HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE  

Date 5th October 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No:</th>
<th>HPK/2020/0073</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Carpenter Plc, Dinting Lodge Industrial Estate, Dinting, Glossop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Demolition of existing building, partial dismantling of second building, construction of new building elevation, realignment of existing kerbs, formation of new access road and on-site staff car parking facilities, bunded off-load area and extension of existing trailer park hardstanding area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Carpenter Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Mr Joe Partridge, Clancy Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/ward</td>
<td>Hadfield South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date registered</td>
<td>25 March 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have a question about this report please contact: Mark Ollerenshaw, Mark.Ollerenshaw@highpeak.gov.uk 01538 395400 ext. 4921

REFERRAL

The application has been referred to the Committee as it is a major development.

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE, subject to conditions

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The site relates to Carpenter Ltd, Dinting Lodge Industrial Estate, which is located at the junction of the A57 and Shaw Lane. Glossop Brook runs along the south west side of the site which is partly within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The site is also partly covered by a Tree Preservation Order and a Coal Mining High Risk Area.

2.2 For the purposes of the Local Plan, the site is within the built up area boundary and a Primary Employment Zone (Dinting Lodge).

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of an existing building (Building 1); partial dismantling of the southern elevation of the building known as the ‘trim building’ and construction of a new building elevation; realignment of existing kerbs; formation of new access road and creation of on-site staff car parking facilities; bunded off-load area and extension of existing trailer park hardstanding area, which includes a new gabion retaining wall.
3.2 Revised plans were submitted during the course of the application which clarifies the proposed works to dismantle, relocate and rebuild the southern elevation of the ‘trim’ building. In terms of the arched detail, the applicant proposes to carefully deconstruct the existing elevation from the top down, with the existing windows and arches safely stored as part of the initial phase of the works. All existing masonry will be retained where possible and then re-purposed within the relocated building elevation.

3.3 The application, the details attached to it, including the plans, comments made by residents and the responses of the consultees can be found on the Council’s website at:

http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=238271

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 The following is a summary of the most recent planning applications relating to the site:

NMA/2018/0023 - Non-material amendment to HPK/2009/0496 for the introduction of retaining wall, building shape altered slightly, reconfiguration of loading doors and dock levellers, reconfiguration of truck circulation areas, reconfiguration of truck parking layout – Approved 15/10/2018.

http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=225350

NMA/2016/0013 - Application for a Non Material Amendment to HPK/2009/0496 for the Introduction of retaining wall to limit the impact of the development on the embankment, Building shape altered slightly (floor space remains the same), Reconfiguration of loading doors and dock levellers, Reconfiguration of truck circulation areas (reduced hardstanding), Reconfiguration of truck parking layout (parking numbers unchanged) – Approved 26/05/2016.

http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=207476


http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=141700

HPK/2010/0071 – Variation Of Condition 2 Attached To Planning Consent HPK/2006/0630 For Change To Hazardous Substances And Quantity Stored On Site – Approved 06/04/2010.
http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=118694

HPK/2009/0496 – Extension to the NE corner of the main industrial building to provide an additional 12160 sq metres of floor space, associated engineering works, tree removal and landscaping works – Approved Dec 2009.

http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=113514


http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=93058

HPK/2005/0313 – Provision of new pipe bridge between existing building, proposed raised roof and single storey extension to existing pump room – Approved 27/05/2005.

http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=45693

5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S1 – Sustainable Development Principles
S1a – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S2 – Settlement Hierarchy
S4 – Maintaining and Enhancing an Economic Base
S5 – Glossopdale sub area strategy
EQ1 – Climate Change
EQ2 – Landscape Character
EQ3 – Rural Development
EQ5 – Biodiversity
EQ6 – Design and Place Making
EQ7 – Built and Historic Environment
EQ8 – Green Infrastructure
EQ9 – Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
EQ10 – Pollution Control and Unstable Land
EQ11 – Flood Risk Management
E1 – New Employment Development
E3 – Primary Employment Zones
CF6 – Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework
6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

| Site notice | Expiry date for comments: 23/06/2020 |
| Neighbours | Expiry date for comments: 16/04/2020 |
| Press notice | Expiry date for comments: 23/04/2020 |

Public comments

None received.

Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Authority</td>
<td>No objection.</td>
<td>Paras 7.23 – 7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways England</td>
<td>Comments to be reported</td>
<td>Paras 7.23 – 7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>No objection, subject to conditions relating to contamination investigation and remediation; control of dust; disposal of waste; piling method statement; restriction on construction working hours; asbestos survey; and control of external lighting.</td>
<td>Paras 7.20 – 7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>No objection to the planning application. However, further more detailed considerations of ground conditions and/or foundation design may be required as part of any subsequent building regulations application in relation to the construction of the new building elevation.</td>
<td>Para 7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboricultural Officer</td>
<td>Original comments</td>
<td>Para 7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Is there adequate Arboricultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
information to assess this application at this stage

No - A tree report has been submitted but the existing trees are not show on the proposed or existing site plans. This makes it difficult to assess the impact of the proposals.

2 What additional Arboricultural information is required to determine the current application

Mark the trees on the plans accurately and provide details of their required root protection areas.

3 Possible tree issues

Unacceptable loss of protected trees

The group of trees along the frontage of the site do contribute to the scheme of the industrial buildings.

4 Information with regards to mitigation required prior to decision making

Some further information on Tree protection and or proposed Landscaping scheme would be required to assess the impact of the proposals.

Further detail may be conditioned.

4 Mitigation that can be conditioned

Probable conditions

LA01 - Approval of landscaping before commencement
LA02 - Landscaping to be carried out and maintained
LA10 – Tree retention
LA11 - tree protection and method statement
LA14 Implementation of tree protection during development
5 Assessment

More information required.

Revised comments (following receipt of additional information):

I am happy with this now as long as conditions are imposed to provide and implement a tree protection scheme.

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust

The Ecological Impact Assessment undertaken by LM Ecology provides a comprehensive assessment of the potential impacts on biodiversity at the site. The EIA has identified a number of features that are likely to be impacted by the development including a bat roost, potential kestrel nest site and some habitat features along the frontage with the brook. The site occupies a sensitive location in relation to the adjacent semi-natural habitats parts of which are included in Local Wildlife Site designations (non-statutory).

The proposed mitigation and biodiversity enhancement measures set out in the EIA are considered to be acceptable and should ensure that there is no net loss of biodiversity. Provision of bat and bird boxes together with other enhancements identified could potentially provide a small net gain for biodiversity if implemented in full.

In reaching a decision, it is important that the local planning authority demonstrates how they have fully considered the three tests set out at Regulation 53 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and state the evidence for conclusions drawn on each test as to whether the test can be met. The three tests set out within Regulation 53 are as follows:

Paras 7.16 – 7.18
(i) The action will be undertaken for the purpose of preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment (Regulation 53(2)(e))

(ii) That there is no satisfactory alternative (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and

(iii) That the action will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at favourable conservation status in their natural range (Regulation 53(9)(b))

In relation to test (iii) we advise that the proposed mitigation measures are suitable to maintain the favourable conservation status of the local bat population.

A licence will be required from Natural England in order for the bat roost to be destroyed. The EIA considers that the works can be done under Natural England’s Bat Low Impact Mitigation Licence (BLIML).

Recommend conditions:

- The demolition of building 1 shall not take place until a protected species licence has been obtained from Natural England and any other survey work considered necessary to inform the licence application has been undertaken.
- No removal of hedgerows, trees, shrubs or brambles or demolition shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent
| Conservation Officer | If you are comfortable with the demolition of this end range then we will need more information to control the taking down and rebuild. The elevations show that the rebuild will be a more simplified elevation with less arched windows and arched recess panels:  
- The crucial issue is to execute the rebuild of the architectural details well – including the recess to the windows and recess panels, eaves and verge details and corbels.  
- It is unclear which arched details will be window and which will be blind panels. This needs to be clarified and we need details of the windows. Will existing metal windows be reused? Some windows should be incorporated to give the elevation a more active frontage.  
- A condition is required to submit details of taking down, material storage and rebuilding (using only existing materials with any new to match). I would also suggest a sample panel of rebuilding.  
Follow up comments in response to updated drawings:  
I think that this is a reasonable re-build given the circumstances. We need conditions to ensure careful | Paras 7.12 – 7.15 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Original Comments</th>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Utilities</td>
<td>The applicant should be aware that there is significant existing UU infrastructure (both water and wastewater) within the area they are wishing to redevelop. This includes a large diameter trunk main which we will not permit building over. Our current position is that we must OBJECT to this proposal.</td>
<td>Withdraw objection, however, a condition is recommended requiring submission of a construction management plan to ensure adequate protection for the below ground infrastructure. Also recommend conditions requiring drainage for the development to be carried out in accordance with the FRA; and foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal and River Trust</td>
<td>There is no requirement for you to consult us in our capacity as a Statutory Consultee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC Flood Risk Management Team</td>
<td>We are unable to provide an informed comment until the applicant has provided further information: In the report Clancy Consulting Limited (26th February 2020) FRA &amp; SuDS Assessment Carpenter Ltd Dinting Lodge Industrial Estate Glossop SK13 6LE Ref 8/2293: It is not clear what the areas given in Section 5.4 refer to or how much of the total site is positively drained. The plans appear to indicate that the whole site area will be utilised, but not all positively drained. As per paragraph S3 of the Defra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For developments which were previously developed, the peak runoff rate from the development to any drain, sewer or surface water body for the 1 in 1 year rainfall event and the 1 in 100 year rainfall event must be as close as reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff rate from the development for the same rainfall event.

