

	<p>surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.</p> <p>The development shall subsequently be completed, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that management arrangements are in place for the sustainable drainage system in order to manage the risk of flooding and pollution during the lifetime of the development.</p> <p><u>Water Supply Comments</u> If the applicant intends to obtain a water supply from United Utilities for the proposed development, we strongly recommend they engage with us at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p><u>General comments</u> It is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities' assets and the proposed development.</p>	
<p>DCC Contribution Officer</p>	<p>It is noted that a s106 has been signed on the original outline which provides for an education contribution towards St Andrews CE junior School, payable prior to occupation. No further comments</p>	<p>3.32</p>
<p>DCC Flood Risk Management Team</p>	<p><u>Comments awaited on revised plans.</u></p> <p><u>Comments on revised plans/information – September 2019</u></p> <p>No objection, subject to conditions. The drainage strategy for the proposed site is for surface water to be restricted to greenfield run off rate of 9.1L/S to the combined sewer.</p> <p>United Utilities have raised concerns of capacity issues and requested to find if there could be a more suitable outfall, on this basis the LLFA also requested that further discussions should be held with Highways England to assess if disposal to watercourse through</p>	<p>7.53- 7.60</p>

their land could be attained. Subsequently Highways England has stated that they still have no objection to disposal to combined sewer, and would also not accommodate any sewer through their proposed development. Given that the applicant has given a satisfactory response, with regards to assessing the drainage hierarchy for the proposed development, the LLFA cannot insist that a different outfall be sought.

Recommend the following conditions;

- Submission of detailed surface water management plan,
- Details of surface water management during construction phase,

Summary of the recommended informatives:

- The County Council does not adopt any private SuDS schemes. It should be confirmed prior to commencement of works which organisation will be responsible for SuDS maintenance once the development is completed.
- Works in or near an ordinary water course may require consent under the land drainage act 1991.
- No part of the proposed development shall be constructed within 3-8m of an ordinary watercourse and a minimum 3 m for a culverted watercourse (increases with size of culvert).
- The applicant should obtain relevant information pertaining to proposed discharge in land that is not within their control.
- The applicant should demonstrate the appropriate level of treatment stages from the resultant surface water discharge, in line with Table 4.3 of the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753.
- The County Council would prefer the applicant to utilise existing landform to manage surface water in mini/sub-catchments.
- A flood evacuation plans should be provided,
- Flood resilience should be considered,
- Details of peak flow control, volume control, infiltration systems.
- The applicant should submit a comprehensive management plan detailing how surface water shall be managed on site during the construction phase of the development ensuring there is no increase in flood risk off site or to occupied

	buildings within the development.	
DCC Urban Design Development Control Officer	<p><u>Comments on revised plans - November 2019</u></p> <p>There are still 31 Units. The applicant has rearranged the housing at the top of the site in lieu of placing apartments on the A57 entrance corner frontage. Whilst this gives a reduced cluster at the top of the site and fulfils the suggestion of the LVIA officer by removing two houses from the highest area of the site, I still consider the overall density to be too high. This is because the size of the dwellings and their height give a high level of built form. The rhythm of detached and semi-detached properties with gaps and retaining walls in between will still be too intense on this hillside.</p> <p>If we were to have a linear approach to housing development I would prefer a more terraced style of housing in blocks of three and four, than the rhythm of so many individual buildings, which I consider will look unattractive above the traditional terraces below.</p> <p>I have concerns regarding the height of the buildings on the North-western elevation and the impact these will have on the skyline when approached from the roundabout north of the A57. At three storeys they are 11m and 11.5m high and although the ridgeline is lower than other houses within the development, my assertion is that the majority of the elevations are likely to be exposed to views from the A57. The tree screen at the rear will be affected by the implementation of the building works and resultant cutting of the bank will delete part of the existing tree screen. New mature trees will take time to grow and I am not convinced the provision will be enough with the type of retaining treatment recommended.</p> <p>I welcome the reconfiguration of the houses in the highest north-eastern corner of the site which allows for more space and reduces visual impact. However, I consider the expanse of tarmac put aside for group parking is a poor ending to the street. This has also resulted in deleting of the footpath link to the High Peak Trail that we have recommended previously. This footpath we considered was necessary for walkability</p>	7.8-7.24

and connectivity.

In effect, the overall character is still too urban with the impression of a town house development within a visibly rural context. In particular the integral garages are a concern and would not be an appropriate character in this site's context. The integral garages are emphasised by the box windows above. I still concede that this is not in the spirit of the outline which had smaller units, larger gardens and more public open space which allowed the woodland at the rear to be managed, rather than at the risk of private gardens reducing the screening to The High Peak Trail. The tree screen in the foreground is also dependent on being maintained in the private gardens of the properties below. If the effectiveness of this screen were reduced then the buildings above would be more dominant, especially at 3 storeys high.

The apartments on the corner are an uncomfortable introduction because of the introduction of a hipped roof when no other exists, and the placing of a flank wall with windows directly against the footpath. This is a poor entrance into the estate and not in character with the terraces along here. Plots 1-4 do not represent traditional simple terraced layout and the overall impression is still a predominantly detached characteristic with 15 substantial detached four bedroom 2-3 storey properties with integral garages.

The amount of parking spaces at 59 spaces results in more than the outline application which proposed 51 spaces. This is due to the number of 3-4 bed houses that also require integral parking to meet parking standards. These add to the increased urbanisation of the site and will detract from the frontages and opportunity to create green amenity space.

The development has an uncomfortable rhythm because of the number of detached narrow frontage three storey houses. A better response was to create blocks of 3 and 4 number terraced houses with ridgelines that step up and down.

Conclusion

This site is located in an elevated position with a degree of woodland screening. It is a previous brownfield site that in principle was given outline planning permission for housing development. The applicant has tried hard to respond to the topographical constraints on this site however, this has still resulted in a pattern of development which gives an appearance of being too dense and too urban in character, a result of the restricted developable area of the site due to steep slopes and woodland planting. The resultant rhythm, intensity and height of the houses present other issues, such as the possibility of visibly dominating the houses below, an intense urban development form and character, and poor useable garden spaces and lack of connectivity to the wider footpath network.

