

**HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

13th December 2021

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Application No: | HPK/2019/0316 | |
| Location | Shire Hill Hospital, Bute Street, Glossop | |
| Proposal | Redevelopment of the Shire Hill Hospital site for residential development including retention and conversion of the former Administration Building. | |
| Applicant | NHS Property Services Ltd | |
| Agent | Sarah Clark, 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 is a major development and is locally contentious. The applicant has, on 9th November 2021, lodged an appeal against non-determination, although as the appeal procedure has not yet formally commenced, the determination of the application still rests with the Members of the Development Control Committee. If in the event the appeal is validated before the decision notice is issued then HPBC will utilise the resolution made by Members as forming the basis of the defence to the appeal.

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 such as an electricity substation, bin stores and gas store all surrounded by car parking. 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.

2.4 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.

2.5 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 BACKGROUND

3.1 Members will recall that this application was scheduled to be heard at Development Control Committee on 2nd December 2019. The application at that time sought outline consent for the demolition of all buildings on site and redevelopment for 52 residential units, (revised down from an initial 72 dwellings), and included;

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

3.2 At the applicants request, the item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the committee meeting. The original committee report is available for public view at the link below (pages 11-52),

<https://democracy.highpeak.gov.uk/documents/g1449/Public%20reports%20pack%2002nd-Dec-2019%2013.30%20Development%20Control%20Committee.pdf?T=10>

3.3 The applicant subsequently amended the scheme to seek to address Officer concerns and the revised scheme was submitted in June 2020 and is now the subject of this application.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 This application as amended in June 2020 now seeks consent for the redevelopment of the site to provide up to 52 residential units comprising 26 apartments (conversion and extension to the administration building) and 26 new residential dwellings. All other buildings on site are proposed to be demolished. Outline planning permission is sought including means of access. This is proposed from Bute Street, for pedestrian and road users, utilising and upgrading the existing access, requiring the relocation of a stone pillar. The field access to the west and access to the east will be retained.

4.2 The revised scheme followed detailed and lengthy discussions with the LPA and centred largely on the assessment of the feasibility and viability of retaining the Administration and Ward Buildings on site. The proposed redevelopment of the site now seeks the retention and conversion of the Administration Building with the rest of the buildings on site, including the Ward buildings being demolished.

4.3 Consent for matters relating to scale, access, landscaping and design will all be subject to a reserved matters application for a later date.

4.4 The illustrative layout demonstrates the removal of all existing buildings except the Administration building on site and redevelopment of the site for up to 52 units on site, comprising a mix of detached, semi detached and terraced housing and a two storey apartment block (conversion and extension to the Administration Building).

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

- Revised Planning Statement (May 2020)
- Illustrative Site Layout (May 2020)
- Financial Viability Assessment (May 2020)
- Conversion Feasibility Report (Rev B 14-05-2020)
- High-Level Design and Conservation Parameters (January 2020)
- Phase II Geo-Environmental Investigation (February 2020)
- Access Technical Note (January 2020).
- Design and Access statement
- Site Location plan
- Topographical Survey
- Tree Survey
- Transport Assessment
- Travel Plan
- Access Technical Note January 2020
- Archaeological assessments
- Derbyshire County Council Monument Full Report
- Updated Flood risk assessment
- Updated Drainage Scheme
- Updated Ecological Appraisals
- Ward Block Re-inspection

- Reptile survey
- Bat Assessment letter and Bat roost assessment
- Utility Assessment
- Asbestos Appraisal
- Affordable Housing statement within Planning Statement
- Developer contributions statement within Planning Statement
- Environmental Risk Assessment (phase I)
- Heritage Assessment
- Conversion feasibility report

4.6 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>

5. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

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

6. 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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraphs 1 - 14 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

7. CONSULTATIONS

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Site notice | Expired: 12/09/2019 |
| Press notice | Expired: 19/08/2019 |
| Neighbours consultation on revised plans | Expired: 06/07/2020 |

Neighbours

112 Objections have been received following neighbour consultation on revised plans, details of which can be read on the related public files. The following is a summary of the objections and issues raised;

- While I was initially pleased that the old Workhouse building is going to be retained, I was staggered to read that this was in return for backing out of providing affordable housing and contributing to local infrastructure; this is completely unreasonable and untenable.
- This is a money making exercise at the expense of heritage, the environment, and residents safety.
- It is important that the former workhouse is retained and historic features retained. It is not a question of whether it will be retained if viable
- Retention and conversion of the administration building should not be used as a bargaining tool to offset obligations towards secondary education provision, open space and travel planning or affordable housing etc.

- 'Road rage disputes' have become prevalent as cars converge with no means of relief
- Adding more housing in this area will just compound traffic problems.
- The area around Shire Hill Hospital is fields supporting trees and wild life and should be protected.
- The hospital, formerly the workhouse was bequeathed to the people of Glossop in perpetuity. Therefore, when did NHS Property Services Ltd gain the right of possession and permission to dispose of the property?
- The hospital should be developed for the benefit of the people of Glossop, Not developed to the total detriment of the conservation village of Old Glossop.
- The present access to the site is a potential accident black spot,
- The proposals will disfigure Old Glossop,
- This scheme should be delayed at least until the by pass and spur have been built,
- This should be scaled down to a less ambitious scheme,
- Shire Hill Hospital should be retained and redeveloped for community purposes rather than converted into flats.
- Proposals would increase the Flood risk due to the site being steep
- It would cause increased pollution for the residents and the school children attending the primary school along this road.
- There is a great risk to pedestrians with such narrow footways in vicinity of site,
- It will have a huge negative impact on the local wildlife (including bat populations, birds of prey and Roe Deer).
- Shire Hill site is outside the 'built up' boundary of the Local Plan.
- Local services are already overstretched,
- The site is an asbestos risk
- HPBC should be encouraging reductions in carbon emissions rather than supporting applications that will significantly increase the number of cars,
- The development / establishment of an estate of residences will not be of a style that is in character with the existing character of the neighbourhood and will be detrimental to the preservation of the charm of the local village,
- The levels of 'affordable housing' offered are not appropriate or consistent with recommended levels.
- There is insufficient evidence that the proposed development would not add to the risk of flooding downstream in an area that is already susceptible to this problem
- The irreparable damage to the character of the neighbouring conservation area;
- A far better development would be for sheltered housing and residential accommodation for the elderly.
- The site could be repurposed and the impact on infrastructure lessened as fewer cars would be likely.
- Further development of the area for family-sized homes does not meet the population needs,
- With Covid 19 threatening the population, a local hospital would seem a more appropriate use.
- Whilst the significance of the former Work House is the primary factor, some of the later hospital buildings are of merit and should be considered for retention. Surviving historic features should be retained as should the stone barrel vaulted basement with stone slabs; internal circulation patterns etc.
- The resubmission of the application to include the former administration block does not improve the situation; the infrastructure of an old village simply cannot cope.