Please clarify whether the proposed discharge rate of 64.9 l/s is as close as reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff rate.

- Please provide a Quick Storage Estimate.
- Please provide evidence of consideration of a range of SuDS methods.
- Please provide an indication of the condition and capacity of Glossop Brook.
- There appears to be a mistake in paragraph 4.4.10 which refers to Chorlton Brook.

Follow up comments

We are unable to provide an informed comment until the applicant has provided further information:

Runoff rate:
- The runoff rate for the application site (whole red line boundary) must be as close as reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff rate from the site for the same rainfall event. If the greenfield runoff rate is not achievable, the applicant should provide evidence as to why the proposed rate is as close as reasonably practicable.
- The aco drains in Area 2 are positioned perpendicular to Glossop Brook. How will it be ensured that all
of the runoff will be intercepted?

Revised comments

No objection subject to conditions:

(1) No development shall take place until a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of the surface water drainage for the site, in accordance with the principles outlined within:
   a. Clancy Consulting Limited (26th February 2020) Flood Risk & SuDS Assessment Carpenters, Glossop, SK13 6LE, Revision B, ref 8/2296, including any subsequent amendments or updates to that document as approved by the Flood Risk Management Team.
   b. And DEFRA’s Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (March 2015), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.”

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Agency</th>
<th>Flood risk comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We have reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application and we are satisfied that it demonstrates that the proposed development will not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The proposed development must proceed in strict accordance with the FRA and the mitigation measures identified as it will form part of any subsequent planning approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommend condition:**
Development shall only be carried out in accordance with the FRA and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

1. The boundary fence is not closed boarded to maintain flood flow path.

2. Identification and provision of safe routes into and out of the site to an appropriate safe haven including hazard maps highlighting risks to people and users.

3. The preparation of an emergency evacuation plan, including the removal of parked cars and registration with Floodline to receive Flood Warnings for Glossop brook.

**Groundwater & Contaminated Land team comments**

**Recommend conditions:**
- Submission of a site investigation into possible
contamination, remediation strategy and verification plan.

- Submission of a verification report.
- No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water to the ground are permitted other than with the written consent of the local planning authority.

Land & Water team comments

Recommend condition:-
Submission of a scheme to treat and remove suspended solids from surface water run-off during construction works.

The Environment Agency also recommends a number of informatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Policy (HPBC)</th>
<th>Main Policy Considerations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Policy (Feb 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 11 NPPF – “Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development, approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 80 NPPF- “Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paras 155-165 NPPF cover Planning &amp; Flood Risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 181 – “Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management, and green infrastructure provision and enhancement. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones is consistent with the local air quality action plan”.

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance (i.e. the heritage interest and value) of the heritage assets affected, including the contribution made by their setting.

Para 197 NPPF – “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.”

High Peak Local Plan

Policies of particular relevance include:

Policy S5 (Glossopdale Sub-Area Strategy) – supports the diversification and growth of local business by (amongst other things) safeguarding existing employment sites for industrial and business use. The policy states that the Council should work with partner organisations and developers to address congestion along the A57 and A528. It also states
that Transport Assessments in support of developments in the Glossopdale area should be scoped with Highways England and the highways authority in order to determine whether the assessment should consider impacts on A57/A628 junction and to identify mitigation measures as appropriate.