My recommendation is Refusal on urban design grounds.

Submission of Design Framework to the applicant which included the following principles (October 2019)

1. Blocks of terraced properties, in two and three storeys,
2. Parking located across from the dwellings at the rear of existing dwelling on A57,
3. Reduction of housing to upper north eastern slope of site,
4. Footpath to meet trail above.
5. Realign road eastwards,
6. Reduction in number of properties overall to create a stepped terraced layout.

Comments on Revised Plans - September 2019

The layout is more linear to reduce the levelling required and to use upper garden areas on sloping less useable land. However, this will give a strong building line with frontages and backs being clearly visible within the surrounding landscape. In particular, I am concerned on the impact of views from across the valley and along the A57 from the north. The height of the housing at this point and the reduction in tree screen in rear gardens will increase the prominence of

the rear of Plots 26-31. These plots will have three storey rear elevations and the land immediately falls away quickly at the rear with a change in levels of up to 5m. I am concerned these dwellings will have an impact on the skyline.

The sloped access path to the trail above is a welcome addition; however a path without steps meandering up the slope would be a preferable. This could be achieved by removing these two plots and retaining this area as open space within the scheme, which would have added benefit of giving space to improving the layout.

Plots 23-25, The Bayport, are detached 3 storey houses. I prefer the amended main door access at ground floor level, however, I still do not like the repetition of integral garages as these are not a traditional vernacular in this location and provide a townhouse character rather than a rural character to the development.

Plot 19&20 The Cortland are projecting forward due to need to squeeze in as many houses as possible. I would prefer these two to be two-storey height also. Plots 16-17 The Woodmere, semi-detached are also three storey frontages. Between plots 12 to 18 there is a rhythm of three storey properties stepping slightly down the hillside. In general, most ridge heights are between 136m and 138m, assuming the height of the three storey houses at approximately 11 m. Overall, between Plots 5 to plot 23, which are all 3 storey frontages there is a level difference of 5 metre.

Plots 1 – 4 The Rye are two storey semi-detached on the main road frontage, these are in scale and character and alignment with existing properties along the A 57 and are acceptable. There are 60 car parking spaces throughout the development and I consider this also to be excessive.

The scheme is not acceptable on urban design grounds. The scheme is in too prominent a location and with the level of density proposed there are issues with

being able to achieve an acceptable layout. I therefore recommend Refusal of the application.

Initial comments (July 2019) - The site is steep and overlooking the A57. It does not relate well to existing development. The existing houses along the A57 are terraced properties with little frontages, and the odd detached house, with farm and fields opposite. The High peak trail and crossing point over the A57 is also a key accessibility point for walkers, cyclists and horse riders, this crosses near the entrance to the site and up and behind the hillside of the proposed development site.

The proposed layout for 31 dwelling appears very dense due to the height and massing of the proposed development. The proposal is for 14 No 3 bed and 17 No 4 bed, which I do not consider a good affordable mix. The scheme is dominated by 3 storeys + (main bedroom in roof space) throughout the scheme and this in fact gives the appearance of 4 storeys despite the attempts to have long roof slopes at the front of the properties. The overall effect is too intense.

The street scenes are mainly characterised by a predominance of steps and garages at street eye-level, which is too urban and hard. The continuous facades of integral garages will look bland. The amount of stairs to first floor doors looks unnecessarily fussy. The proportions of the Huntingdon are more likely to be acceptable on this site.

The use of white render is not ok in this location as this will be highly visible across the valley, neither so I like the use of stone Quoins as trimmings to white facades in this location. It is out of character and pastiche. The frontage of the Woodmere with the projecting stone 'Art Stone band course' with the lintel of the window immediately below it looks uncomfortable. I only see window lintels occasionally touching the eaves level in some traditional Derbyshire terraces but not at ground (of first floor level) on taller buildings.

	<p>Some of the elevations have a repetition of small single casement windows which gives a bland appearance to the rear walls. Whilst these are probably non-habitable rooms the elevational treatment should be better arranged so that they can still have a mix of double and single casements.</p> <p>In general, the development provides a too densely laid out 'townhouse' character dominated by steps and garages at the front and steps and retaining walls to rear gardens. This is a very intense rhythm in this location. The areas of green do little to mitigate the urbanising effect.</p> <p>I would like to see links to be made to other housing areas: to Sandy bank Close and Springfield Close; and the High peak trail if possible. The layout in the outline plan gave more possibility of this.</p> <p>There are difficult level issues with this site. If the only solution is to have long linear terraces, this isn't necessarily bad design response, so long as the detail is correct. This would mean a reduction in height and massing, and a friendlier street frontage. This would mean arranging garages and parking differently, and providing front doors at street level.</p>	
<p>DCC Landscape</p>	<p><u>Comments on revised plans - November 2019</u> The Outline has been approved with an overall greater area of tree loss; I am not sure how to make a case against the current application for tree loss.</p> <p>However, I do consider that the proposals will have a big impact on the existing tree buffer (A). I am concerned that much of the existing/buffer planting to Tree Buffer A is within private gardens and the longevity of trees in this situation is not assured. In addition I am concerned that the space allowed for Tree Buffer B is insufficient and along with the level changes in this area there is a risk this will not be successful.</p> <p>Comments on Landscape and Visual Assessment –</p>	<p>7.25-7.33</p>

The LVIA states that:

'Visibility of the site is highly localised given the existing screening provided by the neighbouring built form and mature tree planting to the east and south of the site. The natural topography of the area is gently sloping in nature. Views into the site are typically broken by boundary vegetation, built form and hedgerows.'

I agree with this I would recommend a more detailed examination of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility taking into account the ridge heights of the proposed dwellings.

I consider that views looking west into the site are a key area where the present proposals will have an unacceptable impact by interrupting and creating a gap in a belt of mature trees on the skyline.

The LVIA considers that providing a footpath link to the Trans Pennine Trail will have a large impact on the existing woodland buffer. However, I consider that the inclusion of a footpath can be dealt with in a way that minimises tree removal. It is the regrading required for the construction of the dwellings in this area which necessitates the larger scale removal of trees and I consider the LVIA over emphasises any tree loss that would result in construction of the footpath.