- Old Glossop attracts tourism to the local area from all over the world to see the picturesque views, history, greenbelt and open space. This will be significantly impacted with this planning proposal,
- The Shire Hill development alone would increase the built-up residential area by 18% and house numbers by 22%.
- Alternative uses which meet the needs of Glossop residents do not appear to have been actively considered such as Whitfield House in Glossop,
- Demolition of existing viable buildings and replacement by a new build housing estate could not be considered sustainable development,
- Archaeological considerations have not yet been addressed
- Proposal needs revisiting in light of potential new anticipated health needs of the nation following COVID-19.
- The proposal provides no assurance that profitable income for the NHS shall be invested in NHS services locally, in order to support health and wellbeing for local communities;
- The proposed SuDS strategy does not meet environmental water management requirements with respect to attenuation volumes, and requires re-evaluation,
- Have any checks been carried out to investigate the asbestos at the site and the old quarry at the back of the site?
- If the stone pillar at the access point is removed to make a two way road access then it means that the protected oak tree (G9A), will be compromised as well as other preserved trees on the route, they are the natural historical border between Glossop and the hills that surround us,
- If we are to reflect on the value of Shire Hill to the local community, the building and any development must be for the benefit of the community and support all ages, abilities, and economic situations.
- Development will impact on already slow internet speeds,
- The access is totally unsuitable for a site this size,
- There are two other applications for significant development on nearby sites (Bute Street, Hawkshead Mill), it seems to me to be irresponsible in the extreme not to take the cumulative impact of the three developments into account,
- I object to the re-siting of the stone pillar at the front of the site as it is a distinguishing and historic feature,
- The applicant has not given any guarantee that the Former Workhouse will be retained.
- Th site is falling into a state of disrepair. However, it is of critical importance that any subsequent development must be done in the right way and with full consideration to the implications of the effects to the local area together with full consultation with local residents.
- The current application as it stands is very loose and flimsy in its detail
- Local infrastructure remains inadequate for what we have at present
- The retention of the former Administration Building should be in addition to the provision of much needed affordable housing and 106 contributions towards the infrastructure needs.
- The proposed flood attenuation volumes to be stored in three infiltration basins and swales are incorrect in that there has been no allowance for climate change or urban creep incorporated in the figures. In addition the proposal that the swales would be integral to the storage of run off is misrepresenting the function of

constructed swales in that their function is a form of conveyance in storm events not storage.

- Are car charging ports included (100+ needed)
- Plans have been revised only modestly, without adequately addressing the concerns of local residents,
- The revised development proposal for Shire Hill site is clearly stated to provide profitable income for the NHS. As a result Section 106 payments have been removed, making no financial provision for availability and capacity of local infrastructure and services to resident and the local communities;
- The emergency access proposed on Blackshaw Clough must remain as emergency access only
- The hospital should be a mental health hospital,
- They want to get outline permission without any contributions to the local community so they can sell for maximum profit. This lack of corporate social responsibility is shocking,
- The site is 20 minutes walk uphill from Glossop town centre. Many of the roads are narrow and some don't have pavements.
- The downpours we can expect more frequently and in greater volume are liable to overwhelm Blackshaw Clough and further downstream, leading to flooding in the village below and the township beyond
- The proposal does not equate with "appropriate density" considering the semi-rural situation 150 yards from the National Park boundary and close to the Conservation Area in an elevated position
- The building in question was originally erected to house the poor and needy . To use it as a bargaining device to reduce their quota of affordable housing goes against the benign principle which the Guardians expressed in constructing it and the caring role of the N.H.S. as current custodians,
- Keeping the building, "only if viable"?, this is surely a cynical and exploitive attitude and not one that is compatible with any coherent planning application
- The former workhouse should be retained and used as an attraction to visitors to Glossop which currently is sadly lacking in cultural amenities.
- If the design is not financially viable in light of the requested changes then the scheme is fundamentally flawed as it negates the key Planning Requirements relating to Affordable Housing and section 106 contributions.
- It is feasible to retain old buildings alongside new work to genuinely create a sustainable development

12 representations of a 'neutral' response have been received and are summarised below;

- This application must be considered alongside HPK/2019/0215 land east of Bute Street and HPK/2019/0311 Hawkshead Mill due to their proximity, common access, schooling, services etc.
- The development of brown field sites for housing is understandable and desirable if conducted in a manner that improves the local environment for all local residents,
- The development of the Shire Hill Hospital site must retain the character of the historic Work House building and must retain as many of the trees as possible. Control of flooding must be adequately provided for without impacting other local houses.
- New housing should be in keeping with other local housing and should include green energy generation and electric car charging.

- The application should be on hold until face to face meetings are back in place,

1 representation of support has been received following neighbour consultation on revised plans, details of which can be read on the related public files. The following is a summary of the points made;

- I welcome the applicants' proposal to retain and convert the earlier workhouse range and former barn which have high heritage significance. This is a significant improvement on the previous schemes.
- The loss of the former infirmary is regrettable; it has been altered and extended and so has medium not high significance, but it may still be viable and sustainable to retain this?
- I do not object to new build housing alongside retaining the best of the historic buildings and a landscaping scheme that protects and improves biodiversity on the site.

Councillors Jean and George Wharmby

Cllrs Jean and George Wharmby wish to note that their comments are the same as previous (included below).

'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 July 2020 -

The site is not included in the High Peak Borough Council Local Plan and is outside the defined 'built up area' boundary of Glossop.

Any proposed development would need to preserve the character and style of buildings in the adjacent Old Glossop Conservation Area. It would need to be sympathetic to the area, reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials whilst reinforcing local distinctiveness. Any development would also be clearly visible from the Peak District National Park and should be in keeping with other developments bordering the park.

The amount of traffic coming through Old Glossop is already a concern. The extra traffic generated will only exacerbate the current traffic problems. Given the narrow streets, the number of parked cars on the roads and the lack of pavements, pedestrian safety would be compromised. The traffic entering and leaving Glossop is already an issue and there is a petition calling for no new major developments in Glossopdale until the Mottram Bypass & Glossop Spur is built.

Affordable Housing

While we welcome the proposal to retain and convert the former Administration Building (originally the workhouse), we are disappointed that it comes at the cost of providing

affordable housing and Section 106 contributions for secondary education, open space and travel plan monitoring.

Retention and conversion of the former administration building

There is no guarantee from the applicant that the Former Workhouse will be retained. Given that the outline application includes the retention and conversion of the former workhouse, the footprint should remain and historic features protected from removal. Consultation with statutory advisors, key stakeholders and the local community are proposed should outline permission be granted. Such input would be vital to retain and enhance the heritage of the former workhouse and to preserve the historic character of the site.

Archaeology

The High-Level Conservation and Design Parameters document makes reference to the potential recording of the following:

- The remains of building foundations and deposits associated with the Glossop Union Workhouse
- Remains of infrastructure and deposits associated with the extraction industry, in particular at Charles Lane Quarry
- Evidence for farming practices from the Medieval period.

Simply recording them is insufficient. Consultation should take place with the relevant local bodies and experts on what should be preserved and how this would be done.

Flood risk

Drainage from the site is a major concern. There is insufficient detail about how drainage would be dealt with. Adjacent properties on Kilmory Fold and Bute Street could be at risk from flooding. A far more detailed Strategic Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) report should address this and also take into account global warming.

Access and egress

The applicant seeks detailed approval regarding site access as part of the outline application. The location of the Shire Hill development site is 20 minutes' walk uphill from the amenities of Glossop and many of the roads are narrow; some with no or very narrow pavements. The local highway infrastructure is 19th century, and, together with the conservation area housing, gives Old Glossop its distinctive character. The roads would struggle to cope with the additional traffic that would be generated. It is likely that future occupants of any development would be somewhat reliant on the use of private vehicles. The proposal to use walking and cycling as the preferred methods of commuting does not take this into account.