EQ1 Climate Change – Promotes energy efficiency and the use of renewable / low carbon energy in new development and through retro-fitting of existing buildings. Supports the use of sustainable design and construction techniques including the use of recycled materials in construction, including where appropriate, the local or on-site sourcing of these building materials.

EQ7 Built and Historic Environment – seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This includes non-designated heritage assets. (Also, Glossop Design and Place Making Strategy Supplementary Planning document is relevant).

EQ11 Flood Risk Management – sets out criteria which apply to development in flood risk areas.

Policy E3 (Primary Employment Zones) – states that planning permission will be granted for employment development within these zones and that they will generally be retained for business, industry and other economic development.

Comments

• It is unclear as to the reason for the proposed changes as there is no accompanying planning statement or other narrative. Further evidence is required to justify the proposal, particularly in the context of the
proposed loss of floor space (circa 3271m² gross) and its replacement with 188 additional staff parking spaces. Do these changes offer significant operational benefits to the business concerned?

• An Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) has recently been designated by the Council along the A57 and mitigation measures may be required in relation to this scheme. Environmental Health can provide further clarification on this matter.

• As stated in Policy S5, it should be determined whether this proposal would have an impact on the A57 / A628 junction and if this is the case, identify mitigation measures as appropriate. The A57 Link Road which forms part of the Trans-Pennine Upgrade as proposed by Highways England will have implications for Glossop. It needs to be determined whether the level of additional staff parking proposed in this scheme would cause further congestion to the road network in this area. It may be appropriate to seek feedback from Highways England.

• 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 use of on-site recycled materials for construction of the new building facade is proposed.

7. POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Planning policies

Adopted High Peak Local Plan 2016
7.1 The determination of a planning application is to be made pursuant to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which is to be read in conjunction with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

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

7.3 Policy S1 sets out the sustainable development principles for new development, whilst S1a reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF.

7.4 Policy S2 ‘Settlement Hierarchy’ sets out the focus for new development with the market towns being the main focus for housing, employment and service growth, consistent with maintaining and where possible enhancing their role, distinctive character vitality and appearance.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

7.5 The NPPF Paragraph 11 explains that at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision makers this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.

7.6 Section 6 ‘Building a strong, competitive economy’ of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.

Principle of development / Sustainability

7.7 Policy S4 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to maintain and enhance the economic base of the area by making provision for employment land to be developed during the plan period. This includes supporting proposals which help to deliver the economic focus of the Local Enterprise Partnership. The policy also seeks to support appropriate employment development to improve and enhance the existence of expanding employment opportunities.

7.8 Policy E1 of the Local Plan relates to employment in new development. The policy supports new businesses and industrial development in sustainable locations which contribute towards job creation, education and training. The policy sets out that new employment
development will be achieved by supporting the development of sites allocated for future employment, encouraging development within the Primary Employment Zones (PEZs), protecting employment allocations, supporting business and employment within the built up area, and supporting business development within the countryside which accords with Policy EQ3.

7.9 Policy E3 of the Local Plan sets out Primary Employment Zones (PEZ) in Glossopdale, Buxton and the Central Area. This policy states that planning permission will be granted for employment developments (B1b, B1c, B2 and B8) within the Primary Employment Zones.

7.10 The site is within a designated PEZ (Dinting Lodge) where the general principle of alterations and extensions to an industrial site may be considered acceptable. The demolition proposals result in the loss of floor space (circa 3,271m² gross) and its replacement with 188 additional staff parking spaces and a new access road. The loss of 3,271m² floor space on the site is off set by recent planning approvals for extensions to the main building. Approved application HPK/2009/0496 was for an extension to provide an additional 12,160m² of floor space, though this was subsequently amended to 9,241m², and this scheme is being implemented. The loss of floorspace currently proposed is therefore not considered to be a significant concern in the context of the previous applications for extensions.

7.11 The principle of the development is considered acceptable, subject to other material planning considerations as discussed below.

