

**HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

2nd December 2019

Application No:	HPK/2019/0316	
Location	Shire Hill Hospital, Bute Street, Glossop	
Proposal	Outline Planning Permission for residential re-development with demolition of existing buildings (all matters reserved).	
Applicant	NHS Property Services Ltd	
Agent	Claire Adie, Planning and Design Group (uk) Ltd	
Parish/ward	Old Glossop	Date registered: 5 th July 2019
If you have a question about this report please contact: Faye Plant, faye.plant@highpeak.gov.uk 01538 395400 ext. 4995		

REFERRAL

The above planning application has been referred to the Development Control Committee as it is a major development.

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 Shire Hill Hospital is located to the North east of Glossop, approximately 1.6km from the town centre, and to the north of Old Glossop. The hospital closed in 2018 and is currently vacant and comprises 1.7 hectares in area made up of several buildings, access roads and car parking. The site comprises the former Glossop Union Workhouse constructed between 1832 and 1834, along with an infirmary building added in 1890's-1920's, a former barn (of unknown date) and other more modern buildings and associated ancillary structures. The buildings have been significantly altered and extended over the years in order to accommodate the former NHS services.

2.2 Shire Hill Hospital (the former Glossop Union Workhouse) was considered for listing by Historic England in 2018. The Secretary of State decided on 5 December 2018 not to add the building to the List. The Local Authority were notified by Historic England in September 2019 that the building should not be added to the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest and that a Certificate of Immunity from Listing (COI) should be issued for the building. A copy of this report by Historic England and the reasons for issuing a certificate of immunity from listing is detailed below;

<http://services.historicengland.org.uk/webfiles/GetFiles.aspx?av=59381359-1C6F-46BE-A71B-C2CD33741A12&cn=12CBA110-4C71-42F8-94D5-C66388843CC8>.

2.3 In general the report concludes that removal of buildings and other alterations have diminished the original context, eroded the architectural character of the workhouse. The essential principal elements have been lost to successive phases of development and the site should not be listed. Although not listed or within a conservation area, the buildings, particularly the former barn, workhouse and infirmary and have acknowledged significance for historical and communal values and are therefore considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.

2.2 The site is accessed via a single entry point at the end of Bute Street with an emergency entrance to the east off Blackshaw Clough. The site slopes upwards from the south and east and climbs gently through the site to north where land continues to rise and meets agricultural land. A field gate in the western corner of the site provides access to neighbouring agricultural land to the east. Trees surround the site to the north and east with mature trees located through the site, tree preservation orders cover individual and groups of trees within the site. The hospital site is included in the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record database and a further historic environment record is located to the north east of the site and relates to disused sandstone quarries circa 1880

2.3 For the purposes of the High Peak Local Plan, the site is located within the countryside, with Greenbelt surrounding to the north, east and west of the site, the built up area boundary is to the south. The Old Glossop Conservation area is located to the south.

3. THE APPLICATION PROPOSAL

3.1 This application seeks outline consent for residential development with all matters reserved. The application also includes the demolition of all existing buildings. Consent for matters relating to scale, access, landscaping and design will all be subject to a reserved matters application for a later date.

3.2 The revised indicative layout demonstrates the removal of all existing buildings on site and construction of 52 units of residential accommodation shown with the following mix described in the accompanying planning statement;

- 32 dwellings comprising,
 - 12x 2bed town house terraces
 - 12x 2-3bed semi-detached dwellings,
 - 8 x 2-23 bed detached dwellings.
- 20 apartments

3.3 The existing access point off Bute Street will be utilised and widened to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians, requiring the relocation of a stone pillar. The field access to the west and access to the east will be retained.

3.4 Revised plans and additional information has been provided during the course of the application which reduce the scale of the development shown on the indicative layout plan from 72 units.

3.5 The application is accompanied by the following key supporting documents;

- Revised Planning Statement
- Design and access statement
- Site Location plan
- Revised Indicative Layout Plan
- Topographical Survey
- Tree Survey
- Transport Assessment
- Travel Plan
- Archaeological Desk Based assessment
- Derbyshire County Council Monument Full Report
- Updated Flood risk assessment
- Updated Drainage Scheme
- Updated Ecological Appraisals
- Interim Bat Assessment
- Utility Assessment
- Asbestos Appraisal
- Affordable Housing statement within Planning Statement
- Environmental Risk Assessments
- Transport Statement
- Heritage Assessment
- Draft Heads of Terms

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

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=233454>

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Numerous applications relate to minor alterations and developments in relation to its former use as a hospital.

5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Adopted High Peak Adopted Local Plan 2016

Policy S1	Sustainable Development Principles
Policy S1a	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Policy S2	Settlement Hierarchy
Policy S3	Strategic Housing Development
Policy S5	Glossopdale Sub Area Strategy
Policy E4	Change of use of Existing Business Land and Premises
Policy EQ1	Climate Change
Policy EQ2	Landscape Character
Policy EQ3	Rural Development
Policy EQ4	Green Belt Development
Policy EQ5	Biodiversity

Policy EQ6 Design and Place Making
 Policy EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
 Policy EQ8 Green Infrastructure
 Policy EQ9 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
 Policy EQ10 Pollution Control and Unstable Land
 Policy EQ11 Flood Risk Management
 Policy H1 Location of Housing Development
 Policy H3 New Housing Development
 Policy H4 Affordable Housing
 Policy CF3 Local Infrastructure Provision
 Policy CF4 Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities
 Policy CF5 Provision and Retention of Local Community Services and Facilities
 Policy CF6 Accessibility and Transport
 Policy CF7 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy

High Peak Design Guide 2018

Supplementary Planning Guidance

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

Designing out Crime

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Achieving Sustainable Development

Paragraphs 2 - 11 The presumption in favour of sustainable development

Section 5 - Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes

Section 6 – Building a strong, competitive economy

Section 8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities

Section 9 – Promoting sustainable transport

Section 12 – Achieving well designed places

Section 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Section 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

National Design Guide 2019

6. CONSULTATIONS

Site notice	Expired: 12/09/2019
Press notice	Expired: 19/08/2019
Neighbours	Expired: 14/08/2019

Neighbours

A total of 155 representations have been received, details of which can be read on the related public files. The following is a summary of the objections and issues raised:-

- Some of the older existing buildings should be retained and utilised on the basis of the respect for the importance of the social history of Old Glossop and the area itself.
- The wealth of wildlife in and around the proposed site will be compromised by the level of disturbance created by the proposed building.
- The increase in traffic volume would impact greatly on the health of those who live along the route,
- This would be a large increase in the local population would put further strain on Glossop's service infrastructure, i.e. getting necessary appointments with the local doctors and places in schools for children in the area.
- There are mature native trees which provide a necessary environment for several species of wildlife including birds, mammals, beneficial insects and bats. Close to the wall on the outside of the site is an extremely rare species of native edible mushroom which would be destroyed by any destruction of its location.
- There is no consideration to the flow of traffic exiting the area and, in particular, the impact on Wesley Street and Wellgate, and the subsequent extra traffic flowing out onto Church Street, Church Street South, and Manor Park Road.
- Church Street South, is often described as the "Jewel in the Crown" of Glossop, because of its heritage, character and 17th Century origins. More traffic flow will do nothing to preserve its character or respect its heritage.
- Extensive growth of Old Glossop will erode the sense of the community and it will become a series of commuter passageways.
- This proposal forms part of a group of three - HPK/2019/0215, HPK/2019/0311 and HPK/2019/0316. If all three current applications are granted, it would mean the total number of new houses for Old Glossop would exceed the Local Plan by 3 times. A small community like ours would not be able to sustain this and on those grounds alone the proposal should be rejected.
- The site contains remaining elements of Glossop's historic workhouse, which would be demolished as part of this proposal, rather than considering alternative uses or sensitive conversion which would preserve the visual amenity of the site.
- The proposed development is overlooked by some of the the main western access points to The Peak District National Park's Bleaklow area, in particular the old Glossop Low Quarry track that heads northwards from Charles Lane.
- Increase in pollution from vehicles
- There are no local amenities (shops, banks, fuel, post offices etc) and only 1 small school, it is 25 minutes is the nearest shop, along many roads that have no pavements.
- Application is lacking in ecological information
- The development will increase light pollution,
- The public footpath (Blackshaw Clough) runs along the east side of this site, this path is the gateway to the Peak Park within 300 metres of the hospital gates.
- The amount of affordable houses offered on this development is just above 10%, 8 houses (80% renting and 20% buy), how can this assist local first time buyers on the property ladder. There is also a neglect of consideration for accessible houses for disabled or older people.
- The area has known flood issues