We object to the proposed re-siting of the stone pillar at the front of the site. It is a distinguishing and historic feature and we are sure that an alternative solution to providing continuation of the footpath can be found in the space available. Re-siting the stone pillar would increase the road width which could encourage vehicles leaving the site to exit at speed, compromising road safety. The applicant does not indicate where the pillar would be re-sited and should provide this information before the application is considered.

A secondary gated vehicular access is provided to the east of the site on Blackshaw Clough. Further detail is needed on what this access would be used for before the application is considered.

Sustainable Development

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. The proposed residential development of Shire Hill Hospital should take the innovative step to integrate electric car charge points for every dwelling.

Design

We urge the committee to include a condition limiting the number of units and restricting the height of any units to two storeys if the outline application is approved.

Arboricultural

The trees located to the east of the site above The Lodge form the natural boundary between Glossop and the Peak District National Park and conditions should be imposed to ensure these are retained. We ask the committee to impose the conditions as detailed in the Arboricultural assessment.

Infrastructure – broadband

The current broadband provision in Old Glossop is poor with slow speeds due to the distance from the Openreach cabinet. This is a particular issue for residents living close to the Shire Hill site. We ask the committee to look at what developers can contribute to the broadband infrastructure.

Sewerage

The current sewer system, which is Victorian, would be unable to cope. There would need to be plans to upgrade/replace the sewer system to cope with any such large-scale housing development.

Roger Hargreaves on behalf of the Glossop and District Heritage Trust

Comments on revised plans (June 2020)

The Trust welcomes the applicant's recognition that the Administration Building (former workhouse) is of high historic significance, and supports the proposal for retention and conversion, subject to detailed plans being put forward which fully meet the criteria set out in the High-Level Conservation and Design Parameters, and in particular the retention of the external appearance and, as far as possible, internal layout and circulation patterns.

The Trust is currently engaged in research into the history of the workhouse with the aim, inter alia, of establishing more precisely the dates of its component parts, including those already demolished, and of interior and exterior alterations, and understanding circulation patterns and use of spaces and how these evolved over time. This research is currently held up due to inability to access the records held at the County Record Office, but in due course, we would welcome the opportunity to contribute to the work on the design of the conversion, and also to the drawing-up of a detailed brief for archaeological investigation and recording.

High Peak Access Group

Comments on revised scheme June 2020

It is disappointing, though not unusual, that 'access' is interpreted in the DAS as vehicular access rather than (as was intended) access for disabled people.

- High Peak Access has no confidence that Policy H3e will be taken into account when developing detailed proposals.
- High Peak Access request an appropriate condition be attached in the event of approval of this outline application, in order to satisfy policy H3e.
- Proposing that all spaces and routes will be 'uncluttered and easily maintained' is not sufficient to ensure inclusive design of the built environment
- We note that the illustrative layout (05/09) appears to show a pedestrian walkway off the site to an adjoining road to the east that includes steps. This clearly is not accessible and HPA request that this walkway is ramped.
- We welcome the proposal to relocate the gate post as it will improve access for disabled people.
- HPA request that a proportion of the parking bays are designed, and marked, as accessible parking and dropped kerbs should be provided at appropriate locations.

Consultations

| Consultee | Comment | Officer response |
|--------------|---|------------------|
| DCC Highways | <p>The appended Technical Note states that access to the site is now not to be a reserved matter and makes reference to carriageway widths provided within the MfS design guide. Each of the existing vehicular accesses to the site are identified, that from Bute Street being the primary one of 5.2m width (between a stone pillar located on the line of the footway to the left when entering and a stone pillar/ boundary wall of an adjacent property for a distance of approximately 12m – 15m into the site on the right) and a secondary one from Blackshaw Clough also of 5.2m between existing stone gate pillars.</p> <p>It's been previously recognised that the nature and scale of the development proposals will be unlikely to result in additional trip generations from the site during the morning peak hour when compared to extant use as a hospital and a predicted net reduction of circa 100no. trips over the course of the day. Therefore, <u>any recommendation for refusal on the grounds of intensification in vehicular use of the primary access in its current form would be likely to prove unsustainable.</u></p> <p>The Note recognises the existing pedestrian infrastructure available on Bute Street and continuation of this on the north-western side being obstructed by the existing stone pillar referred to above. The footway on the opposite side of Bute Street terminates at the junction with Blackshaw Clough.</p> | |

As you will no doubt be aware, and as recognised within the Note, this Authority's current design guide is Delivering Streets and Places therefore it's recommended that the layout of any proposed estate streets generally complies with the advice contained within this document.

The 'Site Access Arrangement' drawing contained within Appendix B of the Technical Note demonstrates a carriageway width of 5.47m flanked by a footway of 1.84m width to the north-western side, these achieved by removal of the stone pillar on the same side of the access. However, there is no margin between the proposed carriageway and face of the stone boundary wall on the opposite side of the access (a minimum of 1.0m would be required for adoption standards) and the layout would result in an unacceptable carriageway channel alignment, for adoption purposes, between the proposed estate street and the existing carriageway of greater width on Bute Street. However, as noted above, the internal road is to remain private and, apart from the short section around the existing access where the recommended minimum corridor width of 7.5m will not be achieved (190mm deficient), the proposed layout generally complies with adoption standards. This being the case, and given the availability of a secondary access that may be used in emergency situations together with the aforementioned perceived net reduction in vehicular activity as a result of the development proposals, it's considered that the proposed access arrangements may be considered as acceptable.

It should be noted that the Highway Authority would expect the secondary access with Blackshaw Clough to be restricted to pedestrian/ cycle use with vehicular use being prevented at all times other than in the case of emergency when direct access from Bute Street is not available.

You will be aware that the initial highway response to the above application was made in combination with that to HPK/2019/0215 for development of land to the east of Bute Street that is identified within the High Peak BC Local Plan as housing option site. You may wish to note that the appended access proposals do not allay any of the previously raised issues with respect to serving the adjacent site.

Therefore, if you are minded to approve these development proposals with no further consideration to the adjacent site, its recommended that the following Conditions are included within the Consent:-

1. No development shall take place including any works of demolition until a construction management plan or construction method statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan/statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The statement shall provide for:

- Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors.
- routes for construction traffic
- hours of operation
- method of prevention of debris being carried onto highway
- pedestrian and cyclist protection
- proposed temporary traffic restrictions
- areas for standing plant and materials clear of the highway
- arrangements for turning vehicles

2. Notwithstanding the submitted information, a subsequent reserved matters or full application shall include design of the internal layout of the site in accordance with the guidance contained in the Delivering Streets and Places Design Guide.

3. No development shall take place until construction details of the residential estate road(s) and footway(s) (including layout, levels, gradients, surfacing and means of surface water drainage) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

4. The carriageway(s) of the proposed estate road(s) shall be constructed in accordance with Condition [3] above up to and including at least road base level, prior to the commencement of the erection of any dwelling intended to take access from that road(s). The carriageways and footways shall be constructed up to and including base course surfacing to ensure that each dwelling prior to occupation has a properly consolidated and surfaced carriageway and footway, between the dwelling and the existing highway. Until final surfacing is completed, the footway base course shall be provided in a manner to avoid any upstands to gullies, covers, kerbs or other such obstructions within or abutting the footway. The carriageways, footways and footpaths in front of each dwelling shall be completed with final surface course within twelve months (or three months in the case of a shared surface road) from the occupation of such dwelling, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

5. Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall not be commenced until a detailed scheme of highway

improvement works at the access with Bute Street, together with a programme for the implementation and completion of the works, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be brought into use until the required improvement works have been constructed in accordance with the approved details. The developer may be required to enter into a 1980 Highways Act S278 Agreement with the Highway Authority in order to comply with the requirements of this Condition.