Design, Layout and Heritage considerations

7.12 The proposals include the demolition of a large industrial building in the centre of the site which is of relatively recent construction, as well as the southern end bay of the ‘trim building’ to allow for the creation of the new access road which will run alongside Glossop Brook. The submitted Heritage Statement notes that “the existing ‘trim’ building is of local historical significance, given its link to Glossop’s industrial past and its importance as a centre of employment and commerce over a significant period of time. The building does not fall within any conservation area, nor is it Listed. Removing the southern bay and reducing the footprint of the existing building will alter the street scene from both Shaw Lane and the A57. However, the majority of this building will remain, and by using reclaimed masonry from the deconstructed elevation and recreating the arched openings to mimic the existing elevation, the impact of this alteration will be softened and the historic character of the area will be preserved to some extent. In terms of the arched detail to this elevation, the applicant proposes that this elevation be carefully deconstructed from the top down, with the existing windows and arches safely stored as part of the initial phase of the works. All existing masonry is to be retained where possible and then re-purposed within the relocated building elevation. The applicant considers that there may be some damage during deconstruction, given the
age and condition of the existing masonry. For that reason they have indicated less arches on the repositioned elevation, so that the best examples of the existing stonework can be re-purposed. The Conservation Officer does not object to this proposal, but advises that it is important to execute the rebuild of the architectural details well – including the recess to the windows and recess panels, eaves and verge details and corbels. A condition will be required to require submission of details of taking down of this end range, material storage and rebuilding (using only existing materials with any new to match). A sample panel of the rebuilding would also be required.

7.13 In line with LP Policy 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. Given that the majority of this building will be retained and the elevation will be sympathetically rebuilt, the scale of harm is considered to be low. Any harm arising from the loss of this end range would be outweighed by the operational benefits to the business, which is a major employer in the local area.

7.14 Other key elements of the application include the creation of a new car park following the demolition of Building 1, a warehouse structure which is not of any architectural or historic merit. The new car park would not be detrimental to the appearance of the area as it will replace this existing large industrial building and this part of the site is well screened from Dinting Vale (A57) by the mature trees alongside Glossop Brook. The proposal to extend the existing trailer park hardstanding area within the south-east part of the site requires a new gabion retaining wall structure. This area of the site is also well screened from Dinting Vale by the mature trees along the site boundary and the new gabion wall will not be visually detrimental, particularly given the industrial context of the site.

7.15 The overall design and layout of the scheme is considered acceptable and accords with Policies EQ6 and EQ7 of the Local Plan and Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity / Trees

7.16 Policy EQ5 of the adopted Local Plan relates to biodiversity stating that biological and geological resources will be conserved and enhanced.

7.17 The submitted Ecological Impact Assessment has identified a number of features that are likely to be impacted by the development, including a bat roost, potential kestrel nest site and some habitat features along the frontage with the brook. The site occupies a location in relation to the adjacent semi-natural habitats parts of which are included in Local Wildlife Site designations (non-statutory). DWT advise that with the proposed mitigation and biodiversity enhancement measures set out in the EIA, there will be no net loss of biodiversity. Provision of bat and bird boxes
together with the other enhancements identified could potentially provide a small net gain for biodiversity if implemented in full. These can be secured by way of a condition. Conditions are also recommended in relation to the need for a protected species licence from Natural England and protection for nesting birds. In respect of the three tests set out at Regulation 53 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the new car park will be positioned in an area currently occupied by a building and hardstanding. The car park would serve the existing business, and there are no other opportunities to locate it elsewhere. The economic needs for the development are significant, and with the proposed mitigation measures identified, there would be no net loss of biodiversity.

7.18 Subject to the above conditions, it is not considered that the proposal will have an adverse impact on ecological interests and it thereby complies with Policy EQ5 of the Local Plan and Section 15 of the NPPF.

7.19 In relation to trees, the applicant has provided further information to demonstrate that there is unlikely to be adverse impacts on the protected trees. The Council’s Arboricultural Officer raises no objections subject to submission of a scheme for tree protection, which can be secured by condition.

Amenity

7.20 Paragraph 127 of the NPPF requires a good standard of amenity for all existing and future users of land and buildings. Policy EQ6 of the Local Plan requires new development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent occupiers to ensure that the amenity of neighbouring occupiers will not be compromised, thus reflecting the requirements of paragraph 17 of the Framework.

7.21 The nearest residential dwellings are located on Shaw Lane to the west / north-west of the site. These are a significant distance away from the proposed development and the amenities of these properties are therefore unlikely to be significantly affected by the proposals. Conditions are required to protect the amenities of the neighbours during the construction/demolition phase, including a restriction of working hours and dust suppression measures.