- Each housing unit will require parking for min of two cars and access to the area is already over stretched
- The style of these houses also do not fit in with the local area.
- This is a windfall site not planned development,
- There is a shortage of primary places locally and cannot take more demand,
- How will tourism be affected when this tranquil heritage area is transformed into busy through-roads?
- The Council need to put health, safety and well-being before profit,
- This is not sustainable for the future as car usage is a significant contributor to climate change and should be rejected.
- The plan to replace an older stone building with new houses is out of character with the surroundings of the village and would not fit in with the conservation area .
- The development is too close to the nearby National Park to allow additional traffic and the noise/ air pollution that this entails.
- The site could be of archaeological relevance
- Too many houses are planned to be built,
- Pedestrian safety is an issue as there is a lack of pavements in many areas or a very narrow pavement, with the already poor access for emergency vehicles.
- This application is in conflict with the stated aims of the High Peak Local Plan, which states: If permission is granted for a change of use or redevelopment, preference will be given to premises remaining in some form of community or employment use so long as this does not result in traffic, amenity, environmental or conservation problems.
- Demolishing the stone buildings and replacing it with modern housing is in conflict with point SO4 of the High peak local plan 2016 : To protect and enhance the character, appearance and setting of the towns and villages.
- The historic buildings which could be converted in to serviced dwellings (ideally for the elderly or other vulnerable people) without there being any significant change to the nature of the local area
- The site is in an area of considerable beauty, which attracts tourists, not least walkers; the proposed development changes the nature of the local area and reduces its attractiveness to visitors.
- The proposed drainage system appears adversely to affect other sites, and does not take in to account the current increase in rainfall and the long-term effect of global heating
- The land is adjacent to a wildlife habitat rich in native Peak District birds, toads, hares, buzzards, deer, moles, voles and Kingfishers to name but a few.
- Old Glossop has a very antiquated sewer system,
- The bus route at present can just about be manageable but with additional traffic and kerb parking necessary this would cause gridlock.
- The existing history and architecture of Shire Hill should be maintained and parts of the tower and workhouse be retained for future generations.
- The Hospital was gifted to the NHS and therefore any profit should be returned to the health service.
- The economic benefits by no way outweigh the negatives.
- There are not many places left like this and our places of interest need protecting.
- Any development should be for the benefit of local people, such as sheltered housing for the elderly/stroke patients etc. The proposed 8 units of social housing is derisory.

- Increasing hardstanding areas would increase the run off of water down the watercourse/soakaway from Swineshaw Reservoir to Glossop Brook. There have been periods of sustained, heavy rainfall above expected monthly averages. This is likely to become the norm.
- The design would not add to the overall quality of the area and clearly fails to reflect the character of the Old Glossop area.
- If demolished the amount of very heavy lorries loaded with stone and waste would have a severe detrimental impact on the immediate vicinity and the Old Glossop Conservation area. A vehicle count by Old Glossop Residents' Association logged more than 4,500 vehicles per day. The additional traffic generated during any build and the subsequent traffic generated by any properties built would be excessive and detrimental to the health, safety and wellbeing of local residents.
- An asbestos survey carried out on the property in February 2019 highlights issues and need dealing with immediately. What assurances can be given to the people of Old Glossop in regard to asbestos removal.
- These NHS buildings could be restored or rebuilt to provide additional dental and health care options that are sorely lacking in Glossop.
- The risk of accidents happening will increase considerably
- Glossopdale Secondary School was oversubscribed for the 2019 intake, with the building of a further one hundred and sixty four houses this will put increasing demands on limited public resources.
- The train service from Glossop to Manchester is overcrowded
- The Kilmory development was provided with a tank system to store flood water for regulated release at a later date. I don't believe that the tank will be able to cope with the increased surface water run off from Shire Hill
- The plan was for Old Glossop to have only 30 houses.
- The views are beautiful in that area meaning we can see the Peak National Park uninterrupted. Adding new properties on this field just metres from the Park will mean massive ugly blots of brick / fake stone will disturb the natural surroundings forever.
- The area is very popular for outdoor pursuits and increasing traffic and reducing parking will make it unsafe for all these groups.
- The proposals will affect waste management
- The one way road off Bute St between a characterful bungalow and small house is not suitable for 200 cars per day. This would cause serious structural damage to the bungalow and houses nearby especially during building works.
- Guardians of the Borough who founded and invested in Glossop Union Workhouse on this site, sought to enable all to benefit from nearby access to clean air, open spaces and improved service provision to enhance wellbeing.
- How can levels of traffic will be lower than when Shire Hill hospital was open.
- The age profile of the population means there is going to be a greater need for hospital facilities rather than less,
- There are inaccuracies in the reports – it states walking distance to Glossop Dale school which has been closed for over 12 months.
- I understand that 80% of the dwellings planned for this site are to be sold as "buy to lets" which is an absolute disgrace
- The Shire Hill development alone would increase the built-up residential area by 18% and house numbers by 22%. The further implications are an increased population of perhaps around 250 people, 150+ cars and 168 extra wheelie bins.

- Contradicts HPBC policy “Council committed to securing best outcome for Shire Hill”
- Alternative use should be considered following the example of Whitfield House, Glossop which provides independent living for older people with added security of support services
- The site is surrounded by pasture on three sides. It is highly visible from the popular walking route
- The three contiguous sites located to the north east of the village can only be accessed via the original street layout of the historic village.
- The Climate Crisis, and recent events at Whaley Bridge (Toddbrook) have highlighted possible complacency over flash flooding and risks from early Victorian dams upstream of residential areas.
- Modern planning should include re-using existing buildings to improve our carbon footprint.
- The archaeology report states that the building should be demolished as it has been vandalised but a lack of security by its owners is not an excuse for demolition
- The report states there are workhouses in other parts of the country that are better preserved then it really is not worth preserving this one. This is Glossop Workhouse; we are not in other parts of the country.
- In 2018 Historic England recognised the historic significance and local significance of a number of structures on the Shirehill site with particular attention given to the "early workhouse".
- The proposal that because of the close proximity of two public parks there is no requirement to provide additional recreational spaces removes the opportunity for residents to have communal spaces where families can share time.
- Combining SUDS schemes with communal spaces offers a more sustainable way forward when considering planning.
- The location on the hill means people will drive rather than walk,
- Detailed designs should be submitted before determination,
- The travel plan is inaccurate and based on irrelevant statistics
- The flood report is inaccurate and states there has been no flooding,
- The build density is more in keeping with large urban areas rather than the semi-rural area of Old Glossop.
- The land drainage system for houses on Kilmory Fold is poor and severe flooding downstream in Manor Park happens regularly. Further development would impact on the current soakaway area and cause increased flooding in flood zone 2 and 3 to the south.
- The Bridge on the corner of Wesley Street and Hope street is already struggling with clear signs of traffic damage
- Any application within Old Glossop should be stopped until the Old Glossop Neighbourhood Development Plan is drawn up.
- The development is contrary to the Key Issues within the Local Plan
- Recently, 44 new builds were created on land off Shepley street and Hope street which have placed enough pressure on Local Infrastructure,
- Proposals compromise emergency vehicle access
- If the building is demolished then reuse the materials on site which would help to maintain a link with the sites history and reduce the need to transport material off site and bring in new construction materials.
- The hospital had a bus turning circle which should be retained

- It is evident there are springs on the site as water runs down Bute Street from the site even in dry weather,
- There will be increased flooding downstream as seen in recent flood events at Manor Park
- Even if the government funded the infrastructure there is no way the narrow and unpedestrian roads could be widened
- The amount of affordable houses offered on this development is just above 10%, 8 houses (80% renting and 20% buy), how can this assist local first time buyers on the property ladder.
- Demolishing the building will destroy the bat population
- Heritage Statement does not assess the impact on the grade II listed Laneside Farm. The proposals will affect aspects of setting which contribute towards its significance.
- The small town has absorbed expansion in Simmondly, Hadfield, Shire Brook, Scotty Brook, Pygrove, York Street, The Heath and Shepley Street. Numerous other developments are underway.
- Old Glossop has flooded in the past - in 1930, 1969 and 2002 and this development will make it worse and more frequent
- A vehicle count by Old Glossop Residents' Association logged more than 4,500 vehicles per day, with Church Street being used as a cut through/rat run by motorists avoiding Glossop town centre traffic lights.
- It is against the guidance for the Provision and Retention of Local Community Services and Facilities agreed in the High peak local plan of 2016
- There are no local job opportunities,
- Under the High peak local plan, 'The ongoing protection and enhancement of these key assets is essential for maintaining the quality of life for local residents.' This is incompatible with this proposed development for a variety of reasons.
- This development clearly harms the distinctive character of Old Glossop conservation area
- Transport assessment is lacking and uses other non comparable site and assumptions,
- It is not a sustainable site, it is 20min uphill walk from Glossop amenities,
- The land is outside of the development boundary and the land should be returned to countryside
- There are no shops to serve the development in Old Glossop,
- Environmental issues are a global concern with insects, butterflies, bees, etc essential to ecological balance and needing meadows and fields. Developing over three hectares would have an irreversible effect on the environment.
- Noise from additional vehicles will be unbearable
- Apartments will not sit well aesthetically on elevated ground,
- Such a large collection of dwellings on the edge of the Green belt is unacceptable,
- The historical and philanthropic social background is well documented and although the buildings may not have listed status their purpose has been to serve the community of the area. So much of Glossop has been lost recently we need to preserve and salvage what we can.
- There is no public benefit with this proposal
- The neighbouring applications (Bute Street and Hawkshead Mill) all need to be dealt with together and the cumulative impact considered.

- The poor condition of the building is the view of the developer only, it has only been vacant 18 months.
- The whole development would spoil the integrity, ambience and character of the village.