6. Before any other operations are commenced (excluding modification of the new access, the subject of Condition [5] above), the existing access to Blackshaw Clough shall be closed in a manner to prevent frequent vehicular use in accordance with a scheme first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

7. No dwelling, the subject of the application, shall be occupied until space has been provided within the site curtilage for that dwelling for the parking of residents vehicles, located, designed, laid out and constructed all as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and maintained throughout the life of the development free from any impediment to its designated use.

8. The proposed access drives to the new private estate street shall be no steeper than 1 in 12 for the first 6m from the nearside highway boundary and 1 in 10 thereafter.

9. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of arrangements for storage of bins and collection of waste have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and the facilities retained for their designated purposes at all times thereafter.

10. Prior to the commencement of the development details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing the means to prevent the discharge of water from the development onto the highway. The approved scheme shall be undertaken and completed prior to the first use of the access and retained as such thereafter.

11. The Approved Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timescales specified therein, to include those parts identified as being implemented prior to occupation and following occupation, unless alternative timescales are agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Approved Travel Plan shall be monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan targets.

12. No development shall be commenced until details

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>of the proposed arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as a private management and maintenance company has been established.</p> <p>In addition, advisory notes regarding run off and works in the highway should be included for information.</p> | |
| <p>DCC Urban Design Development Control Officer</p> | <p>Comments on amended scheme</p> <p>Whilst I have no objection in principle to the site being used for housing, I have the following comments to make:</p> <p>The site has strong physical and emotional connections, which imbues it with a meaningful sense of place and attachment in the local community. This has a significance to the identity of Old Glossop and the community attached to it. Any development should be sensitive to the social value of the site. To this end I would suggest that the Workhouse and Hospital buildings are important. Apart from heritage grounds I think both buildings have significant townscape value and add to the variety and richness of the building fabric of the local area. Any proposal for development should incorporate the architectural qualities of both buildings. The workhouse building would require more conservation whereas the main façade of the hospital building should be maintained and incorporated into a creative layout. Whilst this could be interpreted as simple facadism, it is not necessarily out of place in this location. I feel that a more contemporary response could be made to combine and contrast with the older buildings, that is an authentic response to the current day needs to reuse the site.</p> <p>The current layout plan 18.070/09 is an improvement on the previous proposal. Keeping the green space at the front south-west boundary of the site which has medium heritage value maintains a sense of placemaking. However, the access road severs this space and is of a character that may ruin the Victorian garden setting. I would prefer the road to run close and parallel to the buildings so that their Architectural prominence is maintained.</p> <p>I prefer the attempt to create more shared surface areas throughout the scheme which enhances the communal</p> | |

value of the scheme. The access road is somewhat straight and engineered and the parking seem to be more dominant throughout, whereas the last plan had greener threshold space at the front of the houses. However, such details can be dealt with at detail design stage. The two houses backing onto Blackshaw Clough seem to be have a weak relationship and a rhythm in the spacing and orientation could be made with the gatehouse to improve the appearance of the scheme from Blackshaw Clough.

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. The materials and detailing of the roofs will need to be recessive. I would resist dormers in this location with a simple traditional roof form. The pedestrian steps from the upper part of the site to the apartments could be wider and more of a feature in the layout, and the walking route through to the secondary gate to Blackshaw Clough needs to be strengthened.

My fear is that the scheme fails to address this edge of settlement location with a more urbanising effect than the existing old institutional buildings and their setting in an enclosed wooded large garden area. Any development should try to build upon this existing Victorian landscape garden character and be mindful of the urbanising effect that housing can have.

The character of the entrance gate and the road into the site needs to consider the existing gateway effect and I have no problem with maintaining the gateway column at this point as it adds character. The feeling of entering a threshold into the site should be considered rather than a modernised continuation of the existing adopted road with standard streetlights. The layout also shows a shared access driveway link to the field to the west and at this point, in time I would prefer this to be left as green space as the dead-end driveway will be a poor detail within the design.

I welcome the retention of as many existing trees as possible but hope the western boundary will have a stronger green edge so screen the houses, as the development is quite visual from surrounding countryside at this point. There appears to be some tree reduction on this boundary on the latest plan. Any internal planting should be mindful of the historic garden setting as well as impact on the wider landscape character.

I am very keen to see any development in this site

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>enhance the placemaking qualities of Old Glossop. This housing development and other's in the vicinity need to be based on a framework for development of the area that takes into account demand for new housing and the subsequent increase in use of cars that result, and also the integration of walkways to the surrounding hillsides. There are three potential housing applications in this area that will change the character of Old Glossop. Each one is compartmentalised with little attempt to relate to each other in character. A new design code is required to ensure that the character that develops on all these housing sites has a resemblance of the character of Old Glossop by way of relating materials and finishes, roads and building form to bring about visual references and connections. This will rely on greater placemaking and high-quality design, however, a coordinated materials palette and street design in all the schemes with bespoke pavements, small incidental spaces and character planting will really help to assimilate these new developments.</p> <p>At present, I have no objections to the site being used for housing. However, I am unable to support the current application as I think it still falls short on design grounds. 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 to produce a more contextual development.</p> | |
| <p>HPBC Arboricultural Officer</p> | <p>Comments on amended scheme</p> <p>These comments are based on the indicative layout Drawing ref 18.070/09 and should be considered in conjunction with previous comments</p> <p>a) The reduced density of the scheme and the conversion of some of the existing buildings allows for the more sustainable retention of the trees at the entrance and around the lodge</p> <p>b) There are layout issues that will need to be resolved at reserved matters stage</p> <p>c) The boundary to the west is still sensitive in landscape terms the modest garden areas limit the options for tree planting.</p> <p>d) There is likely to be engineer works required to deal with level issues these will need to be accommodated outside side RPA of trees to be retained.</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>As previously recommended, if outline consent is granted I recommend that tree protection and method statement to be submitted with full app.</p> <p>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> | |
| <p>HPBC Conservation Officer</p> | <p>The comments on the revised scheme are in addition to my comments previously made in October 2019.</p> <p>We now have a revised scheme showing the retention of the Admin Block (former workhouse and barn), removing later additions and alterations but demolishing the Ward Block and all other structures on the site.</p> <p>Alongside we have a useful document 'High-level Conservation and Design Parameters' to inform the scheme and guide a Reserved Matters application. I note that there is an intention to retain architectural detailing and materials but there is concern as to what UPVC sliding sash 'style' windows are. The treatment of doors and windows to the main elevations will be crucial to the success of the scheme and it could be substantially weakened by poor fenestration.</p> <p>It is very disappointing that the Ward Block is to be demolished. I note that the building is not very deep and will be difficult to convert but the building contributes to the distinctive character of the site as well as being a key part of townscape and the area's social history. Even if the frontage was retained with a contemporary addition it would help anchor the other buildings and retain the strong built frontage to site approach. I would strongly urge the retention of this element & retention of this larger building, with part rebuild and extension could provide a good number of units.</p> <p>The layout on the site has improved and is beginning to respond to the estate feel of the site but the roads are very engineered and do not relate well to the Admin Block. The access road needs to create a sense of arrival rather than a continuation of Bute Street and run parallel to the Admin Block, avoiding standard turning heads and dead-ends. I support the retention of the open, green frontage but the two detached houses will look out of place and very suburban. Instead, a terrace of cottages would tie new development into the location, help create enclosure and</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>be more in the spirit of the existing buildings. The form and massing of new buildings generally needs to be informed by that of the historic buildings avoiding the default option of suburban detached and semi-detached housing. The north-western boundary needs more screening to help assimilate the development into the rural landscape beyond. This is a transition site and must respond to both the character of the historic buildings and landscape setting.</p> <p><u>To progress with this site we must seek to retain the most historically significant parts of the Ward Block, or the frontage as a minimum, and look for development which responds to the siting, form and massing of the historic buildings and works with the rural, estate character.</u></p> | |
| <p>DCC Archaeology</p> | <p>The field evaluation involved the excavation of 5 trial trenches at various locations around the site. Some were focused on areas which historic mapping indicated the foundations of buildings may occur, whilst others were to sample 'blank' areas should any earlier remains survive in these less disturbed locations. Ultimately archaeological remains were only encountered in trenches 3 and 5.</p> <p>The works demonstrated that some structural remains of the 19th-century workhouse outbuildings survived within the site boundary; there was no evidence of any archaeological remains pre-dating the mid-19th century however. Preservation was good in the buildings that were excavated, with intact walls and surfaces uncovered. Structural remains unearthed in Trench 3 are likely to represent the remains of a stable block or piggery, although some walls extend beyond the footprint of buildings shown in this part of the workhouse shown on historic mapping. Well-preserved structural remains were also discovered in Trench 5 in the eastern part of the site, where a complete surface of cobble sets and a half an intact cellar were uncovered.</p> <p>Delivery of the proposed scheme will necessitate ground-reduction works across the site, which will impact on the remains described above. On the basis of the results of field evaluation more extensive archaeological recording (excavation) of the remains identified in trenches 3 and 5 will be required in advance of their removal. For this reason we would recommend that the pre-commencement condition below be attached to the current application:</p> <p>"a) No development shall take place until a Written</p> | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>Scheme of Investigation for archaeological work has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing, and until any pre-start element of the approved scheme has been completed to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording 2. The programme for post investigation assessment 3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording 4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation 5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation 6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation" <p>"b) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a)."</p> <p>"c) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a) and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured."</p> <p>This recommendation is in line with the requirements of NPPF para 199 which requires developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part). The fieldwork should be conducted by a suitably qualified archaeological consultancy (ie a CIFA registered organisation), to a written scheme of investigation to be agreed with ourselves.</p> | |
| <p>DCC Local Lead Flood Authority</p> | <p>Nov 2020 -</p> <p>Derbyshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the information submitted for this application, which was received on 11th June 2020 (HELD). The LLFA has no objection subject to the conditions below</p> <p>To ensure adherence to National Planning Policy</p> | |

