JR ■ CONSULTING

HPK/2013/0315
HIGH PEAK
12 JUN 2013
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Planning, Design and Access Statement

ADDENDUM

in respect of:

Outline Planning Application for

29 Residential Units on land off marsh Lane,

New Mills, High Peak

on behalf of:

JW Swindells Ltd

June 2013

JR ■ CONSULTING | 44 CARLETON ROAD | HIGHER POYNTON | CHESHIRE | SK12 1TL
tel. 01625 876800 | mob. 07801 473065 | email. john-rose1@btconnect.com

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Key Changes
3. Conclusions

JR CONSULTING

Document Title / Job No.:
13-016-Addendum_June 2013
Prepared By:
RSP
Checked By:
JDR

1.0. Introduction

1.1. This addendum document has been prepared to accompany a resubmission of an outline planning application for 29 dwellings at land off Marsh Lane, High Peak. The original application was first submitted in March 2012 (High Peak Ref: HPK/2012/0143). This application was put before the planning committee who resolved delegate powers to grant planning permission subject to the signing of a s.106 agreement.

1.2. At that time there was an ownership challenge pursuant to the land in question and therefore the applicant was unable to sign an s.106 agreement and the permission was never fully granted. This land ownership challenge has now been resolved which has required some minor changes to the eastern and north-eastern boundaries of the applicants land and as such a revised application is now submitted.

1.3. The original findings of the March 2012 Planning, Design and Access Statement (PDAS) remains sound and relevant, as do the supporting technical reports and studies submitted at that time. As a result, this application includes a slightly revised housing layout (including a revision of two indicative housetypes) and the existing application package is again submitted for outline approval.

1.4. This document highlights the changes and should be read alongside the original material all of which has been submitted with this revised application.

2.0. Key Changes

2.1. The following paragraphs set out the key changes from the original material submitted. In short they can be summarised as:

- Updated policy position to include an assessment of the NPPF in place of the PPS/PPG suite and to demonstrate continued compliance;
- A summary of the scheme development process since March 2012, and the overall changes to layout and the s.106 that have been undertaken;
- Highlight clearly the changes to chapter 5.0 and the Development Parameters.

Updating the policy position

2.2. Chapter 3 of the original March 2012 PDAS makes no reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). At that point the 'Framework' had not yet been adopted by central government and the PSS / PPG suite remained in force. The following paragraphs highlight the relevant polices and replaces paragraphs 3.3. to 3.11. The applicant's response to the policy points is shown in italics.

2.3. *Paragraph 14* of the Framework states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It goes on to note that Local Planning Authorities should approve 'development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.' *[N.B. An assessment against the Council Local Plan is contained within the original document]*

2.4. *Paragraph 17* goes on to set out the core planning principles. Not all are relevant in the case of this application, however, requirements for high quality design, tackling climate change, reusing brownfield / previously developed land and focusing development on sustainable locations (e.g. access to public transport another transport modes) are all relevant in this instance.

2.5. *Chapter 4* addresses the provision of new housing. In general there is a desire to deliver more new housing; both of the market and affordable types. Paragraph 49 states that housing applications should be determined in the *'context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development'*. The chapter also deals with the desire to see a mix of sizes, types and tenure.

2.6. *Chapter 7* sets out the government objectives for 'good design'. It notes in paragraph 56 that good design is a key aspect of *'sustainable development'* and that it is *'indivisible from good planning.'*

2.7. ***Comment**: This application is the redevelopment of an allocated, previously developed site and as such is totally in accordance with the Local Plan policies (see original March 2012 PDAS) and as such should be approved without delay.*

2.8. *The scheme delivers 29 new dwellings which are intended to be a mix of sizes (apartments 2 and 3 bed houses) and a draft section 106 agreement has been submitted to accompany the application which ensures that there is an affordable elements part of the scheme.*

2.9. *The design is appropriate for the site and even at this outline stage the applicant has submitted indicative layouts and housetops in order to demonstrate a reflection of the local vernacular. Chapter 5 of the original PDAS (Page 29 onwards) deals with the design response and its relationship with the context.*

2.10. *The site remains within the Core of New Mills and is within easy walking and cycling distance of shops and services, including public transport options including connections to the sub-regional centres and Manchester and Stockport. A full appraisal of this is contained in chapter 6 of the original March 2012 PDAS.*

2.11. *As a result it is considered that this application clearly demonstrates the governments 'sustainable development' principles.*

Scheme Development since March 2013

2.12. Since the submission of the original application in March 2012 the application has been amended to reflect and respond to the land ownership issues that have arisen, as well as setting out clearly the Head of Terms for the section 106 agreement so that this can be agreed without delay. As a result of these discussions / deliberations there have been some minor changes to the layout design.

2.13. The Land Registry has confirmed a new boundary to the east and north-east of the site. This is a slightly convoluted boundary which is now reflected within the application site. To the north eastern corner this has resulted in 'twisting' properties 1 – 4 further into the site and allows for adequate garden space. A revision to the design of house number 4 has been necessary (although at outline this is indicative only) and the housing layout plan 249.001 – which is now revision B.

2.14. In addition, JR Consulting have corresponded at length with Nicola DeBruin, the Council's solicitor, on the exact wording and content of the s.106 agreement. A draft Heads of Terms has been submitted with this planning application in order to avoid a repeat of the earlier situation with HPK/2012/0143.

2.15. In addition, an ecology survey was requested for the site in June 2012 by the case officer, Anne Jordan. A phase 1 habitat survey was undertaken by Rachel Hacking Ecology and this found no protected species or barriers to development on this allocated site.

Changes to the Parameters

2.16. For clarity and in the avoidance of doubt, the following paragraphs set out any changes to the original development parameters which were set out in chapter 5.0 of the March 2012 PDAS. This is done on a paragraph by paragraph basis (the paragraphs refer to the original March 2012 PDAS). There are NO changes to the access arrangements (Chapter 6.0).

2.17. *Paragraph 5.1* – the layout has now changed to reflect the new land ownership boundaries. A revised housing layout / site plan is submitted with this application reference 249.001-RevB.

2.18. *Paragraph 5.11* – All landscape principles remain the same as with the previous application, however, the outline nature of the application means that this application is no longer submitted with a indicative landscape scheme and details are shown on the revised housing layout 249.001_RevB. The landscape strategy remains in line with that set out in paragraph 5.11.

3.0. Conclusions

3.1. This addendum has demonstrated the relatively small changes that have been made since summer 2012 to this application. This clearly demonstrates that whilst the changes eastern the boundary and the layout are important to the legal position, they have little or no impact on the planning arguments put forward.

3.2. The site remains allocated and the revised National Policy contained within the NPPF adds greater weight to the principle of redevelopment on this site, as sustainability is at the very heart of the proposals.

3.3. Given that the Committee have previously given permission for this site (31 dwellings in 1994) and had resolved to grant permission in summer 2012 for HPK/2012/143, then there can be no justified planning reason why this (slightly) revised scheme should be refused.