Councillor Jamie Douglas – Old Glossop Ward

The site is not in the Local Plan as a site for housing. Furthermore, it is outside the 'built-up area' boundary. Either of these on their own are grounds for rejecting the application. The Local Plan was put together to deliver a long-term plan for 'sustainable housing growth' in the High Peak. To approve large-scale development such as this one, outside of the areas approved for development, runs contrary to the Local Plan.

My other objections are the same as those put forward in detail by Old Glossop Residents Association (OGRA), so rather than repeating all their points here, I will state that I fully support all of their objection comments. This application should be rejected

Councillors George and Jean Wharmby

Objection on the grounds of inadequate infrastructure - The access to this site is via already over capacitated roads in this conservation area of Old Glossop. The one way system along Thorpe street is narrow and large construction vehicles will have to navigate a sharp right hand bend. This is already a problem area for the local bus service. The way out from Bute street is equally as dangerous more so for pedestrians and young children in this already populated residential area you then have navigate even narrower streets of Well Gate and Church Street. If this development is approved the congestion will increase significantly with private cars and these days daily delivery vehicles.

Old Glossop Residents Association

Comments on revised information - We refer the committee to HPK/0003/9653 which gave permission in 2001 for Ollersett View Hospital to be redeveloped to include 4 bungalows, 7 houses and 24 apartments. Like Shire Hill Hospital, Ollersett View Hospital was a former workhouse that later expanded to become an infirmary. The redevelopment of the site included a sympathetic and successful conversion of the former workhouse and we see no reason why any redevelopment of the Shire Hill Hospital site should not follow the same rationale. We support comments of the Conservation officer, Tree Officer, DCC Archaeology, DWT, Roger Hargreaves on behalf of Glossop and District Heritage Trust, and Marion Barter.

Flood Risk

The Flood Risk Assessment applied to this application is not in dispute. However, the SUDS report is disputed as the drainage figures quoted do not seem to allow for global warming effects. The positioning of the proposed swales could compromise the properties adjacent to them on Kilmory Fold.

Sustainable Development

DCC Clean Air policy aims to minimising resource use and maximise energy efficiency. Poor air quality is found on transport routes and Old Glossop residents living along the

access and egress route proposed for the Shire Hill development would experience an estimated increase of 25% in vehicle use and therefore the equivalent in air pollution.

Given that the National Climate and Carbon Reduction Manifesto adopted by DCC promotes the use of electric cars, it would be supportive of this stance if the proposed residential development of Shire Hill Hospital took the innovative step to integrate electric car charge points for every dwelling. Doing this would also fulfil the NPPF requirement to create sustainable developments.

Infrastructure Schools

We note the Derbyshire County Council consultation (closed on 15/11/2019) on the expansion of Glossopdale School. In summary DCC believes that there is a strong case to expand the school however it is seeking the views of interested parties about the expansion and the provision of an additional 240 pupil places.

Given the issues experienced for the 2019/20 applications for places at Glossopdale School, we ask the committee to check the veracity of the information contained within the consultation document and to fully gauge the impact of any proposed housing developments in Glossop on places at Glossopdale School.

Marion Barter (referred to by DCC archaeology)

Comments on revised plans - The amended planning statement offers no robust justification for total site clearance and the scheme will not contribute to local distinctiveness or reinforce local identity unless it retains at least one of the existing buildings- the earlier workhouse or the barn. A similar scheme at Ollersett show it is feasible to retain old buildings alongside new work to genuinely create sustainable development that will also retain some local heritage. There is very strong local concern about losing all buildings on the site, which surely carries weight in this case.

Original comments - Historic England recognised the historic significance of the buildings as an early workhouse and for its local significance, although the buildings do not meet national listing standards due to the level of alteration. The buildings have acknowledged significance for historical and communal values and should be treated as a non-designated heritage asset (NPPF para 197 and HP policy EQ7) in the planning process.

The heritage impact assessment provides an accurate summary of the history and significance of the main buildings on the site (former barn of unknown date, former workhouse dating from the 1830s, the infirmary added in the 1890s-1920s and various ancillary buildings). The best of the buildings are surely capable of re-use, particularly the former barn, a robust structure, and the 1830s workhouse. If the barn and 1830s range are converted to dwellings instead of cleared for new houses, this would be a sustainable solution that retains local distinctiveness, alongside new build. How can total demolition and new build protect local distinctiveness?

There is no detail on the options appraisal process and the potential for a compromise scheme. I disagree that the scheme will have no impact on Old Glossop conservation area; total demolition will negatively affect the setting of the CA and the traffic impact will be harmful to the character of the village conservation area. Partial retention of buildings would preserve part of local heritage, the setting of the CA and comply with the NPPF's

core principle that development should be sustainable for environmental and social as well as economic factors.

I am also very concerned at the accumulative impact of new housing and associated extra traffic on Old Glossop and the surrounding inadequate road infrastructure, particularly when the Shirehill application is considered alongside proposals for Bute Street/Hope Street (HPK/2019/0215) and Hawkshead Mill (HPK/2019/0573). It is not credible for the Shirehill applicants to argue that the traffic generated by the scheme for 77 dwellings will have 'no severe residual impact' on surrounding roads.

The current scheme should not be approved as it is contrary to policies EQ6 and EQ7. Instead, a compromise option for partial retention of buildings alongside some newbuild should be thoroughly explored

Roger Hargreaves on behalf of the Glossop and District Heritage Trust

Additional Comments -

The extant main workhouse building dates from about 1840 and was built by the Glossop Poor Law Union, formed in December 1837, to meet its responsibilities under the 1834 Poor Law (Amendment) Act. The original parish workhouse, opened in 1835, then served as the workhouse infirmary until a new infirmary was built in 1897, and thereafter as accommodation for elderly inmates and infirmary staff, finally being demolished in the 1960s along with the separate casual ward.

Although, contrary to the assertion in the Heritage Statement, the extant workhouse was designed after the passage of the 1834 Act, it is nevertheless of more than just local historical significance, being very untypical of early union workhouses. This reflects what appears to have been a local policy of minimal compliance with the harsh requirements of the 1834 Act, which was in turn probably a consequence of the fact that the Glossop Union was largely contiguous with the Duke of Norfolk's Glossop estate, and the Board of Guardians would have been heavily influenced by the Duke's agent.

Apart from the loss of the chimneys, and the addition of a door plus the uPvc windows, the front elevations of the main building and the extension retain their original appearance, the removed dormer windows dating only from the 1860s, and the exterior of the 1842 barn/cowhouse is also largely original. As a group, they represent the greater part of the Union workhouse as shown on the 1857 Poor Law Map, the main losses being the parish workhouse/infirmary and the casual ward/porter's lodging which stood next to the original gate.

The workhouse was designed after the passage of the 1834 Act, it is nevertheless of more than just local historical significance, being very untypical of early union workhouses. The building retains largely what appears to be its original plan. It might not be possible to retain this in its entirety in a conversion to housing, but if access to dwellings was primarily from the back it should be possible to restore the front elevation, chimneys excepted, to its original appearance. Such a conversion is perfectly viable, as has been demonstrated by the successful conversion of the Hayfield Union workhouse, later Ollersett View Hospital in New Mills."

Original Comments -

The loss of any buildings of local heritage significance is to be regretted. However, in respect of the majority of the buildings the Trust and GLAS accept the conclusions of the Heritage Report, that there is no realistic alternative to demolition.

Consideration should, though, be given to the conversion of the main workhouse building and the infill block to apartments or houses as part of the larger scheme. Although the main building is of rather less historical importance than indicated in the report, dating from around 1840, the original workhouse, opened in 1835, having been demolished in the 1960s, it is nevertheless a relatively-intact example of its kind, has considerable local heritage significance, and is of relatively simple design and domestic scale which might well lend itself to sympathetic conversion. Consideration should also be given to including the barn, which dates from 1842-3; as a group, these three buildings represent the initial expansion of the original workhouse to meet the requirements of the 1834 Poor Law (Amendment) Act.

In order to preserve a memory of what the site was, the boundary walls and gate piers should be retained as far as possible, and appropriate names should be chosen for the development itself and for the internal roads. Any portable internal features of historic importance such as plaques or tablets, and the stained-glass name panels above the ward entrances, should also be identified and arrangements made for removal and preservation.

Prior to demolition or conversion the standing buildings should be fully recorded to the appropriate national standard, and a full archaeological record should be made of the remains of the original workhouse, its lodge and casual ward, which now lie under grass and tarmac at the east end of the site, and which represent a significant survival of a complete workhouse site pre-dating the coming into force of the 1834 Act.

High Peak Access Group

- Proposed site plan gives no details of house plan types or layout or sizes
- There is no detail of how access and inclusion is considered
- Indicative design schedule of size makes no reference to National Described Space Standards Guidance or accessible housing
- No details are given about the public realm or accessible footpaths
- As a result of legal advice given in respect of a previous development, (Foxlow Farm), the council needs to be clear on expectations relating to size and internal layout of dwellings for accessible housing at outline stage with appropriate conditions to any approval.