I do not agree that sufficient attention has been paid to reducing tree loss and consider that this is problematic with the proposed density.

Conclusion

I have concerns about the scale of the loss of existing trees and the visual impacts of this; I consider that in some cases the LVIA does not explore the impacts of this in enough detail. It does identify the need for new buffer planting as mitigation especially to the north of the site and recommends the omission of plot 23. I agree with the need for new buffer planting but this will take time to reach maturity and I consider that the preservation of existing planting needs to be given more importance. The LVIA concludes that with the

	<p>inclusion of recommended mitigation, the development will not impact negatively on the character of the site and surrounding area. However the existing plans do not include this mitigation and at the density shown it will not be possible to provide it. I would consider that plots 22,23,24 would need to be omitted to maintain the buffer to the Trans Pennine Trail and that the existing trees be retained to the rears of plots 26-31 by redesigning the layout and parking areas to allow the dwellings to be closer to the access road.</p> <p>I consider that the conclusions of the LVIA necessitate the revision of the current layout and following that any affected views need to be reassessed and accompanied by photomontages of the principle views.</p>	
<p>Derbyshire Wildlife Trust</p>	<p><u>Comments revised plan – November 2019</u></p> <p>It is understood there are some minor amendments to the proposals but there are no significant amendments to the scheme since our comments in September which are still relevant.</p> <p><u>Comments September 2019</u></p> <p>Further to the responses that we provided on 14th May 2019 and 24th July 2019 it is understood that the proposed development layout has been amended slightly with one less road turning head than previously proposed. We have also reviewed the revised soft planting schemes produced by SLR L1-L4. The amended layout and the revised soft planting scheme has not addressed our concerns in relation to the proposed layout as detailed in all our responses from 2017 and 2019.</p> <p>We still maintain that the proposed development will result in a net loss of biodiversity and that this needs to be addressed, either through significant amendments to the site layout and/or through off-site measures (above and beyond the Section 106 agreement). Details of the concerns raised can be found in our previous responses from 2017 and 2019.</p>	<p>7.34-7.36</p>

Comments on updated information – July 2019

Further to the response that we provided on 14th May 2019 we have received the updated Ecological Mitigation, Compensation & Enhancement Scheme (424.06992.00002, July 2019) produced by SLR and a copy of the S106 agreement.

In terms of the SLR report we recommend that the proposed swift and bat boxes, which are surface mounted boxes, are changed for integrated boxes. Integrated boxes require no maintenance, are less visible and are less easily removed/tampered with, and provide a much better long-term biodiversity benefit. The report should be amended to reflect this. We welcome the planting of 47 trees, 80 m of new species-rich hedgerow and the incorporation of hedgehog gaps into the new fences. We note that a small area of wildflower grassland is proposed along the western boundary; however this is very limited in extent and includes proposed trees which are likely to shade the grassland and add leaf litter.

As we stated in our 14th May 2019 response we still maintain that the current proposed layout is of significantly less benefit for biodiversity than the approved plan at outline stage. The existing woodland along the eastern boundary is to be partially lost (along with ponds and grassland) and the retained sections are to be within the individual ownership of the new property owners. We still advise that this is contrary to the aims of local and national planning policy.

We can see that a Section 106 agreement has been drawn up that secures financial contributions from the developer for management/maintenance of existing open space to the east of the proposed development site. There are no details about how this woodland will be managed and maintained or its existing value. There can often be conflicts between areas that are to be used as public open space and areas for wildlife, so it would be useful to understand if a management plan is to be drawn up to manage this woodland in the long-

term for its biodiversity rather than amenity value. Even with this Section 106 agreement in place it is still considered that the proposed development will result in a net loss of semi-natural habitats (grassland, woodland and ponds) and consequently in biodiversity. The concerns about this layout that we raised in 2017 and in May 2019 are still relevant and have not been fully addressed. Additional compensatory measures are required.

Original comments May 2019

The current proposed layout (Drawing: 1228/PR-001 Rev. G, HNA Architects) seems significantly less beneficial for biodiversity than that approved at the outline stage (Drawing: WB000003, BNP Paribas Real Estate). It no longer includes the retained woodland along the eastern boundary outside gardens, but instead has garden curtilages extending into the woodland. This appears to result in the loss of woodland and an increase in the risks of fly-tipping and garden waste being introduced to the woodland. We do not support this alteration in layout and advise that it is contrary to the aims of local and national planning policy.

A small area of wildflower grassland is proposed along the western boundary, however this is very limited in extent and includes proposed trees which are likely to shade the grassland and add leaf litter. The Trust welcomes the native hedgerow and the wildlife attracting shrubs; however these are unlikely to compensate for the loss of habitats on site.

The Trust also welcome the inclusion of bat and bird boxes, however we would advise that swift boxes should be integrated and at least eight installed within the scheme (perhaps two on each dwelling proposed in the Ecological Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Scheme (SLR, 2019)). Hedgehog holes should also be included in boundary fencing.

Overall, the development will result in the net loss of

	<p>semi-natural habitats (grassland, woodland and ponds) and consequently in biodiversity. We do not consider that the measures proposed in the new layout and the Ecological Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Scheme (SLR, 2019) adequately address this or reflect our comments made at outline stage.</p>	
<p>HPBC Officer Tree</p>	<p><u>Comments on revised plans</u> I agree with DCC Landscape officer, whilst the initial impact of development will not lead to an increase in the area of tree loss the long term impact of the proposals will be much greater due to the inclusion of the tree buffer in the garden area.</p> <p><u>Comments October 2019</u> - Clarity has been provided with regards to trees on site and on HPBC land.</p> <p>The tree works specification to thin the group is broadly acceptable and in line with good management but it is not clearly defined in terms of species to be selectively removed or not. The method statement provided relates to health and safety issues in relation to work by constructors on site not tree protection. A full arboricultural implication study is required.</p> <p>To the east of the site there is a significant tree belt which is adjacent to public open space. The trees in this area are densely planted and in need of management.</p> <p>This proposal leads to significant potential loss of trees. Instead of the tree belt being retained within POS [as shown at outline] it is now within private gardens which are sloping meaning that trees are on higher land and potentially will be imposing. I anticipate that there will be a lot of ad hoc tree removal which will impact on the effect of this screen as a landscaping buffer. Also this will lead to a loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>There will also be increasing pressure to fell or inappropriately prune trees in the council land to the east and issues with fly tipping and encroachment are likely</p>	<p>7.25-7.33</p>

