

ADDENDUM REPORT

HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

22nd April 2024

Application No:	HPK/2024/0055	
Location	Land at Forge Road, Chinley	
Proposal	Permission in principle for the construction of one dwelling	
Applicant	Wain Homes (North West) Limited	
Agent	Hourigan Planning	
Parish/ward	Chinley	Date registered 14.02.24
If you have a question about this report please contact: Rachael Simpkin rachael.simpkin@highpeak.gov.uk 01538 395400 ext. 4122		

1. REFERRAL

- 1.1 Members will recall this application was presented to the 25th March 2024 Development Control Committee meeting where it was resolved to refuse the application on the grounds of loss of the amenity land in accordance with the recommendation as set out in the previous report. This report formally appraises Members of advice received from the Council's independent Valuation consultant following publication of the previous report as Officers consider this should be clearly reflected in the proposed reasons for refusal of the application.
- 1.2 This addendum report deals only with matters relating to viability and any other matter which have arisen since the previous officer report was and should be read in conjunction with the original report (as attached at Appendix 1), which deals with all other matters in relation to the scheme for a proposed permission in principle for the construction of a single dwelling.

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

OFFICER COMMENTS

Policy Context

Affordable Housing Provision

Adopted Local Plan (LP) Policy SS1 'Sustainable Development Principles' expects all new development to provide for "a mix of types and tenures of quality homes to meet the needs and aspirations of existing and future residents in sustainable locations.

In addition, LP Policy H3 'New Housing Development' requires, amongst other matters, "all new residential development to address the housing needs of local people by: a) Meeting the requirements for affordable housing within the overall provision of new residential development as set out in Policy H4 ...".

In these regards, LP Policy H4 'Affordable Housing' requires 30% affordable housing on sites of 25 units or more, however, where "the provision of affordable houses proposed is below the requirements set out above, the Council will require applicants to provide evidence by way of a financial appraisal to justify a reduced provision".

Furthermore, LP Policy CF7 'Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy' states: "Development proposals will be required to provide, or meet the reasonable costs of providing, the on-site and off-site infrastructure, facilities and/or mitigation necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms through the appropriate use of planning obligations and/or conditions. Standard formulae will be applied when applicable. The Developer Contributions SPD will provide further guidance on how contributions will be calculated".

Of further relevance, paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states:

"Where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. The weight to be given to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date, and any change in site circumstances since the plan was brought into force. All viability assessments, including any undertaken at the plan-making stage, should reflect the recommended approach in national planning guidance, including standardised inputs, and should be made publicly available".

In relation to paragraph 7.19 of the original committee report regarding site wide concessions already made in relation to the reduction of affordable housing provision in relation to the larger Forge Works consent, officer discussions have been held with the Council's Independent Valuation Consultant who was previously engaged with advising on such matters at the Forge Works site. Subsequently, they have confirmed that consideration should be given to the impact of an additional market dwelling as sought by this proposal to the viability of the wider Forge Works site.

Consequently, it has been determined that the applicant would need to provide an updated financial appraisal to enable the viability of the wider Forge Works site to be adequately reappraised to determine whether additional affordable housing provision should be sought as a result of an additional market family dwelling being placed into the wider Forge Works development. This matter constitutes a material consideration of considerable weight to be taken into account as part of the planning judgement in such circumstances.

Given principle scheme concerns as raised in the original report concerning the loss of a valued pocket of amenity land as a result of the proposed development of the site, officers have not requested such information from the applicant as a consequence.

Accordingly, the scheme proposal in these regards would be contrary to Adopted Local Plan policies, particularly SS1 'Sustainable Development Principles', H3 'New Housing Development', H4 'Affordable Housing' and CF7 'Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy', together with the recently adopted 'Developer Contributions' Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) dated 2023 and the NPPF to form a proposed second reason for refusal in these regards.

To confirm, no other matters have arisen since the report was presented to the 25th March 2024 Development Control Committee meeting.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

Consequently, as stated in the original officer report as referred to above, despite the scheme's sustainable, larger village location, it would result in the loss of a valued pocket of amenity land integral to the wider residential estate and setting of Forge Terrace.

In addition, insufficient information has been provided by the applicant concerning the consideration of the impact of an additional market dwelling to overall site wide viability.

Accordingly, the development is contrary to the provisions of the development plan as a whole, relevant supplementary planning documents / guidance as well as the National Planning Policy Framework and should be refused.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. The development proposal for a single dwelling would result in the loss of a valued pocket of amenity land with mature tree cover, which plays a key role in securing a sense of place and well-being integral to securing high quality design as part of the wider residential estate / Forge Terrace and therefore positively contributes to the area's character and appearance. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SS1 and EQ6 of the Adopted High Peak Local Plan 2016, Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2005, High Peak Design Guide SPD 2018 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**
- 2. Insufficient information has been provided from the applicant in relation to site wide viability matters to determine whether any affordable housing provision would be required as a result of the proposed development for the addition of a single market dwelling. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policies SS1, H3, H4 and CF7 of the Adopted High Peak Local Plan 2016, the 'Developer Contributions' Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 2023 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

- B. In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the 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.

Location Plan