Framework, DEFRA's Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems and local guidance, these recommended conditions should not be altered without consulting the County Council Flood Risk Management team.

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. SuDSmart Pro Drainage Strategy by GeoSmart Information Ltd for Shire Hill Hospital, Bute Street, Glossop SK13 7QP (referenced 71830.01R4 FINAL and dated September 2020) and "including any subsequent amendments or updates to those documents 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. "No development shall take place until a detailed assessment has been provided to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to demonstrate that the proposed destination for surface water accords with the drainage hierarchy as set out in paragraph 80 reference ID: 7-080-20150323 of the planning practice guidance."

3. "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."

4. "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).

According to the drainage hierarchy options, infiltration is preferable but if it is not found to be deliverable the applicant has now also supplied an amended drainage strategy that indicates how the site would still be able to safely drain to either a local watercourse or surface water sewer offsite. Please note that if infiltration tests show

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>infiltration to not be deliverable then the LLFA will need to see discharge rates reassessed and QBar Greenfield rates of discharge proposed, the potential proposed rate of 27 L/S for only a 1.7 Ha site would need to be revised suitably downwards to be at least in line with discharge rates on other nearby applications which will have similar local runoff regimes.</p> <p>Jan 2020 Comments-</p> <p>The LLFA need to see the following information regarding the SuDS Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further ground investigations are required to assess whether infiltration will be feasible. As the nature of the ground appears to be variable across the site any infiltration will need to be sited only in the locations where infiltration is found to be suitable. • In anticipation that some areas will not infiltrate, please supply the likely location for outfall to potential watercourses and supply evidence that potential offsite watercourses have sufficient capacity and onward offsite connectivity. • Proposals need to include an allowance for urban creep incorporated to the impermeable area as well as appropriate allowance for climate change. • The LLFA need to see QBar as the Greenfield runoff rate as the proposed discharge rate. • The proposed attenuation volumes are proposed to be stored in three infiltration basins and swales. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o However, swales depending on the detailed construction usually act only as a form of conveyance in storm events. o The proposed attenuation volumes for the swales dimensions are incorrect, they would only provide at best half the volume estimated. o The outlined proposed location could become difficult to maintain and become a flood risk to lower lying properties offsite. | |
| Environment Agency | Original comments - No formal comment to make as there are no environmental constraints associated with the site which fall within our remit. | |
| Environmental Health | <p>I can confirm that High Peak Borough Council, Environmental Health have no additional observations to make concerning this revised application.</p> <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>Comments awaited on updated proposals will be presented to Members on the update sheet.</p> <p><u>Comments on original submission.</u> 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</p> | |

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.

Secondary Level

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 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

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>places and 5 post16 places at Glossopdale School towards Project B: Enhancement of education facilities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Broadband</u> 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.</p> <p>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 viable.</p> | |
| <p>Derbyshire Police Designing out Crime Officer</p> | <p>Comments on revised scheme;</p> <p>There are still no objections to residential development in principle.</p> <p>Should the outline application be approved and subsequent reserved matters follow the current indicative details, as before I would wish to see an open aspect for the Blackshaw Clough footpath link, and the facing apartment elevation treated as primary with windows to habitable rooms for all apartments.</p> <p>Additionally care will need to taken to adequately define the curtilage of the detached house plot in this area from the open space and communal car park which is adjacent.</p> <p>As a fairly substantial element of the development is shown as shared parking, a lighting scheme should</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>accompany future detail, and possibly be subject to a general condition at this stage.</p> <p>Finally, there will need to be arrangements for rear garden access to central house plots which avoid remote or convoluted routes. Probably by separating larger blocks or providing undercroft/ginnal access.</p> | |
| <p>Derbyshire Wildlife Trust</p> | <p>Comments on revised information August 2020 –</p> <p>We have reviewed the Ecological Appraisal prepared by Udall-Martin Associates Ltd (October 2019). The report has been undertaken to a reasonable standard and provides a comprehensive assessment of the site. Overall we consider that the assessment of the value of the site for biodiversity is accurate.</p> <p>We can confirm that there are no statutory or non-statutory designations associated with the site. The habitats present within the site are typically of low value, but we do note the presence of some more diverse grassland in the north of the site. There are also a range of broad-leaved trees present across the site which will be of value locally. The northern boundary of the site lies adjacent to broad-leaved woodland which is of higher value and should be protected from the development by a suitable green space buffer.</p> <p>We note that the letter from Udall Martin dated August 2019 providing a summary of the bat survey results has been withdrawn. We also note that the barn located to the north-west of the development site was the subject of earlier surveys that confirmed the presence of brown long-eared and Natterer's bat as well as evidence of barn owl. There should be no direct impact on these species as the barn is excluded from the development. However, indirect impacts from lighting or loss of foraging habitats are possible.</p> <p>The ecological appraisal by Udall Martin (October 2019) has confirmed the presence of common and soprano pipistrelle bats within buildings 1, 2 ad 3.</p> <p><u>Reptiles</u></p> <p>The ecological appraisal has recommended that a reptile survey is undertaken. We would concur that there is a possibility of reptiles using the margins of the site (most likely common lizard). However, much of the site is probably unsuitable for reptiles (buildings and hard standing). Nonetheless a survey should be undertaken to ascertain use of the site by reptiles and help inform mitigation for this group.</p> | |

Proposed measures to address impacts

We support the proposed retention of adjacent woodland habitat and advise that a minimum 10m buffer should be put in place between the woodland and the edge of the development. This buffer can be incorporated into green space within the site and used for additional tree and shrub planting.