Consultations

Consultee	Comment	Officer response
Highways England	The submitted transport assessment indicates a net reduction in trips from the proposed residential development (including am peak) when compared to the previous usage (hospital). In addition the site is	

	<p>over 2 miles distance to the strategic Road Network (SRN). The proposal will have no material impact on the SRN and as such Highways England have no further comments to make.</p>	
<p>DCC Highways</p>	<p>A major concern of the Highway Authority is suitability of the junction layout of Bute Street and Blackshaw Clough to serve development of both sites. I note that approval of access & layout is being sought with respect to the Land East of Bute Street site (East site) whilst all matters have been reserved for the former hospital site.</p> <p>It's noted that the Transport Assessment has been submitted in support of 77no. residential units although the application has now been revised to be for 52no. units. The Assessment predicts that morning peak hour trips generated by the development proposals will be equitable with those generated by the former use, however, there would be a net reduction of around 100no. trips per day (based on 77no. units). The Highway Authority does not consider that there is an evidence base to suggest that this conclusion is incorrect.</p> <p>The overall reduction in trips would be sufficient to enable the modified existing access (linked footway; minimum 5.0m carriageway width; and speed suppression features) to be considered acceptable subject to there being no additional development served via Blackshaw Clough. However, as stated above, <u>it would appear that there is insufficient controlled frontage to deliver an adoptable layout therefore the internal road(s) would remain private.</u> (NB vertical deflection (i.e. speed suppression features) will not be considered to support development within existing or proposed highway).</p> <p>The existing site access to Blackshaw Clough is identified as an emergency access (with pedestrian and cycle use) as the existing highway leading to this point is not considered to be suitable to serve additional development. Comment with respect to possible improvement to enable an adoptable layout to be delivered has been provided above.</p> <p>Reference is made to the public footpath located approximately 25m to the south east of the Bute Street access providing a shorter route to local amenities although it should be noted that the path is unlit and has a stepped section thereby potentially</p>	

limiting those who may use it in terms of time and capability.

It is considered that the local topography is likely to make walking and cycling less favourable than may be the case elsewhere and the Glossopdale school has relocated to the single site at Hadfield (i.e. in excess of the preferred maximum distance suggested within the Assessment).

Whilst an Indicative Draft Sketch Layout (drg.no. 18.074/6 dated 30/08/19) has been provided, as stated within the Assessment, layout is a reserved matter and would be the subject of future Full or Reserved Matters submission. This being the case, detailed comment won't be provided on the layout other than it should generally meet the recommendations of the Delivering Streets and Places design guide and, unless a satisfactory access can be delivered, will remain private.

Use of a loop road arrangement would be acceptable although all dwellings should be located within the recommended maximum maximum distance of 25m of a turning facility suitable for use by a typical supermarket delivery vehicle.

Swept paths for a Large Refuse Vehicle have been provided although these of limited use until the proposed layout is known. It may also be prudent to demonstrate suitability of the layout at any future stage for use by agricultural vehicles accessing the field to the north west of the site.

I trust that you will ensure adequate conveniently located off-street parking is provided for each premises and areas adjacent to the proposed estate street(s) are provided for standing of waste bins on refuse collection days.

Appropriate forward and exit visibility sightlines will need to be secured to be maintained clear of obstruction as necessary and footways will need to be of 2.0m minimum width (if adoptable criteria can be met elsewhere).

Comment with respect to operation of the Bute Street - Kilmory Fold junction is noted and agreed. However, this may need to be reviewed if both developments, the subject of this response, were to go ahead.

	<p>Specific comments with respect to the Travel Plan are appended to this response. The document should be revised as necessary to incorporate the attached comments. It's recommended that funding of £750 p.a. is secured for a period of 5 years for monitoring of the document i.e. £3,750 total (index linked).</p> <p>Therefore, it's recommended that each of the applicants is given opportunity to submit revised details to satisfactorily address the above issues. However, if you are minded to determine the applications as submitted, the Highway Authority would be grateful to receive further opportunity to provide recommendations for inclusion within the Decision.</p>	
<p>DCC Urban Design Development Control Officer</p>	<p>I have formulated the view that the workhouse building, and the facade of the hospital have significant heritage and townscape value to warrant retention.</p> <p>The site is close to the historic core of Old Glossop but has a direct relationship to the surrounding landscape, due to its historical edge of settlement location. The current car park is exposed within the wider landscape and any houses on it will be visually prominent. They will not blend with existing development and be visually prominent.</p> <p>The housing layout fits well within the space of the site and tries to introduce some characterful design with attempts to have green amenity space at the entrance opposite the existing gateway lodge and creating verges around the trees along the north east boundary of the site. The apartments attempt to add interest with a crescent shape form with the backdrop of existing trees used to minimise their impact. However, the scheme is very suburban in this edge location with a more urbanising effect than the existing old institutional buildings and their setting in an enclosed wooded large garden area.</p> <p>There are three potential housing applications that will change the character of Old Glossop. Each one is compartmentalised with little attempt to address the historic fabric or relate to each other in character.</p> <p>A framework for development is required to ensure</p>	

	<p>that character of Old Glossop is enhanced. This will rely on greater place making and high quality design. One way I can see this being achieved is to utilise the frontage of the workhouse/hospital as part of a more defined space linking with other areas.</p> <p>Presently the adjoining track Blackshaw Clough and the valley walkway up to Swineshaw Reservoir is part of the way local people experience the transition from town to countryside. The relationship to this valley is important and seems to be a secondary consideration to any of the proposed sites in this area.</p> <p>I recommend refusal of the current application on heritage grounds, and on visual impact grounds, however, I consider that there are opportunities for greater placemaking that are not being considered and that involves recognising the townscape significance of the existing buildings and the local context of the adjoining valley and links to the town.</p>	
<p>HPBC Arboricultural Officer</p>	<p>Comments on revised plan</p> <p>The proposals as presented are in outline with all matters reserved. However there is a suggested layout comprising the demolition of the existing buildings and a development of 32 dwellings and 20 apartments therefore my comments respond to this illustration.</p> <p>A temporary TPO which included the trees of highest amenity on the site has been drafted and this TPO is to be confirmed. This does not necessarily mean that those trees not protected are without value, but the approach was taken to allow some flexibility to within the site to progress a development proposal. Trees should be retained where possible and appropriate whether protected or not. Any trees removed to accommodate the proposals will require replacement.</p> <p>The site has existing infrastructure, existing buildings hard surfacing, access roads and parking. The site also has level changes and slopes towards to the south so level changes and significant engineering works will be required to accommodating the density of housing illustrated for the site. This will have a significant impact on both the protected and non-protected trees inevitably leading to the loss of tree cover on the site. A proposal which reflects more closely the existing massing of building on the site</p>	

would have much less of an impact and be more acceptable in terms of arboricultural impact.

The proposals show that the retained trees are largely restricted to the rear gardens of properties and at the illustrated density the relationship between the trees and the properties will be less than ideal. The indicative proposals do allow for more tree retention than the initial higher density proposed layout. But even so there are still likely to be some less than ideal relationships between the mature trees and the properties and encroachments of hard-surfacing and level changes within the Rooting zones of the trees

The site can be viewed from some distance especially from Woodhead Road to the north and west. The site is right on the edge of the built up boundary and as the site is developed at present with larger massing of buildings towards the centre of the site set within landscape grounds with mature trees. This setting acts grade out towards the edge of the built up area and to soften the impact of more dense neighbouring housing areas.

The Peak District National Park (PDNP) boundary is around 150m to the north and the site will be clearly visible from here and higher ground within the park.

The mature trees obviously contribute the landscape character of the site and their retention is important in terms of the impact on the landscape as much as from more immediate views of the site.

Whilst the current illustrated proposals would not be acceptable of landscape/arboricultural grounds there is no overriding objection to development of the site. The development of the site needs to provide a layout that allows for the sustainable landscaping including the retention of the protected trees and where appropriate other established trees as trees. A development of eth site which reuses some of the older existing buildings and is closer to the existing footprint and massing of development would be much more acceptable .

A tree protection and method statement should be required by condition if outline consent is granted

I would recommend that an landscaping scheme is also submitted with the application and this should include an induction of the how any POS on the site, the woodland in particular will managed.