	<p>As the current layout stands I consider that there has been inadequate consideration of the impact on the trees to the east of the site. There is a preference for this area to be POS as illustrated in the outline consent so the landscape and ecological benefits of this group can be maximised.</p> <p>Any impact or loss of this group needs to be mitigated for with additional tree planting and / or ecological enhancements to be agreed with DWT.</p> <p><u>Original Comments – August 2019</u></p> <p>The tree report does not clearly differentiate between trees on the development site and those trees on HPBC land to the east. The trees to the rear either need to all be in joint management or within garden areas as it stands it appears that there is an area which will be ‘no man’s land’ which could be an issue from the future management of the open space to the east. I also note the layout makes no provision for linkages with the POS and the footpath networks from within the site. I consider it should to both encourage active lifestyles but also to avoid any number of ‘private’ and ‘unofficial accesses being created from the rear gardens of the properties. The landscaping with the site is limited and restricted to ornamental species.</p>	
<p>HPBC Environmental Health</p>	<p><u>Comments awaited on revised plans.</u></p> <p><u>Comments following revised plans/information – October 2019</u></p> <p>The preliminary phase 2 ground investigation submitted for the upper site is accepted by further phases (additional ground investigations, remediation, validation of remediation) is required prior to the discharge of condition 25 on the outline application relating to contamination.</p> <p><u>Comments – September 2019</u></p> <p>Im in broad agreement with the details within the site investigation report however clarification is required regarding site formation levels. If ground is excavated vertically towards gassing vegetation layer it would</p>	<p>7.60- 7.62</p>

make sense to remove. A discovery strategy may be appropriate.

Comments- August 2019

As the submitted reports has been made independently of other investigations taken for the land it does not adequately characterise the site and does not address implications of previous investigation results. Findings cannot be accepted at this time.

Comments – April 2019

Environmental Health Department has no objection to the proposed development subject to the conditions set out below being applied to any permission granted. Condition 24 of outline approval HPK/2017/0198 has not been met.

The contaminated land reports submitted in support of the application may be accepted but the reports identify the need for further assessment:

In addition I believe further assessment is required to characterise the site with regard to the following:

- Additional assessment for TPH C12-C16, Naphthalene and Trichloromethane identified in ground waters. The reports should be submitted to the EA for assessment; there may be a charge for this (E3P, 2018).
- Based on the above exceedances there are grounds to require additional assessment of soil concentrations of (S)VOC including degradation products such as vinyl chloride, in the region of the petrol station forecourt, and surrounding land (to determine the source of contamination).

Further general assessment is also required for the embanked area as only a relatively small number of samples have been taken, the pond area should be targeted along with proposed gardens.

The piling method statement submitted is insufficient to discharge condition 8 of approval HPK/2017/019, in that it describes the physical act of piling, but does not

	<p>address any of the appropriate environmental issues. In this case the issues will be (but not necessarily limited to) loss of amenity to surrounding properties due to noise/vibration, and potential pollution of controlled waters as the piling creates a pollution pathway from contaminated soils to the water table.</p> <p>An appropriate method of attenuating the noise element would be to limit the hours of operation e.g. “piling shall not take place outside the hours 09:00 hours to 16:00 hours Mondays to Fridays”, and/or to use an alternative piling method e.g. screw piles, or a bottom driven piling system.</p> <p>An assessment of the potential to contaminate ground waters should have regard to, and make reference to the guidance set out in the Environment Agency publication “Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention”, (Environment Agency 2001).</p> <p>Recommend following informatives –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any approved noise scheme and measurements should pay due regard to British Standard BS8233: 2014 Sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings BS4142 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound and the Building Regulations 2010 Document E or other appropriate guidance. • Advice on controlling flies and light can be found in: Statutory Nuisance from Insects and Artificial Light (DEFRA 2005) <p>A Demolition or refurbishment asbestos survey and risk assessment should be carried out prior to the demolition of the existing buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During any demolition and construction activities (including landscaping) the contractor shall take all reasonable steps to prevent dust formation and prevent any dust formed from leaving the site boundary. 	
Environment Agency	<u>Comments Awaited</u>	7.53-7.60
HPBC	The proposals secured sports and open space	3.2

Operational Services	contributions at outline.	
Alliance Waste and Recycling	No issue with this application.	

7. POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS AND PLANNING BALANCE

Policy Context

7.1 The determination of a planning application is to 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 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 currently consists of the adopted High Peak Local Plan April 2016.

7.3 At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development (paras 10 and 11). For decision makers this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date, grant planning permission unless a) policies in the Framework which protect areas or assets of importance provide a clear reason for refusing the application or b) any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

7.4 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 a well-designed and safe built environment, 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 contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making the effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

7.5 Section 5 of the Framework relates to delivering a sufficient supply of homes. Paragraph 59 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.

7.6 High Peak Local Plan policy S1a establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development as contained within the NPPF.

Principle of development

7.7 The principle of residential development on the site has already been established by the granting of outline consent (HPK/2017/0198) and this application for all reserved matters does not present an opportunity to revisit that principle. This reserved matters application therefore seeks to agree matters of layout, access, scale, appearance and landscaping.

Layout, Scale and Appearance

7.8 Section 12 of the NPPF outlines that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what planning and the development process should achieve. Design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 127 seeks to ensure development;

a) functions well and adds to overall qualities of the area over the lifetime of the development,

b) are visually attractive as a result of good design,

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting whilst not discouraging innovation,

d) establish a strong sense of place using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

e) Optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount of mix of development and support local facilities and transport networks.

f) Create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity of existing and future users and where

crime and disorder, including the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

7.9 The NPPF is clear that permission should be removed for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

7.10 Policies S1 and EQ6 of the adopted Local Plan seek to ensure that development is well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to its environment whilst contributing towards local distinctiveness and a sense of place. New development should take account of the distinct character, townscape and setting of the area and secure high quality and locally distinctive design and amenity. Developments should be easy to move through and around and incorporate well integrated car parking, pedestrian and cycle routes.