We support the retention of mature trees across the site wherever possible. However, there remains a possibility that some trees might be lost and we would advise the LPA to seek clarity on the potential loss of any of these trees from the applicant as soon as possible.

Conclusions and recommendations

We consider that the proposed development will have an ecological impact on a range of habitats and species and that without mitigation there would be a loss of biodiversity. The proposed mitigation and enhancement measures set out in section 6.2 and 6.3 should be implemented in full in order to ensure that any losses in biodiversity are addressed and that where possible some gains for targeted species are achieved.

Reptile

We note that a recommendation has been made in the report for a presence/absence reptile survey to be completed. Normally surveys of protected species should be completed prior to determination and it is unclear whether this survey has been completed. We advise the LPA that if this survey has not been undertaken the applicant should ideally be asked to provide it prior to determination. The survey needs to be completed between now and the end of September or next spring (April – June).

Bats

We would advise that the survey work undertaken in relation to bats has been carried out in accordance with current best practice guidance and has confirmed the presence of common pipistrelle and Soprano pipistrelle bat roosts on site. From the information submitted, we advise that the proposed development is likely to affect bats through disturbance of a European Protected Species and the damage or destruction of a roost and, as such, we concur that a licence from Natural England will be required in order for the development to proceed without committing an offence.

We consider the mitigation recommendations outlined in the Ecological Appraisal prepared by Udall-Martin Associates Ltd (October 2019) to be appropriate to maintain the favourable conservation status of the local bat

population.

We would therefore recommend that a condition to secure the following is attached to any consent:

“The development shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation recommendations detailed in section 6.2.6 and 6.3.3 of the Ecological Appraisal prepared by Udall-Martin Associates Ltd

(October 2019) together with the requirements of the requisite European Protected Species licence, a copy of which once obtained should be submitted to the LPA.”

Protection of breeding birds during construction

To ensure that breeding birds are protected from harm we advise that a condition should be imposed requiring that

“No removal of hedgerows, trees, shrubs or brambles shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity on site during this period, and details of measures to protect the nesting bird interest on the site, have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and then implemented as approved.”

Badgers –

Due to the presence of badger activity we would advise the LA to attach a condition requiring that a survey for any recently excavated badger setts on the site or within 30 metres of the site boundary should be undertaken prior to the commencement of any groundworks on the site and submitted to the LA for approval.

Restrictions on operations involving invasive non-native species

The exact species of Rhododendron and Cotoneaster found on site is not clear, but we would recommend attaching the following condition. If it is found that the species involved are not the ones listed on Schedule 9 then information confirming that should be submitted to the LPA.

Prior to the commencement of development, an invasive non-native species protocol shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, detailing the containment, control and removal of Rhododendron and Cotoneaster species on site. The measures shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Construction environmental management plans (Biodiversity) –

No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local

planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- b) Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”.
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Biodiversity Enhancement Plan

Prior to building works commencing above foundation level, a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to achieve a net gain in biodiversity in accordance with the NPPF 2019. Such approved measures shall be implemented in full and maintained thereafter, with photographs of the measures in situ submitted to the LPA to fully discharge the condition. Measures shall reflect those proposed in the Ecological Appraisal prepared by Udall-Martin Associates Ltd (October 2019)

Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan (LBMP)

A landscape and biodiversity management plan (LBMP) shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the LPA prior to the commencement of the development. The LBMP should combine both the ecology and landscape disciplines and include the following:-

- a) Description and location of features to be managed.
- b) Aims and objectives of management.
- d) Appropriate management methods and practices to achieve aims and objectives.
- e) Prescriptions for management actions.
- f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a ten-year period).
- g) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>h) Ongoing monitoring visits, targets and remedial measures when conservation aims and objectives of the plan are not being met.</p> <p>The LBMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p><u>Lighting</u></p> <p>A wildlife friendly external lighting scheme shall be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to the commencement of the development.</p> | |
| <p>Alliance Waste and Minimisation</p> | <p>No Issues with this application. Note: Please identify bin storage and any communal areas on further plans.</p> | |
| <p>HPBC Service Commissioning</p> | <p>Here are the calculations based on the revised numbers of 52 dwellings. The costs are formula based and the figure is per dwelling, so if numbers change it can be re-calculated.</p> <p>Shire Hill Contributions Parks & Gardens - £29,692 Play – £9,984 Outdoor Sports – £25,448.80 Allotments - £4001.40</p> <p><u>Comments on original plans</u></p> <p>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</p> | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>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.</p> | |
| <p>Economic Development</p> | <p>The proposal is for outline planning permission for development of 52 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 52 units of residential accommodation at the former Shire Hill Hospital site 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 52 units this is calculated at £478,526 per year. • 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 55 direct jobs and 7 indirect jobs. • The development will also generate approximately £10,190 council tax for the area per annum | |
| <p>Regeneration</p> | <p>Comments on original submission -</p> <p>The High Peak Local Plan is considered to be up-to-date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-line with the NPPF 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 been 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

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>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.</p> <p><u>Old Glossop</u> 1 bed - 6.5% 2 bed - 24.4% 3 bed 31.2% 4 bed 30.3% 5+ bed - 6.9</p> <p><u>SMAHH</u> 1 bed - 10% 2 bed - 45% 3 bed - 35% 4 bed 10%</p> | |
|--|---|--|

8. POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Planning Policy

8.1 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.

8.2 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.

8.3 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 well designed, beautiful and safe places, 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 protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making the effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

8.4 Section 5 of the Framework relates to delivering a sufficient supply of homes. Paragraph 60 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.

8.5 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.

8.6 The Council can currently demonstrate 5.22 years supply of housing land (as at 1st April 2020) including a 5% buffer and meeting the shortfall within the next five years using the agreed Liverpool Method approach. Accordingly, for decision makers this means that when considering development proposals which accord with the development plan they should be approved without delay within the context of NPPF paragraph 11.

Principle of development

8.7 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.

8.8 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.

8.9 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.

8.10 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.

8.11 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, affordable housing provision, flooding, and land contamination all which will be discussed in the relevant sections below.

Heritage and Design

8.12 Paragraph 189 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.

8.13 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.

8.14 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.

8.15 The significance of the buildings and areas of the Shire Hill Hospital site was established in a Heritage Statement by Purcell (May 2019). The report categorises the main sections of the Administration building as having a high significance whilst the ward block is of medium significance. The LPA acknowledge that the buildings have been considered unsuitable for listing, however they are still defined as non-designated heritage assets and as such, hold architectural, associative, cultural and historic interest and significance.