<p>HPBC Conservation Officer</p>	<p>The Heritage Statement and Historic England Listing Assessment (November 2018) provide an extremely useful analysis of the buildings on the site and their evolution.</p> <p><u>Setting of Buildings in the Landscape</u></p> <p>It is clear from the Heritage Statement that buildings are situated in a prominent position to the north-east of the town on the edge of the Peak District, set in a context of rolling hills, woodland, scattered farmsteads and long-range views. The hospital sits in the foreground of long-range views and has an impressive setting. The buildings are also prominent in closer views from Bute Street where they effectively terminate the view. For these reasons I would conclude that the buildings contribute positively to landscape character and the setting of the town.</p> <p><u>Value of the buildings</u></p> <p>The Historic England assessment concludes that the hospital is of historic interest because of its early date and the way the building and site illustrates the changes in social welfare. Although not considered to reach the requirements for Listing (because of loss of associated structures, changes in plan form and loss of historic fittings and fixtures) it was concluded that the hospital buildings have local interest as significant structures in the townscape and in the way that they illustrate the local historical provision of organised welfare and healthcare.</p> <p><u>Demolition</u></p> <p>I would not support the demolition of the key historic buildings on the site for the reasons stated above.</p> <p>It should be noted that the HE Listing Assessment indicates that the modest late Georgian design has an overriding character of domestic buildings and yet the application states that the buildings are not considered suitable for residential conversion. Furthermore, the Heritage Statement suggests that demolition and new build would provide residential development creating a strong sense of place and distinctive character (and local connections) which is ironic given that the existing buildings (of domestic scale and appearance) would give the site a sense of identity and be an</p>	
---	--	--

	<p>anchor for the new development to relate to.</p> <p>In accordance with Para. 197 of the NPPF the buildings are considered to be a non-designated heritage asset and the impact of the proposed total demolition on their significance should be taken into account. A balanced judgement is required.</p> <p>My advice would be to work with the applicant to identify those parts of the buildings and features of greatest significance (based on Section 4: The Significance Statement) and arrive at a scheme which retains the key historic buildings and provides a focal point around which to redevelop the wider site.</p>	
<p>DCC Archaeology</p>	<p>The proposals will impact on the significance of both archaeological and built non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>The former Shire Hill Hospital site is included in the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record database (DHER number: MDR23063). Part of the complex incorporates a former workhouse building which was constructed between 1832 and 1834, immediately before the passing of the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, the earliest known plan of the workhouse being shown on the 1857 Glossop Poor Law map.</p> <p>Archaeological impact</p> <p>The archaeological assessment provides a thorough review of the history of the site, along with the results of a detailed walk-over survey of all the land that will be affected by the development. In terms of the archaeological impact of development in this location we would agree with the recommendations in section 3 of this report. Particularly the fact that below ground remains of part of the 19th century workhouse complex may survive here. The walk-over survey aspect of this assessment also indicates that areas of the site which are currently agricultural land may have archaeological potential, and identifies features within Charles Lane Quarry.</p> <p>Taking this in to account we would recommend that a scheme of archaeological field evaluation should be conducted within the footprint of the proposed development area in order to inform this application. This should include geophysical survey and trial trenching. The fieldwork should be conducted by a</p>	

	<p>suitably qualified archaeological consultancy (ie a CIFA registered organisation), to a written scheme of investigation to be agreed with ourselves. This requirement is in line with NPPF para 198 which requires developers to establish the significance of any heritage assets which will be affected by their proposals.</p> <p>Built Heritage impact</p> <p>We note the comments of Marion Barter in relation to the applicant's proposal to totally clear the site, resulting in the loss of all standing remains of the workhouse complex. Marion has commented as a member of the public, but she is known to us as a Heritage professional with many years of experience advising on the conservation of historic buildings both within local authorities and the private sector. We would strongly support Marion's advice in this case, particularly the discussion and recommendations in the first paragraph of her comments where she argues that the early workhouse buildings should be treated as non-designated heritage assets be incorporated and retained in the final scheme for redevelopment. In addition to this approach we would recommend that the principle of any below ground features which come to light as a result of archaeological field evaluation, and which relate to this phase of the site's history, be preserved in situ and if appropriate exposed, consolidated and interpreted.</p>	
<p>DCC Lead Authority Local Flood</p>	<p><u>Comments awaited on revised plans and updated information:</u></p> <p><u>Original comments</u></p> <p>We are unable to provide an informed comment until the applicant has provided further information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate evidence to support how the site will drain, including confirmation of where the surface water will outfall to – photographs/maps. • Basic calculations of the greenfield/brownfield runoff and discharge rates. • A quick storage estimate to show the required storage volume of surface water on site and an indication of the likely location. • Calculations should include allowances for the current Environment Agency guidance for climate change and urban creep. <p>These details are required at the early planning stage</p>	

	<p>to demonstrate that the proposed site is able to drain and that due consideration has been given to the space required on site for surface water storage.</p> <p>Please note the level of detail submitted should be proportionate to the size and scale of the development.</p>	
Environment Agency	No formal comment to make as there are no environmental constraints associated with the site which fall within our remit.	
Environmental Health	<p>The Environmental Health Department has no objection to the proposed development subject to the conditions set out below being applied to any permission granted.</p> <p><u>Contaminated land</u> The submitted phase 1 contamination assessment (EPS, ref: UK19.4488 Issue 1, dated 29th May 2019) recommends that an intrusive site investigation is required to properly characterise the site, and assess the risk from land contamination. Condition relating to Site characterisation, remediation, and unexpected contamination is recommended.</p> <p><u>Asbestos</u> The Asbestos Management reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JPR Asbestos Management Services Ltd, ref: JPR/AR/1808-JPR/AR/2048 Issue 01/A ; dated 13th February 2019; • JPR Asbestos Management Services Ltd, ref: JPR/AR/1817-JPR/AR/2048; dated 17th February 2019; submitted in support of the application identify asbestos containing materials within the building. For this reason condition requiring pre demolition survey is required. <p><u>Construction</u> The construction/demolition stage of the development could lead to an increase of noise and dust etc. experienced at sensitive premises and subsequent loss of amenity, Recommend conditions summarised below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site characterisation, remediation and reporting of unexpected contamination. • Submission of pre demolition asbestos report • Measures to control dust, • Waste disposal methods, • Written piling method statement • Hours of construction • On site radio 	

	<p>Informatives relating to noise, controlling insects and light, asbestos survey, dust prevention, contamination risk assessment details.</p>	
<p>DCC Policy and Monitoring</p>	<p>The County Council has a statutory duty to make education provision available for each young person and elects where possible to provide a school place for each child at their normal area school(s).</p> <p><u>Primary Level</u> The proposed development falls within and directly relates to the normal area of The Duke of Norfolk CE Primary School. The proposed development of 77 dwellings would generate the need to provide for an additional 15 primary pupils. The Duke of Norfolk CE Primary School has a current net capacity for 315 pupils, with 307 pupils currently on roll. The number of pupils on roll is projected to decrease during the next five years to 285. An evaluation of recently approved residential developments of 11 or above units or over 1,000 square metres of floorspace within the normal area of The Duke of Norfolk CE Primary School shows new development totalling 51 dwellings, which would generate a demand for 10 primary places. Analysis of the current and future projected number of pupils on roll, together with the impact of approved planning applications shows that the normal area primary school would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 15 primary pupils arising from the proposed development.</p> <p><u>Secondary Level</u> The proposed development falls within and directly relates to the normal area of Glossopdale School. The proposed development of 77 dwellings would generate the need to provide for an additional 12 secondary and 5 post16 pupils. Glossopdale School has a net capacity for 1,200 pupils with 1,065 pupils currently on roll. The number of pupils on roll is projected to increase to 1,230 during the next five years. An evaluation of recently approved residential developments of 11 or above units or over 1,000 square metres of floorspace within the normal area of Glossopdale School shows new development totalling 640 dwellings, which would result in demand for an additional 96 secondary and 38 post16 pupils. Analysis of the current and future projected number of</p>	

pupils on roll, together with the impact of approved planning applications shows that the normal area secondary school would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 12 secondary and 5 post 16 pupils arising from the proposed development.

Mitigation

The above analysis indicates that there would be a need to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on school places in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms as the normal area secondary school would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate all of the additional pupils generated by the proposed development. The County Council therefore requests financial contributions as follows:

- £441,364.83 for the provision of 12 secondary places and 5 post16 places at Glossopdale School towards Project B: Enhancement of education facilities.

Glossopdale School is housed in brand new buildings (opened June 2018) and has purpose built facilities. The new school has been designed with potential to expand, with core facilities having been built to cater for up to 1,440 pupils. Discussions are on-going with regard to an initial phase of expansion of the school due to housing development. The additional facilities needed are likely to include classroom, specialist and group teaching accommodation. Any education funding secured from this proposed development would be used towards Project B: Enhancement of education facilities and used to support the additional numbers at the school.

Broadband

The County Council requests that an advisory note be attached to any planning permission that encourages the developer to make separate enquiries with broadband providers in order to ensure that future occupants have access to sustainable communications infrastructure, and that appropriate thought is given to the choice and availability of providers which can offer high speed data connections.