7.11 The High Peak Design Guide 2018 requires the setting of any building to be carefully considered. New development should be guided by the existing character and context. The adopted Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design 2005 also provides guidance on the approach to new residential development, and the factors which contribute toward local distinctiveness. The National Design Guide 2019 explains that the underlying purpose for design quality is to create well-designed and well-built places that benefit people and communities. This includes people who use a place for different purposes i.e. to live, or pass through and includes people at different stages of life with different abilities. A well designed place comes about through making the right choices concerning layout, form and scale of buildings, appearance, landscape, materials and detailing.

7.12 The site is located within an elevated position and currently has a wooded setting. Existing development in the surrounding area is characterised by modest terraced dwellings with limited frontages, with occasional detached dwellings and farmland and fields opposite. It is noted that the site is close to the proposed Mottram Bypass, access to which is planned to be directly on the opposite side of the A57. This is likely to introduce direct views of the site on the hillside when approaching the proposed junction where the road joins the A57. Larger residential estates are found to the east of the site however this is well screened behind the trees that surround the public right of way that runs along the eastern boundary. The footpath links to the residential development to the east and also to the north and the wider footpath network which includes the route of the Trans-pennine trail as discussed above.

7.13 The elevation through the site will require significant engineering to create an accessible estate street and useable garden areas including significant retaining walls and boundary treatment. Due to the topography of the site combined with the design approach, dwellings are presented as either three storey to the front or rear depending on the siting. Views of the elongated side elevations of the dwellings will be present when travelling along the A57, in particular when driving in a southerly direction views between Travis Perkins and the existing gable end of 86 Woolley Bridge will be of the rear of the three storey properties. Although additional screening and tree buffers have been provided at this point (and also to the east and west of the site following the advice contained within the Landscape And Visual assessment

submitted by the developer) the extent of this cover, particularly during the winter months is not considered to overcome the concern from the imposing 3 storey rear elevation that would be visible along the A57. The DCC landscape officer considers that this view point is very prominent and more than a fleeting view. The proposals will require the loss of existing trees which interrupts an established 'green screen'. The proposed mitigation, including the addition of a reinforced planted retaining structure, along the northern boundary will take a substantial time to establish and the long term health of the trees to be retained so close to significant level change is unclear.

7.14 The dwellings are proposed to be constructed in artificial reconstituted stone (buff) with traditional art stone headers, cills and mullions to windows all on the front elevation. At the rear there is no such detailing with larger proportioned bi-fold doors, double doors and Juliet balconies. Ten of the houses feature chimneys and are dispersed throughout the site. A slim interlocking tile will be present on the roof with stone corbels below the fascia.

7.15 The lack of stone heads and cills on rear elevations results in a poor elevation with 'floating' windows. Due to the orientation of the dwellings and public right of way, the rear elevations will be prominent, most notably plots 26 to 29 in the north western section of the site but also to the east where glimpse views through the trees are possible especially to the north eastern section of the site. The rear elevations and are odds with, and detract from, the character of the proposed estate.

7.16 The alterations to the layout at the far north eastern corner of the site to reduce the built form at this point are welcomed although the car parking area in its place is not visually attractive and would be a bland turning area.

7.17 The loss of the footpath link to the Trans Pennine trail is a significant loss to the proposal in terms of linking the site with neighbouring residential development, wider footpath networks and also reducing the reliance on private vehicles. The DCC landscape officer comments that the LVIA over emphasises any tree loss that would result in construction of the footpath and it could be included in a way that minimises tree removal. It is the regrading required for the construction of the dwellings in this area which necessitates the larger scale removal of trees. The omission of the path removes a potentially visually interesting and attractive woodland walkway leading up to the public footpath. Paragraph 74 of the NPPF states that patterns of movement are integral to well-designed places. The removal of the footpath from the scheme will remove the connectivity of the site to housing to the east, north and south resulting in pedestrians having to use the main A57 as the sole means of pedestrian access. This is contrary to the advice within the national design guide, sections 8, 12 and 9 of the NPPF and policies EQ6, S1 and CF6 of the local plan, which all seek to promote connectivity, sustainable travel and inclusive design.

7.18 The alteration of the previously acceptable arrangement of 2 pairs of semi-detached dwellings at the south west part of the site adjacent to the site access, to a pair of semis and apartment block is a retrograde step. The apartment block introduces a hipped roof form which now unbalances the row of dwellings and is at odds with the predominant gable roof form of the terraces houses which front Woolley Bridge (A57). The side elevation which sits along the entrance is a

cumbersome elongated elevation that lacks legibility and does not represent a typical gable end which is characteristic of properties along Woolley Bridge.

7.19 The detached houses which are three storey, have a tall and narrow appearance and a total height of up to 11.5m. Built form within the Riverside Meadows Landscape Character Area is characterised as simple with square or rectangular shaped properties with little or no ornamentation. Buildings should have broad front elevations with narrow sides or a square plan form and steep roof. The dwellings present a distinctly urban feel and will appear as town houses. The narrow spacing between with extensive engineering will create an unattractive street scene particularly above the terrace below. The spacing between the dwellings is minimal and the elevated land behind and steps to access rear gardens will close this further. The semi-detached buildings are overly-dominant and not easily read as a pair of properties.

7.20 Although amendments during the course of the application have resulted in improvements to the design of the house types, including the removal of large external stair wells for access, a reduction in the number of integral garages and the omission of render, the approach to the layout and scale of development has not changed and remains unacceptable.