8.16 The feasibility and viability of retaining the Administration and Ward Buildings on site was undertaken prior to the submission of the amended scheme following Officer advice regarding the retention of non-designated heritage assets on site. A High Level Design and Conservation parameter report has been submitted by the applicant in support of the proposed scheme. The proposed redevelopment of the site now seeks the retention and conversion of the Administration Building. This is considered to be an improvement from the original submission and is welcomed by the Council. The Conservation officer also comments that the layout on the site has improved and is beginning to respond to the estate feel of the site. It is noted that this is illustrative at this stage only.

8.17 The 'Design and conservation parameters' document submitted by the applicant acknowledges that *'significance of the site lies primarily in the external envelope of the historic workhouse structure [Administrative Building], for being illustrative of its historic use and its local connection to Glossop. This significance should be preserved as far as possible within a viable scheme. This also offers greater scope for change or loss of interiors and other structures on the site..... The later hospital building holds some interest and should be considered for retention as part of structural assessment, viability and market testing, balance retention with viability..... Whilst facadism is not recommended as an approach, the retention of the historic façades of the workhouse would go some way to alleviate visual impact in long-distance views. This should be considered as part of a wider scheme to retain a proportion of historic interiors whilst including extensions or substantial new build on secondary elevations.'*

8.18 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 the Ward Building, being the remaining non-designated heritage asset, is not supported. A Structural Survey has been undertaken to assess the overall condition of the Administration and Ward Buildings, highlighting specific repair and improvement

works required to accommodate conversion to residential use.

8.19 In addition to consideration on heritage grounds, the Urban design officer highlights that *'both buildings have significant townscape value and add to the variety and richness of the building fabric of the local area. Any proposal for development should incorporate the architectural qualities of both buildings. The workhouse building would require more conservation whereas the main façade of the hospital building should be maintained and incorporated into a creative layout'*.

8.20 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. Lack of maintenance and potential neglect would not justify the loss of the buildings by reason of necessity and safety.

8.21 Whilst the retention of the Administration building it is a benefit weighing in favour of the application, proposals for the demolition of all remaining buildings within the site including the total loss of the remaining Ward building will directly affect the non-designated heritage asset. 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 case the scale of the harm or loss would be significant as it would involve the complete demolition of one of the two most historic buildings on site. In considering the application before it the Council must take a balanced view as to whether the benefits of the scheme would outweigh this significant harm.

8.22 The provision of housing on this site would have some benefits as discussed in more detail elsewhere in this report. The benefits of the scheme are principally, the regeneration of a derelict brownfield site in a sustainable location, a contribution to housing land supply, economic benefits arising from construction jobs / spending, spending by residents in the local economy, a cash receipt for the NHS, reducing NHS costs in maintaining / securing a vacant site and avoiding the anti-social behaviour issues / visual amenity issues that often arise from vacant and derelict premises such as these. However, all of these benefits could be achieved through a scheme involving the retention of both buildings 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.

8.23 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.

Assessment of Viability

8.24 The proposal involves the loss of a non-designated heritage asset on the site. The NPPF states at para 203 that “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.” Paragraph 10 of the the Planning Practice Guidance states ‘In decision making viability helps to strike a balance between the aspirations of developers and landowners, in terms of returns against risk, and the aims of the planning system to secure maximum benefits in the public interest through the granting of planning permission.’

8.25 In support of their revised scheme the applicant undertook a viability assessment to determine whether the retention of the main elements of the administration building and ward Building was viable and, if so, an appropriate level of affordable housing and section 106 contributions that the development could viably provide. Their report concluded it is not commercially viable to retain both the administration building and ward Building due to the significant additional costs associated with converting both buildings. The report also found the provision of affordable housing or other Section 106 contributions is not financially viable, if the Administration building was retained as part of the redevelopment proposals.

8.26 The applicants assessment concluded that the scheme as submitted would not be viable without the demolition of the ward building and thus, the benefits identified at 8.22 would not be achieved. .

8.27 Given the application proposal will result in the total loss of a large part of the heritage asset the Council must rigorously test the information presented. The Council commissioned an independent expert review of the viability assessment submitted undertaken by Keppie Massie. Their review concluded, contrary to the viability assessment submitted by the applicant, that it is viable to retain both buildings, indeed both scenarios (keeping both buildings or just the administration building) are viable inclusive of some planning obligations.

8.28 Viability was debated between all parties with conflict arising in respect of sales values and approach to costs, even following a significant volume of correspondence to seek to find common ground. The applicant submitted a further financial review by another consultant. This report also concluded that it is not financially viable for the proposed development of 52 residential units to provide the Affordable Housing and full estimated S106 whilst retaining both the ward & administration block whilst remaining financially viable. The Council’s consultants have scrutinised the report and concluded as follows:

- *“Based on our assessment of the costs and revenues, the results of the appraisal and sensitivity testing for Option 2 show that the retention of the ward and admin block is viable and that a development on this basis could support some planning contributions.”* of between £1,518 and £535,713)
- Option 1 is viable and able to support a planning contribution of £1,179,234

8.29 The Council must scrutinise the development viability carefully before sanctioning the demolition of a non-designated heritage asset on the grounds that it is not viable to retain and potentially forgoing S106 contributions which would benefit the Council.

8.30 Viability is the key factor in the consideration of the planning balance. The benefits of the proposal, as set out at 8.22 above, would not outweigh the harm caused by the total loss of the ward building, given that the same benefits would also be apparent in an alternative scheme which involved retention of the ward building and administration building. It is the applicant's case that such a scheme would not be viable and as such a scheme involving retention of both buildings would never come forward and the benefits would never be realised. However, it is the evidence of the Council's independent consultants that a scheme retaining both buildings would be viable. A redevelopment scheme that retained both buildings on site would deliver the same benefits, albeit with a lower S016 contribution, without the very significant harm to the non-designated asset the application, involving the loss of the ward building, would cause. Accordingly, on balance the harm arising from the loss of the non-designated heritage assets is not outweighed by the benefits of the development.

Loss of a Community Facility

8.31 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.

8.32 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 compliant with policy.

8.33 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 not 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

8.34 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.

8.35 Paragraph 110 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;
- c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code 46; and
- d) 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.

8.36 Paragraph 111 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 112 goes on to state development should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements within the scheme and with neighbouring areas.

8.37 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.

8.38 Access is shown to the site off Bute Street, utilising the existing access, and a second access off 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.

8.39 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). It is noted that internal roads will remain private and, apart from the short section around the existing access where there is a slight width deficiency, the Highway Authority consider that proposed indicative layout generally complies with adoption standards. They also note there is a secondary access that may be used in emergency situations. In light of this, and the perceived net reduction in vehicular activity as a result of the development proposals, it's considered that the proposed access arrangements may be considered as acceptable.

8.40 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. The site is immediately adjacent to the development boundary and is considered to be within a reasonably sustainable location. As such the proposal complies with Local Plan Policy CF6 and Section 9 of the NPPF in this regard.

Arboricultural and Landscape issues

8.41 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.

8.42 A tree survey accompanies the application. The revised indicative layout plan identifies retained protected trees and the retention of the Administration building allows for more sustainable tree retention particularly at the site entrance. New landscaping will be planted across the site and around boundaries. This is welcomed.

8.43 It is acknowledged however that due to the sites topography, the proposed layout will require significant engineering and properties positioned close to the western boundary will limit planting opportunities; this is a sensitive boundary in landscape terms as it adjoins open fields that form part of the Green Belt. The site is prominent within the landscape, with existing buildings grouped closely to the edge of the site adjacent to the development boundary. Some of the retained protected trees would also appear to be within rear gardens and the relationship between dwellings and trees is inadequate.