Any new development should be served by a superfast broadband connection unless it can be demonstrated through consultation with the network providers that this would not be possible, practical or economically

	<p>viable.</p>	
<p>Derbyshire Police Designing out Crime Officer</p>	<p>There are no objections in principle to residential development of this site.</p> <p>The broad principles relating to designing out crime and community safety set out within page 10 of the supporting design and access statement are a sound basis for future detail.</p> <p>I would recommend that the proposed footpath link onto Blackshaw Clough, if retained, would need a wide and open aspect to maintain sight lines, and ideally should be faced by primary, active building frontages for casual supervision.</p>	
<p>Derbyshire Wildlife Trust</p>	<p><u>Comments on additional information</u> I've reviewed the letter from Udall Martin dated August 2019 that provides a summary of the bat survey results and the ecological appraisal report prepared by Udall Martin dated October 2019 that provides the full details for bats and other species.</p> <p>Unfortunately there seem to be some discrepancies between the two documents and further clarification is required. The letter notes that roosts are present for 4 bat species (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, brown long-eared and natterer's bats); however, the ecological appraisal report provides results and recommendations for common and soprano pipistrelle bats only.</p> <p>The letter also notes that there was fresh evidence of barn owl using the barn (building 5) and a barn owl box was present, although it is not clear whether the box itself was inspected. The ecological appraisal notes that a barn owl was seen foraging nearby during one of the bat surveys but makes no mention of the nest box or any roosting/nesting activity within the barn and includes a recommendation for a barn owl box as ecological enhancement only.</p> <p>The recommendations for mitigation, compensation and ecological enhancement are broadly suitable for the species and habitats that are covered; however, the proposals need to take account of impacts and mitigation for all protected species that will be affected. The applicant will need to discuss this further with their ecologist and in particular confirm whether or not the barn owl box is a nesting site. An updated ecological</p>	

	<p>appraisal report that includes appropriate mitigation measures for barn owl and all four bat species that will be affected by this development. In order for the Council to fulfil their obligations in relation to assessing impacts on protected species as part of their decision making process, this information will be required prior to determination of the application.</p> <p><u>Original comments</u> The application is accompanied by a final version of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Peak Ecology, Nov 2018) that was previously submitted as a draft. However, this finalised report still provides only a preliminary assessment of bat roosting potential and the recommendations for further survey effort to confirm presence / likely absence of roosting bats appear to be still outstanding.</p> <p>We refer you to our previous response and reiterate that the additional survey work is required prior to determination in order for the Council to take full account of impacts on protected species as part of their decision making process when considering any planning application, including at Outline stage.</p>	
Alliance Waste and Minimisation	No Issues with this application.	
HPBC Service Commissioning	<p><u>Comments awaited on revised plans</u></p> <p><u>Comments on original plans</u> Due to the proximity of existing open space and recreational facilities which will be used by any new residents, we are not requiring any on-site provision. Instead, we would suggest we are looking at off-site contributions for all 4 typologies for both applications which includes Parks & Gardens, Play, Outdoor Sports and Allotments.</p> <p>In terms of the Parks & Gardens contribution, both Manor Park and Howard Park are two key open spaces which would be accessed by any new residents from these developments. Both sites will be subject to additional wear and tear on park infrastructure and will potentially require additional park furniture such as seating and bins. We would therefore suggest that the contributions are to targeted to either or both sites mentioned above.</p>	

	<p>Play contributions would be targeted towards Manor Park as this is the nearest play facility which encompasses an equipped play area as well as other recreational facilities for play and recreation. We would recommend that these contributions are targeted towards enhancing the existing play area, or the development of a multi-games court which is highlighted as a priority within the High Peak Local Football Facilities Plan for small sided facilities, with possible match funding from Football Foundation.</p> <p>Allotment contributions from both applications will be targeted towards plot enhancements and infrastructure at Jordan Street Allotment Site.</p> <p>In terms of the outdoor sports contribution, this would could go towards improving outdoor sports within a 2km radius of the site. The contributions required would be as follows:-</p> <p>Shire Hill Contributions Hawkshead Fold Contributions Parks & Gardens - £43,967 Play – £14,784 Outdoor Sports – £37,683 Allotments - £5,925</p>	
<p>Economic Development</p>	<p><u>Comments on original plans</u></p> <p>The proposal is for outline planning permission for demolition of all buildings and development of 77 units of residential accommodation.</p> <p>Residential development will impact on the local economy in terms of jobs and purchasing of supplies and services. In order to assess the economic impact of this development, we have relied upon the data supplied by the applicant and used the Council’s approved multipliers to prepare these comments.</p> <p>The proposal for development of 77 dwellings will provide the following outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new householders occupying each new house will spend some of their income locally through shopping and use of local services. National research has identified that 34% of all household expenditure is spent at district level or below. For this development of 77 units this is calculated at £708,587 per year. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each new house will generate direct jobs within the construction industry or associated supply chain, of which 25% are likely to be locally based. Indirect Jobs are also generated by local spend in shops and services. This is calculated at an additional local job for every seven new homes. Using these multipliers the development will generate 82 direct jobs and 11 indirect jobs. • The development will also generate approximately £15,090 council tax for the area per annum 	
Regeneration	<p>The High Peak Local Plan is considered to be up-to-date. A five year supply of deliverable housing sites can be demonstrated (August 2018) and the Housing Delivery Test (February 2019) has been passed. At the time of writing, the five year housing land supply position update to 31 March 2019 is in the process of being completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-line with the NPPF (Feb 2019) development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan should be approved without delay. • A S106 agreement should consider the provision of affordable housing, open space and outdoor sports provision, education, highways and any other planning obligations in line with adopted Policy CF7. • Policy S5 requires Transport Assessments in the Glossopdale area to be scoped with Highways England and Derbyshire County Council. It does not appear as though Highways England have involved in the TA as submitted. The A57 Link Road which forms part of the Trans-Pennine Upgrade as proposed by Highways England will have implications for Glossop. The site in question would be in addition to the allocations and small sites envisaged in the Local Plan. Feedback should be sought from Highways England on this application if it has not already been requested. • Policy CF5 – the applicant highlights that the scheme is compliant with Policy CF5 as an alternative facility has been provided in an accessible location. It is also noted that the site has been deemed surplus to requirements by the NHS and that the Government’s Public Land for Housing Programme actively encourages new housing on surplus public land. This is a material consideration. However, the applicant’s Planning Statement does not appear to give any 	

consideration to the element of Policy CF5 which states that preference will be given to schemes which retain “some form of community or employment use so long as this does not result in traffic, amenity, environmental or conservation problems”. At the very least, the applicant should provide further information on why community or employment uses do not form part of the proposals.

- If compliance with Policy CF5 can be demonstrated, in terms of the use of the site for housing, the case officer should be satisfied that the criteria for the consideration of development outside of the built up area boundaries as set out in Policy H1 and EQ3 are met.

In line with Policies EQ7 and paragraph 197 of the NPPF, consideration should be given to non-designated heritage assets. In particular, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

- It is noted that the applicant seeks Vacant Building Credit in respect of affordable housing contributions. This would result in less than 30% being provided as required under Policy H4. Advice should be sought from the Housing Strategy officer on this matter.

- With regards to Policy H3, consideration should be given to the housing mix and compliance with the Nationally Described Space Standards and accessibility standards at this stage. These should be secured through a condition and / or legal agreement as per the legal opinion sought by the Council during the determination of the Foxlow Farm Reserved Matters application which concluded that provision should be made at the Outline application stage. Below is the ward based census data with a calculation of the percentages of dwellings for Old Glossop ward and the property size and type recommended by the SHMA. The application should aim to bring the housing stock closer to the SHMA recommendations.

Old Glossop

1 bed - 6.5%
2 bed - 24.4%
3 bed 31.2%
4 bed 30.3%
5+ bed - 6.9

SMAHH

1 bed - 10%

	2 bed - 45% 3 bed - 35% 4 bed 10%	
--	---	--

7. POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Planning Policy

7.1 The determination of a planning application should be made pursuant to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which is to be read in conjunction with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

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

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

- a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of the present and future generations; and by fostering 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.

7.4 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.

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

- i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

7.6 The High Peak Local Plan is considered to be up-to-date. The Council's housing supply planning policies are therefore considered to be up-to-date. The High Peak Local Plan is considered to be up-to-date. A five year supply of deliverable housing sites can be demonstrated (August 2018) and the Housing Delivery Test (February 2019) has been passed.

Principle of development

7.7 This site is located within the countryside whereby the NPPF requires decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. Local plan policy EQ3 allows for the re-use of redundant and dis-used buildings and/or the redevelopment of a previously developed site where it does not have an adverse impact on character and appearance of the countryside.

7.8 Policy H1 promotes effective re-use of land. Outside of the built up area boundary, taking into account other policies in the local plan, consideration is given to approving sustainable sites that adjoin the development boundary that are well related to the pattern of development and surrounding land uses, and are an appropriate scale. Proposals should not lead to a prominent intrusion in, or significantly harm, character of the countryside; are reasonably accessible, and local and strategic infrastructure can meet the additional requirements arising from the development.

7.9 Local plan policy CF5 seeks to maintain and improve the provision of local community services and facilities, supporting proposals which protect, retain or enhance existing community facilities. Proposals which involve the loss of community assets and facilities (including health facilities) will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the existing use is no longer financially or commercially viable and there are no other means of maintaining the facility or an alternative is available in an accessible location. If permission is given for change of use or redevelopment, preference will be given to premises retaining some form of community or employment use so long as it does not affect traffic, amenity, environmental or conservation problems.

7.10 Section 16 of the NPPF requires the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance so they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations. This advice is echoed within local plan policy EQ7 which seeks to ensure proposals will contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment. Buildings within this site are considered to be non-designated heritage assets and whilst not a Listed building, their contribution their historic and architectural value is recognised.

7.11 In principle the redevelopment of this vacant hospital site is supported and complies with local plan policy EQ3 and H1 in this regard. However, this application raises issues with regards to the scheme's effects on: the significance of a non-designated heritage asset; the loss of a community facility; landscape and trees; neighbour amenity; highway safety and affordable housing provision, flooding, and land contamination all which will be discussed in the relevant sections below.