7.21 Overall, the proposed layout and approach to the design of dwellings on this site, including a significant proportion of 3 storey units is not considered to respond well to the surrounding character of this area. The proposed pattern of development gives an appearance of being too dense and too urban in character. The resultant rhythm, intensity and height of the houses presents other issues, such as visibly dominating the houses below, an intense urban development form and character, and poor useable garden spaces. Due to the proposed new highway which will be accessing the A57 close by to the site, this site will be very prominent on one of the main approaches into Glossop. It is imperative therefore that a well designed scheme is achieved in this location which will be a gateway into the town.

7.22 In general, a layout in a linear form could be acceptable in this location. However, the principle of detached and semi-detached dwellings so closely positioned and at a considerably greater height than the existing development on Woolley Bridge (approx. 9m above the terraced house on the A57), on elevated land and with 3 storeys all contribute to an elongated mass which will fail to integrate into the surroundings and have a dominant impact when viewed from outside the site particularly above the existing traditional terraced houses on Woolley Bridge. The height of the dwellings and incline of the road would also create a very urban and imposing form of development from within the site. The DCC Urban design officer comments that the number of narrow detached 3 storey dwellings creates an uncomfortable rhythm and that the development is too urban.

7.23 Two of the proposed housetypes (Bayport and Huntington – both 4 bed units) do not fully meet the requirements of the National Described Space Standards, both being deficient in floor area in one of the bedrooms which is approx. 1m² below standard. However, the Council recently sought legal advice on whether house sizes (floor space) and housing mix were a matter to be determined at the reserved matters stage. Counsel's advice is that these matters should be determined at the

outline stage by the use of appropriate conditions and/or legal agreement. In this case, the original outline consent did not secure specific house sizes or mix, and therefore the requirements of Policy H3 cannot be secured at this reserved matters stage in any event.

7.24 Whilst the principle of residential development on this site has been previously accepted, the proposal as submitted is not considered to result in a good quality form of development and is contrary to the provisions of sections 8 and 12 of the NPPF, policies EQ6 and the provisions of the National Design Guide 2019, High Peak Design Guide 2018 in this regard and the Residential Design Guide 2005.

Arboricultural and Landscape and Issues

7.25 Section 15 of the NPPF requires decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that development is sympathetic to local character, history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).

7.26 Policy EQ2 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to protect, enhance and restore the landscape character of the Plan Area for its own intrinsic beauty and for its benefit to the economic, environmental and social well-being of the District. Amongst a number of criteria, development should be informed by and sympathetic to the distinctive landscape character as identified in the Landscape Character Supplementary Planning. Policy EQ6 identifies that development should contribute positively to an areas character, and consider the relationship between buildings and landscape features. Moreover, public and private area should be well designed and provide for the retention of significant landscape features such as mature trees. Local Plan policy EQ9 seeks to protect existing trees, woodland and hedgerows. Add in the outline indicative layout anticipated that as landscape buffer would be provided to the eastern boundary to link into the existing tree belt and the area of the Trans Pennine Trail. The proposed layout provides this area within individual gardens.

7.27 The High Peak Design Guide 2018 requires the setting of any building to be carefully considered, including its impact on views into over and out of the site. Paragraph 4.15 outlines that a careful analysis of the site and its context including the wider landscape setting is essential.

7.28 The site lies predominantly within the Riverside Meadows with the eastern edge merging into the settled valley pastures landscape area. Within this area the landscape is defined as river corridors enclosed by steep valley sides and extensive woodland. Built form is characterised as simple with square or rectangular shaped properties with little or no ornamentation. It should have broad front elevations with narrow sides or a square plan form and steep roof. Materials should reflect the local and traditional buildings and the colours of the wider landscape.

7.29 The proposals will require a significant level of tree clearing to create a developable area and the land level changes will likely affect trees that are to remain. The Councils Arboricultural officer considers that there is insufficient

consideration on the impact on the trees to the east of the site. At the outline stage it was proposed that these would remain within open space. It is however understood that the development will not lead to a greater initial loss of trees from the site than was envisaged at outline stage, the proposals are more harmful to the trees to the east of the site. At outline stage, an swathe of land along the east of the site was to be left as open wooded area and not privately enclosed. As outlined by the HPBC tree officer, as these trees are on higher land and potentially will be imposing, it is anticipated there will be a lot of ad hoc tree removal which will impact on the effect of this screen as a landscaping buffer and also lead to a loss of biodiversity. It could also lead to fly tipping and encroachment issues within the Council owned land to the east.

7.30 In support of the application, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment was submitted by the applicant. Following this, amendments were made to the scheme, predominantly to the layout, to incorporate more tree buffers with the aim of assimilating the development in the existing landscape character framework and reducing the visual impact the development may have when viewed from surrounding areas.

7.31 Whilst additional tree planting and screening is a welcome addition to the proposal, the tree screening within buffer D lies completely outside of the red line area. These are not protected trees and lie within rear garden of existing properties and so cannot be relied upon to be maintained. Similarly, parts of tree buffer A is within private gardens of the proposed dwellings and the longevity of trees in this situation is not assured. The DCC landscape officer considers that the space allowed for tree buffer B is insufficient and along with the level changes in this area there is a risk this will not be successful.

7.32 The removal of the footpath is a retrograde step and the omission of any link to the footpath to the east and other residential development is poor and not in accordance with the principle of the National Design Guide 2019. The removal of trees to construct dwellings in the north east of the site is more harmful and necessitates large scale tree removal. The applicant's contention that a path would affect the woodland is refuted. An informal path could integrate within existing landscaping.

7.33 Overall, tree loss on the whole was envisaged on a similar scale throughout the site at outline. However, there has been inadequate consideration of the impact of the proposals on the trees to the east of the site, contrary to Policies EQ2 and EQ6.

Ecology and Biodiversity

7.34 Section 15 of the NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment by protecting and enhancing biodiversity. When determining applications paragraph 175 states if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from development cannot be avoided (through locating to an alternative site), adequately mitigated for or as a loss resort compensated for then planning permission should be refused. Policy EQ5 of the Local Plan seeks to conserve and enhance the

biodiversity and geological resources of the area by ensuring that development proposals will not result in significant harm to biodiversity or geodiversity interests.