7.22 Subject to the above conditions, it is considered that the proposal would not harm residential amenity and therefore accords with paragraph 127 of the NPPF and Policy EQ6 in this regard.

Highway and Parking Considerations

7.23 The NPPF promotes sustainable transport and recommends that local planning authorities seek to encourage and facilitate where possible sustainable patterns of transport using practical alternatives to private motor vehicles so that people have a real choice about how they travel. Policy CF6 of the Local Plan requires the site to be accessed safely.
7.24 This application includes a new access road and creation of a new car park for staff (an increase of 188 parking spaces). The Planning Policy Team have advised that consideration should be given to whether the proposal would have an impact on the A57 / A628 junction and if this is the case, identify mitigation measures as appropriate. The A57 Link Road which forms part of the Trans-Pennine Upgrade as proposed by Highways England will have implications for Glossop. It needs to be determined whether the level of additional staff parking proposed in this scheme would cause further congestion to the road network in this area. The Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposals in this regard. No comments from Highways England were available at the time of the preparation of this report and an update on this matter will therefore be provided on the Update Sheet.

7.25 Given the above, and subject to Highways England raising no objections, it is concluded that there would not be a significant adverse impact on the local road network. The proposal therefore complies with the provisions of Section 9 of the NPPF and policy CF6 of the adopted Local Plan in this regard.

**Flood Risk / Drainage**

7.26 The site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3 which are the zones of highest flood risk. A “Main River” also runs adjacent to the site. A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy have been submitted. The Flood Risk Management Team has sought clarification on a number of points, including run-off rates and SuDS. The Flood Risk Team is now satisfied with the scheme and recommends conditions, including the need for a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of the surface water drainage for the site. The Environment Agency (EA) states that the Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that the development will not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The EA recommends conditions as noted above and these are attached to the recommendation.

7.27 Subject to the conditions recommended by the Flood Risk Team and the Environment Agency, it is not considered that the proposed development would increase flood risk to the area and as such would comply with Local Plan Policy EQ11.

7.28 It is also noted that United Utilities has removed its objection to the application, subject to conditions, one of which requires submission of a Construction Method Statement to ensure existing water mains and sewers within the site are protected from damage/pollution during the construction/demolition phases, and this condition is attached to the recommendation.

**Other matters**
7.29 The Planning Policy Officer advises that an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) has recently been designated by the Council along the A57 and mitigation measures may be required in relation to this scheme. Given the size of the proposed car park and likely number of vehicular trips arising from this, there are implications for air quality, however it is noted the section of the A57 adjacent to the site is not within AQMA which is located further towards the town centre. The applicant does not anticipate there being any net increase in the number of cars visiting the site or the wider area. Currently Carpenter employees can either park in one of the car parking spaces at the front of the site, or adjacent to existing buildings, or utilise the existing overflow car parking spaces between the ScrewFix car park and the A57 to the north-west of the Carpenter site. They state that under the proposals there would be no net uplift in the total number of car parking spaces provided on the Carpenter site, compared to the total number in the existing configuration. The application is for the two existing car parking areas to be amalgamated on the Carpenter site, which provides an improvement to the health, safety and wellbeing of the Carpenter employees as they will no longer be required to cross the busy access road if parking in the overflow car parking area.

7.30 The agent advises further that there are currently 100No. HGV parking spaces approved on site, plus deliveries. This application does not propose an increase to the total number of trailer parking spaces on site nor will there be an increase in the total number of HGVs visiting the site. The Environmental Health Officer’s advice has been sought on the implications for air quality and an update will be provided on the Update Sheet.

7.31 The Coal Authority raises no objections to the application proposals, which are situated partly within a Coal Mining High Risk Area. Detailed consideration of ground conditions and/or foundation design for the construction of the new building elevation may be required and this would be dealt with as part of any subsequent building regulations application.

8. CONCLUSION AND PLANNING BALANCE

8.1 The starting point for the determination of any planning application is section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which is to be read in conjunction with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Section 38(6) states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material considerations which indicate otherwise. In this instance the High Peak Local Plan 2016 is the adopted Development Plan for the area.