Heritage and Design

7.12 Paragraph 184 of the NPPF states that Heritage Assets are an 'irreplaceable resource'. Paragraph 197 goes on to state that the effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining an application. In weighing applications that directly and indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Local plan policy EQ7 is clear that particular protection will be given to designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.

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

7.14 The former Shire Hill Hospital site is included in the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record database. Part of the complex incorporates a former workhouse building which was constructed between 1832 and 1834, immediately before the passing of the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, the earliest known plan of the workhouse being shown on the 1857 Glossop Poor Law map. The site is close to the historic core of Old Glossop but also has a direct relationship to the surrounding landscape, due to its historical edge of settlement location.

7.15 A Heritage Assessment has been submitted by the applicant in support of the proposed scheme. The assessment acknowledges the prominent position of the site in views from the north, east and west, and the rolling hills surrounding the site. The assessments statement of significance outlines *'the buildings are significant for the historical connection to the evolving design of workhouses and hospitals in the 19th century ...Internally, substantial alterations have removed or covered earlier fabric making the interiors predominantly neutral and even detrimental to in significance, any surviving features are generally of low significance, but retain a high level of interest relative to the limited survivals seen across the site.'*

The site features in key views of the town from the north and forms a dominating terminus to the view north along Bute Street. This indicates the imposing nature of the buildings that is illustrative of the period of construction and local geography. However, views of the hospital are not designed or focal points, and rather, are incidental or side views, lowering its dominance of the landscape.

The setting of the buildings has been eroded by substantial residential encroaching development and the loss of the mill buildings to the south over time. The buildings have been in public service use, this adds communal significance for the emotions that it evokes, of care and respite, and of more negative emotions. The modern hospital extensions contribute to the character and appearance of the site but hold no inherent heritage value and in some cases, are overly large in scale.

7.16 The Heritage Assessment submitted concludes that; the alterations have eroded the architectural character of the workhouse and constitute a considerable loss of its historic fabric; the infirmary is late in date and of standard design for the period, and it does not survive with any degree of intactness having been extended and internally modified. Principal elements of the buildings have been lost to successive phases of development. It concludes the site has minor significance.

7.17 Although the Shire Hill Hospital buildings do not meet national listing standards, the buildings have acknowledged significance for historical and communal value. Date stones present on the building represent a clear visual indicator of the sites evolution and expansion. Whilst it is accepted that some of the building may have been altered and other more modern additions have a neutral effect on the character of the area, the total loss of this non-designated heritage asset is not supported. The DCC Urban Design Officer states that the workhouse building, and the facade of the hospital have significant heritage and townscape value to warrant retention. The Conservation Officer concludes that the buildings contribute positively to the landscape character and setting of the town.

7.18 The statement outlines that a feasibility assessment has been made and that the re-development of the existing structures were dismissed due to the buildings being previously adapted and requiring significant investment to convert. Details of this report are not included as part of the application and it is unknown whether this is a realistic proposition.

7.19 The statement accompanying the application highlights the deterioration of the site since the NHS trust vacated the buildings in 2018, stating that since closing, the site has been vandalised a number of times and the buildings have been stripped of valuable materials. However there is no structural survey to accompany the application. Lack of maintenance and potential neglect would not justify the loss of the buildings by reason of necessity and safety. At the time of the Officer site visit, the buildings did not appear to be in a poor state of repair.

7.20 The proposals for the demolition of all buildings within the site will directly affect the non-designated heritage asset, particularly as a result of the loss of the workhouse and infirmary buildings. As advised by the NPPF, a balanced judgement should be taken having regard to scale of any harm or loss, and the significance of the heritage asset. In this instance it is total loss. In this case the buildings are considered to represent a significant non-designated heritage asset and the scale of the harm (total loss) would be

substantial. Whilst it is acknowledged that the provision of housing would have some benefits as detailed elsewhere in this report, the Council benefits from a 5 year supply of housing and the site is not needed in order to meet that requirement. On this basis the benefits are considered to be modest and, it is not considered that these outweigh the scale and harm of the loss in the overall planning balance. As such the proposals cannot demonstrate compliance with local plan policy EQ7, or section 16 of the NPPF.

7.21 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker, in considering whether to grant planning permission for the development, which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Laneside Farm is a 19th Century Grade II listed Model Farm located over 300m to the west of the site. There are numerous listed buildings and Churches within Old Glossop itself. Accordingly, the Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to consider the scheme's effect on the listed buildings. With regards to Laneside Farm, the site is a considerable distance from this property with agricultural land and public right of way intervening. From Laneside Farm and the Conservation area, the site would be read in context of the neighbouring built development of Kilmory Fold and its former use of a functional hospital site. On balance, the principle of the proposed redevelopment of the site is not considered to harm the significance of the listed farm. Any detailed proposals would need to assess the impact of any development on designated heritage assets and their settings.

Loss of a Community Facility

7.22 Section 8 of the NPPF seeks to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places. Local plan policy CF5 resists proposals involving the loss of community assets and facilities unless it can be demonstrated that the existing use is no longer financially or commercially viable and there are no other means of maintaining the facility, or an alternative facility of the same type is available or can be provided in an accessible location. If permission is granted for a change of use or redevelopment, preference will be given to premises remaining in some form of community or employment use so long as this does not result in traffic, amenity, environmental or conservation problems.

7.23 A revised planning statement submitted during the course of the application provided additional information. This outlines that services have relocated to Tameside hospital main site and that in line with NHS Estate strategy, the site was listed on the government register of surplus public sector land with no interest from other public bodies to purchase the site. The report states that it should be clear that a facility is not needed nor viable for its current use, and is therefore is compliant with policy.

7.24 Whilst the applicant highlights that the scheme is compliant with Policy CF5 as an alternative facility has been provided in an accessible location. It is also noted that the site has been deemed surplus to requirements by the NHS and that the Government's Public Land for Housing Programme actively encourages new housing on surplus public land, which is a material consideration. However, the planning statement does give any consideration to the element of Policy CF5 which states that preference will be given to schemes which retain "some form of community or employment use so long as this does not result in traffic, amenity, environmental or conservation problems" and so does not fully comply with policy CF5 in this regard.

Highway Safety

7.25 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.

7.26 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.

7.27 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.

7.28 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.

7.29 Access is shown to the site off Bute Street, utilising the existing access, and a second access of Blackshaw Clough. Although no detailed plans are provided at this stage, it is stated in the application that a footway would continue off Bute Street, with the relocation of a pillar and boundary wall.

7.30 The proposals are supported by a transport assessment and overall the Highway Authority accept that predicted trip generations are lower than what would be expected from its extant use (approx. 100 no. trips less - based on 77 units as originally presented). However, with regards to the access, the Highway Authority have outlined due to a margin required adjacent to the Lodge and controlled frontage to Bute Street is of insufficient width to accommodate this. As such it is considered that there is insufficient controlled frontage to deliver an adoptable layout and all internal estate roads would be private.

7.31 The Highway Authority consider that the access off Blackshaw Clough is of substandard layout to serve additional development. It is noted that the public footpath referred to in the application to the south east of the Bute Street access provides a shorter route to local facilities. However this is unlit and contains steps. The Highway Authority also note that local topography is likely to make walking and cycling less favourable than

may be the case elsewhere. It is noted that the application refers to proximity to Glossopdale school in error which has relocated to the single site at Hadfield. However, the site is immediately adjacent to the development boundary and is considered to be within a reasonably sustainable location.

7.32 On balance, on the basis of the extant use and the information provided, it is considered that there would be no adverse impact on the local road network resulting from the proposal. It is considered that a detailed scheme would be able to provide adequate access, turning and parking arrangements although it is made clear that internal roads would remain private. As such the proposal complies with Local Plan Policy CF6 and Section 9 of the NPPF in this regard.

Arboricultural and Landscape issues

7.33 Section 15 of the NPPF requires development to contribute to and enhance the natural environment by amongst other things, recognising the intrinsic character and natural beauty of the countryside including trees and woodland. Local Plan policy EQ9 seeks to protect existing trees, woodland and hedgerows requiring existing healthy trees, woodlands and hedgerows to be retained and integrated within a development unless the need for and benefits of the development clearly outweigh the loss.

7.34 A tree survey accompanies the application. The revised indicative layout plan identifies retained protected trees in the amended layout and outlines that new landscaping will be planted across the site and woodland and boundary trees will remain where possible which is welcomed. However, due to the sites topography, the proposed layout and density will require significant engineering. The arboricultural officer concludes that this will have a significant impact on protected and non-protected trees. A proposal which reflects more closely the existing massing of building on the site would have much less of an impact and be more acceptable in terms of arboricultural impact.

7.35 The indicative layout would also suggest that the retained trees are largely within rear gardens and that at the density proposed as well as the relationship between dwellings and trees is inadequate.

7.36 The site is prominent within the landscape, with existing buildings grouped closely to the edge of the site adjacent to the development boundary. The layout proposed seeks to disperse built form more widely through the site although it is noted that a tree buffer at the rear would remain. The mature trees within and around the site contribute significantly to the landscape character of this site and their retention is important.