7.35 The application is accompanied by an ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement scheme which identifies the provision of bat boxes, bird boxes provision of additional planting. Additional planting and screening is also proposed within landscape buffer zones to the north, east and west of the site. However much of this planting is within private gardens, a significant amount to the front of dwelling adjacent to parking areas. The ecological report relies on the woodland buffer to the east of the site for a wildlife corridor. However as outlined above, as this will be partly within private gardens and is likely to come under pressure for felling and pruning, the long term retention of this area would undermine the potential biodiversity enhancements required by the Derbyshire Wildlife Trust.

7.36 The applicant has stated that the section 106 provides for a contribution towards the enhancement of public open space to the east of the site. However, Derbyshire Wildlife Trust has commented on the proposals and consider that the proposed development will result in a net loss of biodiversity. This is also a view supported by HPBC tree officer. This would need to be addressed through amendments to layout or off site measure over and above the section 106. As these have not been forthcoming during the course of this application, the proposal is considered to conflict with paragraph 175 of the NPPF and local plan policy EQ5 in this regard.

Highway safety

7.37 Section 9 of the NPPF states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of development proposals so that, amongst other things, opportunities from existing or proposed infrastructure are realised, opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport are identified and pursued, and patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design or schemes and contribute to making high quality places.

7.38 Paragraph 108 of the NPPF identifies that in assessing an application for development, it should be ensured that:

- a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and
- c) 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.

7.39 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that 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. Para 110 goes on to state development should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements within the scheme and with neighbouring areas.

7.40 Policy CF6 of the adopted Local Plan 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. Policy EQ8 of the Local plan requires that through its layout and design, new development should respond to the location of existing green infrastructure and ecological networks, supporting their appropriate uses and functions. The Local plan identifies the Trans-pennine Trail as a multi-functional trail that links green spaces, residential areas and town centres together across the Local Plan area.

7.41 The outline application identified the access point off the A57, details of which were required by condition. The developer has worked with Highways England and Derbyshire County Council to agree a design and layout of this access. Revised plans and additional information has been provided to overcome technical issues although the access and layout of the estate street has stayed largely the same throughout the application. The scheme meets with the relevant parking standards with the 4 bed house types also having integral garages. There are no objections from the Highway Authority or Highways England to the scheme.

7.42 During the course of the application a footway was included on revised plans which linked the site to the public footpath (Trans Pennine Trail), this was removed contrary to officer advice. The developer states that this is due to comments within their LVIA, which states the removal of the path as proposed would allow for additional planting and thereby reduce the impact of the development on receptors from medium to low. It does not consider an alternatively designed path that would be expected in a wooded area. The developer also cites the compliance with the Designing out Crime SPD 2005. Whilst the SPD identifies pedestrian access routes can have an impact on whether or not an area may be vulnerable to crime, it does not advise against footpaths, but merely advises they are designed to be clear, direct, busy and well used. The Trans Pennine is a well used green infrastructure route linking Broadbottom and Hadfield, and its wider connections to residential developments to the east.

7.43 As highlighted above, although parking standards are met, due to the linear layout, the development would be visually dominated by vehicles parked at the front of dwellings. The removal of the footpath link from the scheme is considered to be a significant missed opportunity to integrate the development with existing public right of way networks and green infrastructure and closes off the development from existing routes. Residents will be only able to access these routes via the A57, a busy heavily trafficked main road with planned additional highway infrastructure to the west. Accordingly the development does not meet Policies EQ8 and CF6.

Impact on neighbouring residential amenity

7.44 The NPPF at paragraph 127 (f) seeks to ensure that planning decisions deliver, amongst a number of factors, a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policy EQ6 requires new development proposals to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development taking into account matters such as overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effects, noise and light pollution. The Councils adopted Residential Guide SPD advises that a distance of 21m between habitable

windows of adjacent properties should be achieved to provide an acceptable level of amenity. Where changes in level are evident, these distances should increase by 1m for every 0.5m in height difference between the smaller and the taller building.

7.45 Due to significant differences in levels between existing dwellings on Woolley Bridge and the proposed dwellings, (between 7m and 9m difference in ridge heights) an extended privacy distance of around 39m between habitable windows is required. This is possible throughout much of the site although is not possible from the rear of No.s 54 and 56 Wooley Bridge Road where the maximum distance between properties is around 25m.

7.46 However it is noted that there is currently considerable screening at the rear of the 54 and 56 Woolley Bridge, indeed this is identified as tree Buffer E on the proposals which would reduce any potential for overlooking. In addition, as the increase in elevation is so significant the overlooking potential is confined to roof lines rather than directly into windows.

7.47 The proposed properties will undoubtedly affect outlook from the rear of dwellings along Woolley Bridge road but due to the orientation of the dwellings would not harm the levels of daylight to such a degree as would be considered unreasonable. The positioning of the properties to the south west of the site avoids any undue shadowing or loss of light as they sit forward of the existing pair of semi's of 54 and 56 Wooley Bridge road. The proposed side elevations facing north are blank and thus avoid any overlooking issues.

7.48 To the south of the site, the nearest proposed dwelling would be 17m and positioned at right angles to the existing property, Hillside. The property features an existing domestic garage to the side and established planting which would screen much of the development. Proposed boundary treatment would maintain privacy for the garden areas of the existing and proposed development. There are no residential properties directly to the east or north of the site.

7.49 On balance, the proposals are considered to maintain the amenities of existing neighbouring residential properties and provide a suitable level of amenity for future occupants of the proposed dwellings. The proposals are therefore considered to meet the requirements of local plan policy EQ6 and para 127 (f) of the NPPF in this regard.

Affordable housing

7.50 Section 5 of the NPPF seeks to guide the provision of affordable housing within a site, requiring a minimum 10% of the affordable units to be affordable ownership. Policy H4 of the Local Plan requires a 30% affordable housing contribution on sites of 25 units or more, with 80% rented and 30% shared ownership/intermediate split. As noted above, through the submission of a viability assessment, which was accepted at the outline application stage, the Section 106 agreement has secured the provision of 6 affordable units. All of the units proposed meet the minimum Nationally Described Space Standard.