8.2 The site is within the built up area boundary and a Primary Employment Zone. The application accords with policies relating to employment and sustainability, being located within an area identified in the adopted Local Plan as being suitable for employment uses and proposals in Use Class B1b, B1c, B2 and B8. Therefore the proposed development is in accordance with the general thrust of policies E1 and E3 of the adopted Local Plan.
8.3 The scale, design and layout of the development are acceptable. In terms of heritage, the harm arising from the dismantling and rebuilding of the southern elevation of the ‘trim’ building is considered to be low and would be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme, as outlined above. The proposed development is located some distance away from any potentially sensitive neighbouring uses and the impact on amenity will be minimal, subject to the imposition of suitable conditions. The Highway Authority raises no objection and, subject to Highways England raising no concerns, the impact on highway safety would not be considered detrimental.

8.4 Subject to the conditions recommended by DWT, including biodiversity enhancements, the development would not adversely affect ecological interests in accordance with Policy EQ5. The protected trees can be protected during the construction/demolition phase of development. The Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that the proposed development will not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere and mitigation measures can be put in place. Therefore, the proposed development is in accordance with Policy EQ11 of the adopted Local Plan.

8.5 Overall, the application proposal constitutes a sustainable form of development in line with Policies S1 and S1a of the adopted Local Plan and paragraph 11 of the NPPF. It accords with all relevant local development plan policies and other material considerations which include the NPPF. In accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF the application is thereby recommended for approval subject to conditions being attached.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. That, DELEGATED AUTHORITY be granted to the Head of Development Services and the Chair of the Development Control Committee to APPROVE the application, subject to no objection being received from the Highways England and the Environmental Health Officer, and the following conditions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition number</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL01</td>
<td>Three year time limit for implementation of the development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP01</td>
<td>Approved Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTD</td>
<td>Submission of a scheme detailing how the end bay is to be dismantled, material storage and rebuilding of the elevation (using only existing materials with any new to match); and a sample panel of rebuilding to be provided for approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTD</td>
<td>Landscaping scheme to be submitted and agreed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA02</td>
<td>Landscaping scheme to be carried out and maintained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTD</td>
<td>Tree Protection Scheme to be submitted for approval and then implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTD</td>
<td>Demolition of building 1 shall not take place until a protected species licence has been obtained from Natural England and any other survey work considered necessary to inform the licence application has been undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTD</td>
<td>No removal of hedgerows, trees, shrubs or brambles or demolition shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a recent survey has been undertaken to assess the nesting bird activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTD</td>
<td>Biodiversity enhancement plan shall be submitted for approval prior to the commencement of the development and shall include all mitigation and enhancement as outlined in the EIA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTD</td>
<td>Development shall be carried out in accordance with the FRA and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA: 1. The boundary fence is not closed boarded to maintain flood flow path. 2. Identification and provision of safe routes into and out of the site to an appropriate safe haven. 3. The preparation of an emergency evacuation plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTD</td>
<td>Drainage for the development shall be carried out in accordance with the principles set out in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment. No surface water will be permitted to drain directly or indirectly into the public sewer. The development shall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSTD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Details</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be completed in accordance with the approved details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of the surface water drainage for the site, in accordance with the principles outlined within the FRA and DEFRA’s Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems, shall be submitted for approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of scheme indicating how additional surface water run-off from the site will be avoided during the construction phase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report must be submitted for approval. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Method Statement shall be submitted, including details of the means for ensuring the existing water mains and sewers laid within the site boundary are protected from damage during the construction/demolition phases. This must include a risk assessment for the prevention of pollution of all water mains and sewers located within the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of a site investigation into possible contamination, remediation strategy and verification plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of a verification report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ground are permitted other than with the written consent of the local planning authority.

NSTD | Submission of a scheme to treat and remove suspended solids from surface water run-off during construction works.

NSTD | There shall be no visible dust emissions beyond the site boundary associated with construction / demolition works.

NSTD | If piling is necessary a written method statement shall be submitted for approval and shall not take place outside the hours of 09:00 hours to 16:00 hours Mondays to Fridays.

NSTD | All noise-generating activities shall be restricted to the following times of operations.  
• 07:30 - 18:00 hours (Monday to Friday);  
• 08:30 - 14:00 hours (Saturday)  
• No working is permitted on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

NSTD | Any artificial lighting associated with the development must conform to the submitted plans and shall at all times meet the requirements of Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations for Environmental Zone – E3.

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

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