7.37 In principle, there are no overriding landscape or arboricultural objections to the principle of development of this site and landscaping details would form part of a subsequent reserved matters (or full) application. However, the current illustrative proposals are not considered to be acceptable on either landscape grounds or on the resultant impact and loss of trees. It is considered that appropriate landscaping of the site could be achieved with an alternative approach to development at the site. A contribution towards off-site open space and sports and recreation facilities should be provided, along with a management plan for any resultant on-site amenity/open space, which will need to be secured via an s106 agreement.

Residential Amenity

7.38 The NPPF requires a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Local Plan Policy EQ6 also stipulates that development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and should not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity. Furthermore, the Council's Residential Design SPD, as a guide recommends a distance of 21.0m between habitable room windows of adjacent properties to provide an acceptable level of amenity as well. Where changes in levels on site are evident or where taller buildings are present, it is advised that these distances should increase by 1.0m for every 0.5m difference in height between buildings and is applicable in the site circumstances of rising levels from existing development on Kilmory Fold.

7.39 The plan submitted is indicative only and details of access, layout, scale and appearance are to be submitted for approval at a later stage, it is considered that up to 52 No. dwellings could be accommodated within the site whilst maintaining the amenities of existing neighbouring residential properties and providing a suitable level of amenity for future occupants of the proposed dwellings.

Ecology and Nature Conservation

7.40 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.

7.41 Additional information has been submitted during the course of the application to address comments from Derbyshire Wildlife Trust which sought additional bat survey work. The recommendations for mitigation, compensation and ecological enhancement are considered to be broadly suitable by the Wildlife Trust. The report found no evidence of reptiles or badgers.

7.42 However, the bat assessment submitted identifies 4 species of bat present but the appraisal report does not cover all 4 species in full. The additional information also identified the presence of a barn owl and a barn owl box although did not qualify if this was a current nesting site. A recommendation for the inclusion of barn owl boxes is provided as ecological enhancement only.

7.43 As a consequence therefore, it is not possible to take into account the impacts and mitigation for all affected protected species. As such the scheme conflicts with Local Plan Policy EQ5 and NPPF paragraphs 170b), d) and 175a, which seek to ensure that developments recognises the wider benefits from ecosystems and conserves and does not significantly harm biodiversity. This would therefore lead to a recommendation of refusal on grounds of insufficient information to properly assess matters of biodiversity.

Flooding & drainage

7.44 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. The site is not located within an area susceptible to flooding.

7.45 It is noted that residents are concerned about the impact of the development on the existing drainage networks. Additional information has been submitted during the course of the application which seeks to address these issues as requested by DCC Flood Risk Team. Comments are awaited and will be reported to Members at Committee.

Land contamination

7.46 Policy EQ10 of the Local Plan broadly 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(f) of the NPPF seek to protect the amenities of all existing and future residents.

7.47 Part of the site has previously been occupied by Glossop Union workhouse and latterly as hospital buildings and has included the storage of fuel and other sources of potential contaminants and hazardous materials as a result of this, as identified within the Geo-environmental desk study accompanying the application. It is noted that residents have raised concerns regarding asbestos at the site. The Council's Environmental Health Officer raises no objections to the proposal, subject to a range of conditions and informatives, including a pre demolition asbestos survey.

7.48 It is considered that the combination of further investigations and appropriate mitigation, if required, would enable the site to be suitable for residential development. 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.

Housing Provision

7.49 Local plan policy H3 requires new residential development to provide a range of market and affordable housing types and sizes that can reasonably meet the requirements and future needs of a wide range of household types; the mix should contribute positively to the promotion of a sustainable and inclusive community taking into account the characteristics of the existing housing stock in the surrounding locality. This should be secured via condition or legal agreement secured at this stage.

7.50 The application is outline and at this stage only an indicative mix is provided which is unclear, providing potentially 100% 2 bed dwellings and offers no information on bed space within the apartments.

7.51 The regeneration officer has summarised the ward based census data with a calculation of the percentages of dwellings for Old Glossop ward and the property size and

type recommended by the SHMA. The application should aim to bring the housing stock closer to the SHMA recommendations.

Old Glossop

1 bed - 6.5%

2 bed - 24.4%

3 bed 31.2%

4 bed 30.3%

5+ bed - 6.9

SMAHH

1 bed - 10%

2 bed - 45%

3 bed - 35%

4 bed 10%

It is considered that in the event of approval conditions could be added to ensure that the mix of housetypes submitted as part of any reserved matters scheme complied with the SHMA requirements. In addition conditions should be imposed on any approval requiring housetypes to meet the requirements of the Nationally Described Space Standards and Optional Part M of the Building Regulations in accordance with the requirements of Local Plan policy

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

7.53 The applicant has outlined that Vacant Building Credit applies to the calculation of Affordable housing on this site. The NPPG states that where a vacant building is brought back into any lawful use, or is demolished to be replaced by a new building, the developer should be offered a financial credit equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of relevant vacant buildings when the local planning authority calculates any affordable housing contribution which will be sought. Affordable housing contributions may be required for any increase in floorspace. It is accepted that this site has not been abandoned and that vacant building credit would apply. This would be included within the section 106 and calculated accordingly.

Planning obligations & s106 legal agreement

7.54 In line with Section 4 of the NPPF and Local Plan policy CF7, development proposals are required to provide planning obligations where relevant and deemed necessary to mitigate the impact of the development.

7.55 Although landscaping details would form part of a subsequent reserved matters (or full) application, it is considered that appropriate landscaping of the site could be achieved and that a contribution towards off-site open space and sports and recreation facilities

should be provided, along with a management plan for any resultant on-site amenity/open space, which will need to be secured via a Section 106 agreement.

7.56 Contributions required are detailed below.

- 30% affordable housing (of which 80% social rented and 20% shared ownership) (equates to 16 units) - Less Vacant building credit clause included,
- Parks & Gardens - £43,967
- Play – £14,784
- Outdoor Sports – £37,683
- Allotments - £5,925
- £ 441,364.83 for the provision of 12 Secondary places and 5x post 16 palces at Glossopdale School towards Project B: Enhancement of education facilities.
- The maintenance and management of any resultant on-site amenity/open space and biodiversity enhancements shall be the responsibility of the developer.

Other Matters

7.57 Residents have raised concern that the proposals should be considered at the same time as neighbouring applications (at Bute Street HPK/2019/0215 and Hawkshead Mill HPK/2019/0311). Each application is assessed on its merits and the impact on infrastructure, including highways, and the wider area is taken into consideration as part of each application. Indeed, it is noted that the Highway Officers response specifically refers to the combined implications of neighbouring development.

7.58 Neighbouring applications are currently pending and not ready for determination at this time. It would be unreasonable to delay to the determination of this application and may expose the Council to an appeal on the grounds of non-determination. For these reasons the proposals cannot therefore be heard at the same committee.

8. CONCLUSION AND BALANCE

8.1 The NPPF seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and therefore the scheme would thus increase the supply and choice of housing in the Glossopdale Area. The contribution to the economic dimension of sustainable development would include the jobs created during construction and the additional revenue through Council Tax. In addition to maintenance costs, the new residents would be likely to spend money on goods and services in the area, supporting the local economy. These social and economic benefits weigh in favour of the scheme.

8.2 However buildings within the site, particularly the former barn and the 1830s workhouse and infirmary all make a positive contribution to the character of the site and wider area and the demolition of the buildings would result in the loss of a significant non-designated heritage asset. Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states "*The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.*" Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposals would have some benefits as set out above, it is not

considered that these outweigh the scale and harm of the loss in the overall planning balance. As such the proposals cannot demonstrate compliance with local plan policy EQ7, or section 16 of the NPPF.

8.3 Furthermore, insufficient information has been submitted to properly assess matters of biodiversity. The scheme conflicts with Local Plan policies EQ5 and NPPF paragraphs 170b), d) and 175a, which seek to ensure that developments recognises the wider benefits from ecosystems and does not significantly harm biodiversity interests.

8.4 The benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh the conflict with the relevant policies in the adopted Local Plan.

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

8.6 Accordingly, the scheme is recommended for refusal.

9. RECOMMENDATION

A. Planning permission be refused as follows:

1. The proposals result in the total loss of a significant non-designated heritage asset. This will remove any significance that remains and would result in a substantial harm to the non designated asset and historical significance of the surrounding area. The scale of the harm and loss is not outweighed by the benefits of the scheme. The proposals therefore fail to comply with Section 16 of the NPPF and local plan policy EQ7.

2. The scheme raises matters of insufficient and inconsistent information to properly assess matters of biodiversity in relation to bat species and potential for barn owl nesting. In these circumstances, it cannot be concluded with certainty that the proposal has demonstrated that it would not have a harmful effect on biodiversity. As a consequence, the scheme conflicts with Local Plan Policy EQ5 and NPPF paragraphs 170b), d) and 175a, which seek to ensure that developments recognises the wider benefits from ecosystems and conserves and does not significantly harm biodiversity.

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

Informatives:

1. Prior to the determination of the application the Council advised the applicant that the principle of such development is unsustainable and did not conform to the provisions of the NPPF.

Location Plan