7.51 The submitted affordable housing statement states that the house types submitted have been changed during the course of the application to suit registered providers requirements, providing 2x 3 bed two storey dwellings offered for shared ownership and 2x one bed and 2x two bed flats for affordable rent (this equates to 66% affordable rent and 33%% shared ownership). A letter of support from Equity Housing Group supports this mix. Although this is not strictly in accordance with the tenure split of 80% affordable rented and 20% shared ownership as outlined within the signed section 106 agreement, the housing strategy officer has not raised objection to the amendment which would be subject to a formal variation. With regards to housing mix, it would be preferable to revise the scheme to incorporate more 1 bed apartments or 2 bed houses, which could be achieved if necessary by an appropriate planning condition.

7.52 The affordable housing statement explains that due to the topography (which would necessitate larger units built into the hillside) and for management reasons the affordable units are grouped around the entrance to the site at the south west. Whilst it is preferable to disperse units the site, it is accepted that the proposed location provides an accessible level for the dwellings.

Flooding & drainage

7.53 Policy EQ11 of the Local Plan seeks to support development which avoids areas of current or future flood risk. Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that development in areas at risk of flooding, should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk.

7.54 The site lies within flood zone 1, an area which has the lowest risk of flooding, whilst the site entrance and areas of plots 1- 4 at the far south western corner of the site are located within flood zone 2, with flood zone 3 covering the A57 to the west of the site.

7.55 It is proposed that the drainage strategy for the proposed site is for surface water to be restricted to greenfield run off rate of 9.1L/S to the combined sewer. Foul drainage is also proposed to the public combined sewer network via gravity system within the site access road and connection made on the A57.

7.56 The FRA accompanying the application identifies that the modelled water level information for a 1 in 100 year plus 35% climate change event equates to a depth of approx. 300mm in the A57. The report notes that the proposed Bypass would provide betterment to this situation, however this is not a development with consent. Finished floor levels for plots 1-4 are elevated 600mm above 100year plus 35% climate change event which the flood risk assessment states in accordance with Environment agency requirements.

7.57 Additional information has been submitted during the course of the application, as requested by DCC Flood Risk Team. The LLFA has concluded that there are no objections subject to the conditions and informatives outlined. Comments are awaited from United Utilities and the Environment Agency regarding the revised plans/information and will be reported at committee.

7.58 Bearing the above comments in mind it is considered that the proposal will be able to incorporate appropriate drainage for the site and that no flooding issues will result from the development.

7.59 Therefore, it is considered that, subject to appropriate conditions, as there is no flooding or drainage issues arising from the application the proposal accords with Local Plan policy EQ11 and section 14 of the NPPF in this regard.

Land contamination

7.60 Policy EQ10 of the Local Plan seeks to protect people and the environment from unsafe, unhealthy and polluted environments. Paragraph 170 (e) of the NPPF states that 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. Policy S1 of the Local Plan and paragraph 127 (e) of the NPPF seek to protect the amenities of all existing and future residents.

7.61 Part of the site has previously been occupied by a petrol filling station, which was removed some years ago. Following discussions between Environmental health and the developer during the course of the application and the submission of additional/revised information, the Council's Environmental Health Officer raises no objections to the proposal, subject to a range of conditions and informatives.

7.62 It is considered that the combination of further investigations and appropriate mitigation, can resolve any underlying contamination issues. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development does not pose any significant environmental health risks to people or the environment and that the application accords with policies S1, EQ6 and EQ10 of the Local Plan and paras 127 and 170 of the NPPF in this regard.

8. PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSIONS

8.1 The development of the site has been accepted by the granting of the outline planning permission in January 2019. The overall number of houses to be delivered at the site remains the same as considered in respect of the original outline application and also forms part of the built up area boundary.

8.2 However, the scheme proposed differs significantly from indicative layout at outline which anticipated the development would sit away from existing trees to the east and provide a less urban arrangement. Whilst topography is a significant challenge on this site and negotiations have been ongoing with the developer it has not been possible to arrive at a scheme which is considered acceptable. Despite several revisions to the proposals site wide, the scheme is still considered to result in a poor quality design that does not function well or add to the overall quality of the area. The proposal would be contrary to the provisions of sections 8 and 12 of the NPPF, policies S1a, CF5, EQ6 and EQ8 of the local plan, the provisions of the National Design Guide 2019 and High Peak Design Guide 2018 in this regard.

8.3 Furthermore, the scheme conflicts with LP Policy EQ5 and NPPF paragraphs 170 and 175a, which seek to ensure that developments recognises the wider

benefits from ecosystems and does not significantly harm biodiversity interests. Currently, the proposals result in a net loss of biodiversity. Revised plans and additional information has been submitted but does not adequately reduce harm, mitigate for, or compensate for the loss of biodiversity on this site.

8.4 In conclusion, the scheme proposal would not be a sustainable form of development as it would harm to the environment and conflict with the development plan and the NPPF when taken as a whole. 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.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. That the application is REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its layout, form, scale, appearance fails to result in a good quality design that would integrate well with the established green corridor or provide a well designed place that benefits people and communities. The proposed development would cause significant harm to the visual character of the locality, contrary to the provisions of sections 8 and 12 of the NPPF, policies S1, EQ2 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan and the provisions of the National Design Guide and High Peak Design Guide 2018.

2. Due to the layout, design and the lack of connectivity to existing public rights of way, the development fails to respond to the location of existing green infrastructure and does not to create a development that is well integrated to existing pedestrian routes. This is contrary to the provisions of Policy S1, CF6, and EQ8 of the High Peak Saved Local Plan and sections 8 and 12 of the NPPF, and the provisions of the National Design Guide and High Peak Design Guide 2018.

3. The proposed development will result in a net loss of biodiversity which has not been adequately addressed. The proposals are therefore contrary to the provisions of Local Plan policies S1 and EQ5 and paragraph 175 (a) of the National planning policy Framework.

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 Operations Manager - 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.

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process and thorough discussion with the applicants. In accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF the Case Officer has sought solutions where possible to secure a development that improves the economic, social and

environmental conditions of the area, however it has not been possible to secure a form of development that is considered to result in a good quality design.

SITE PLAN