8.44 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 application. However, the current illustrative proposals are not considered to be acceptable on either landscape grounds or on the resultant impact on 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

8.45 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.

8.46 The plan submitted is indicative only and details of layout, scale and appearance to be submitted for approval at a later stage, it is considered that up to 52 No. dwellings, comprising apartments and houses, 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 Biodiversity

8.47 Section 15 of the NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment by protecting and enhancing biodiversity. When determining applications paragraph 180 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. It is noted that residents are concerned about the impacts on local wildlife seen at the site, including badgers, bats, birds of prey and Roe Deer.

8.48 There are no statutory or non-statutory designated nature conservation sites associated with the site although the site is surrounded to the north by woodland and parts are well treed. 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 development area was amended to remove one of the buildings outside of the site from assessment which has previously supported bats and barn owl. As these are not part of the site any impacts would be indirect.

8.49 Derbyshire Wildlife Trust consider that the proposed development will have an ecological impact on a range of habitats and species and that without mitigation there would be a loss of biodiversity. The proposed mitigation and enhancement measures are appropriate and should be followed in full, and gains for targeted species are achieved.

8.50 The proposals are considered to comply with section 16 and policy EQ5 in this regard.

Flooding & drainage

8.51 Policy EQ11 of the Local Plan seeks to support development which avoids areas of current or future flood risk. Paragraph 159 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.

8.52 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. The proposed drainage scheme is comprised of infiltration basins and swales. If this is not possible then infiltration to ground is proposed or controlled discharge to surface water course or public surface water sewer. The LLFA have not raised objection to the proposals subject to appropriate conditions.

Land contamination

8.53 Policy EQ10 of the Local Plan broadly seeks to protect people and the environment from unsafe, unhealthy and polluted environments. Paragraph 174(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 130(f) of the NPPF seek to protect the amenities of all existing and future residents.

8.54 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. Quarries have been present in the locality and infilled soil is anticipated where ground levels have been raised producing a risk to soil quality and potential ground gas. It is noted that residents have also raised concerns regarding asbestos at the site.

8.55 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.

8.56 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. 130 and 174 of the NPPF.

Housing Provision

8.57 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.

8.58 The application is outline and at this stage only and no definitive information is supplied regarding housing mix or bed spaces.

8.59 The regeneration officer has previously 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%

8.60 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 H3.

8.61 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.

8.62 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 taking into account other viability matters and calculated accordingly (discussed in more detail below).

Planning obligations & s106 legal agreement

8.63 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.

8.64 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.

8.65 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
- 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 places 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.

8.66 The applicant has sought to demonstrate that with the retention of the administration building section 106 contributions are not viable. However, the Keppie Massey report commissioned by the Council indicates that the scheme which has been applied for retaining only the administration building (and an alternative scheme involving retention of both buildings are viable inclusive of some planning obligations.) Keppie Massey consider that the application scheme is able to support a planning contribution of £1,179,234 and retaining both buildings could support contributions of between £1,518 and £535,713. A viability reappraisal clause could be included in a Section 106 Agreement to determine the actual amount depending on the final scheme approved at reserved matters and prevailing market conditions at that time. The Keppie Massey report confirms that that the application proposals (retention of 1 building) are sufficiently financially viable to support the S106 contributions that are sought together with 3 affordable dwellings (the adjusted affordable housing requirement once vacant building credit is taken into consideration). Retaining both buildings Could be viable and able to support the S106 contributions being sought and 3 affordable dwellings (compared to the adjusted affordable housing requirement of 4 dwellings for that alternative scheme). As the applicant is not willing to enter into a Section 106, given that the matter of viability remains in dispute a reason for refusal relating to failure to comply with policy CF7 should be added.

Other Matters

8.67 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). Residents have also stated that no more development should be approved prior to the proposed by-pass being constructed.

8.68 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. Neighbouring application HPK/2019/215 is currently pending and not ready for determination at this time. Application HPK/2019/0311 has since been approved with a resolution of approval made by Development Control Committee on 29th February 2020.

8.69 The applicant has appealed non-determination of this application and the LPA have a duty to determine the application and defend the appeal. The applicant has made clear that they want this application determined and the appeal timescales are determined by the Planning Inspectorate.

9. CONCLUSION AND BALANCE

9.1 In principle, the redevelopment of this vacant hospital site is supported and complies with local plan policy EQ3 and H1 in this regard. However buildings within the

site, make a positive contribution to the character of the site and wider area and are considered to be non-designated heritage assets. The demolition of the former ward building would result in the loss of a significant non-designated heritage asset. Paragraph 203 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.”*

9.2 The scheme would result in a number of benefits. 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 addition 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. The benefits of the scheme also include, the regeneration of a derelict brownfield site in a sustainable location, a cash receipt for the NHS, reducing NHS costs in maintaining / securing a vacant site and avoiding the anti-social behaviour issues / visual amenity issues that often arise from vacant and derelict premises such as these. The application scheme could also provide a S106 planning contribution of £1,179,234. These social and economic benefits weigh in favour of the scheme if the contributions were to be agreed.

9.3 Clearly, a redevelopment scheme that retained both buildings on site would deliver the same benefits (albeit with potentially reduced contributions) without the harm to the heritage asset. However, it is the applicants case that such a scheme would be unviable and would therefore never come forward and as a result the benefits identified above would never be realised. Further to this problems associated with a derelict site such as potential for antisocial behaviour or the site becoming an eye-sore would ensue. On that basis, it is applicants case that the benefits of the scheme before the Council outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.

9.4 However, contrary to the Applicant’s assertions independent Viability assessment undertaken on behalf the Council has demonstrated that both the Administration building and ward building are both capable of retention whilst maintaining the viability of the scheme. Thus it is considered that all of the benefits outlined above, including the contribution to housing land supply and a Section 106 contribution (albeit potentially reduced) could still be viably achieved whilst retaining both buildings on site, and avoiding any harm to the non-designated heritage assets. Therefore even if housing were required to support a 5 year supply (noting that there is no cap on the amount to be provided in the local plan) loss of the heritage asset to this extent would outweigh the benefits as discussed above and some 106 contributions could also be provided viably without loss of the extent of non-designated heritage assets as proposed. As such the identified benefits do not outweigh the harm in this instance and the proposals cannot demonstrate compliance with local plan policy EQ7, or section 16 of the NPPF.

9.5 Furthermore, it is the applicant’s case that not only is it unviable to retain both historic buildings on site, that it is not viable to make any Section 106 contributions. However, the Council’s independent assessment indicates that the scheme which has been applied for retaining only the administration building (and an alternative scheme involving retention of

both buildings) are viable inclusive of some planning obligations. As the applicant is not willing to enter into a Section 106, given that the matter of viability remains in dispute the scheme fails to comply with policy CF7.

9.6 The proposal is acceptable in terms of the loss of a community facility; landscape and trees; neighbour amenity; highway safety, flooding, and land contamination. However, these do not outweigh the harm to the heritage assets and failure to provide for affordable housing and adequate infrastructure in terms of S106 contributions to mitigate the impact of development as discussed above.

9.7 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. Accordingly, the scheme is recommended for refusal.

10. 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 applicant has failed to demonstrate that the scheme cannot viably support contributions towards affordable housing and other infrastructure provision in accordance with policies CF7 and H3 of the adopted Hight Peak Local Plan and the NPPF and the applicant has not entered into an agreement to provide them.**

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.

