

**Gladman Developments Ltd**

**Land off North Road,**

**Glossop**

**High Peak Borough**

**Planning Statement**



**June 2013**

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The Site.....</b>	<b>7</b>
	2.1 General Location .....	7
	2.2 The site .....	7
<b>3</b>	<b>The Proposed Development .....</b>	<b>9</b>
	3.1 Introduction .....	9
	3.2 Public Consultation .....	9
	3.3 The Vision – Design Objectives .....	9
	3.4 Delivery .....	10
	3.5 Section 106 Obligations.....	11
<b>4</b>	<b>National Planning Policy Framework .....</b>	<b>12</b>
	4.1 Introduction .....	12
	4.2 Achieving Sustainable Development .....	13
	4.3 Promoting Sustainable Transport .....	15
	4.4 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.....	16
	4.5 Promoting Healthy Communities .....	17
	4.6 Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change .....	17
	4.7 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment .....	17
	4.8 Decision-Taking .....	19
	4.9 NPPF Summary .....	19
<b>5</b>	<b>The Development Plan .....</b>	<b>20</b>
	5.1 Introduction .....	20
	5.2 Weight to be Accorded to the Development Plan .....	20
	5.3 High Peak Saved Local Plan Policies (Local Development Framework) .....	21
	5.4 Relevant Policies of the Local Plan.....	22
<b>6</b>	<b>Other Material Considerations .....</b>	<b>26</b>
	6.1 High Peak Local Plan Preferred Options – February 2013.....	26
<b>7</b>	<b>High Peak Borough Council – Current Housing Land Supply .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Key benefits of the scheme .....</b>	<b>36</b>
	8.1 Planning for Housing.....	36
	8.2 Housing Land Supply .....	36
	8.3 Affordable Housing .....	36
	8.4 Accessibility .....	37
	8.5 Green Space .....	37
	8.6 New Homes Bonus.....	37
<b>9</b>	<b>Summary &amp; Conclusions.....</b>	<b>38</b>
	9.1 The Application .....	38
	9.2 Vision - The Design Objectives.....	38
	9.3 Delivery .....	38

9.4	Accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework .....	38
	Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes .....	38
9.5	Development Plan & Emerging LDF .....	40
9.6	High Peak Local Plan – Preferred Options – February 2013.....	41
9.7	Overview .....	42

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## Context

- 1.1.1 This Planning Statement forms part of the suite of documents submitted to High Peak Borough Council by Gladman Developments Ltd (referred to herein after as Gladman) in support of a planning application for **Outline Planning Permission for Residential Development of up to 150 dwellings** on land off North Road, Glossop, Derbyshire.
- 1.1.2 The proposal responds directly to the need identified within High Peak Borough to deliver, amongst other things, 5,940 additional homes in the Borough up to 2028 (270pa). In particular these proposals will help to remediate the deficit of housing within the Borough whilst also helping to deliver growth in a spatially preferable and sustainable location.
- 1.1.3 The illustrative master plan produced by FPCR, contained within the accompanying Design and Access Statement, demonstrates how the site will deliver a high quality residential development that will integrate well with the existing neighbourhood and will be sensitively assimilated into the existing landscape.
- 1.1.4 The site is identified as a suitable housing site within the Council's SHLAA and noted as being deliverable within years 11 to 15.
- 1.1.5 The site is also identified within the Council's draft 'Local Plan Preferred Options' as a housing site. The principle of residential development on the site is strongly and evidentially supported by the Council.
- 1.1.6 The application has been screened for the purposes of Environmental Impact Assessment by letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> April 2013 which is attached at Appendix 1. Confirmation that the application is not EIA development is awaited.

## The Application

- 1.1.7 This application seeks Outline Planning Permission for a residential development of up to 150 dwellings with all matters reserved, save for that of access. Whilst an indicative masterplan is provided within the Design and Access Statement that illustrates how the site could be developed and demonstrates an appropriate development capacity linked to density, it is not for determination at this stage.

## 1.1.8 The application comprises:

- Residential development of up to 150 dwellings @ circa 35dph
- New structure landscaping including trees and vegetation to create attractive informal public open spaces and street scenes
- New public open space including a children's play area, an informal kick about area and trim trail
- Pedestrian and cycle links to North Road and footpath links to existing statutory rights of way (footpaths 110 & 155)
- Vehicular access off North Road
- Retention and enhancement of natural habitat around the existing woodland area
- On site Sustainable Urban Drainage pond that will also provide for an ecological enhancement area
- Planting to compliment the vista from North Road

## 1.1.9 The Application Documentation consists of the following:

1	Application Covering letter Application Form and Certificates	
2	Location Plan (including Application Red Line)	Dwg No. 5376-L-01
3	Development Framework Plan	Dwg No. 5376-L-03
4	Planning Statement	Gladman
5	Design and Access Statement	FPCR
6	Landscape and Visual Assessment	FPCR
7	Transport Assessment & Travel Plan	Croft Transport Solution
8	Ecological Appraisal	FPCR
9	Arboricultural Report	FPCR
10	Phase 1 Site Investigation Report	Johnson Poole and Bloomer
11	Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)	Lees Roxburgh
12	Air Quality Assessment	Miller Goodall
13	Noise Assessment	Miller Goodall
14	Archaeology Report	CGMS
15	Utilities & Infrastructure Report	Gladman
16	Renewable Energy Statement	Gladman
17	Education Impact Assessment	EPDS
18	Affordable Housing Report	Levvel
19	Socio-economic Report	Regeneris

20	Agricultural Land Quality Report	LRA
21	Statement of Community Involvement	Gladman

### **Structure of the Statement**

1.1.10 The remainder of the Supporting Planning Statement is structured as follows:-

- Chapter 2 - The Site (a more detailed description and analysis of the site and its surroundings is contained within the accompanying Design & Access Statement and Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment, both produced by FPCR)
- Chapter 3 - The Proposed Development
- Chapter 4 - National Planning Policy Framework
- Chapter 5 - The Development Plan
- Chapter 6 - Other Material Considerations
- Chapter 7 - High Peak Borough Council – Current Housing Land Supply
- Chapter 8 - Key Benefits of the Proposals
- Chapter 9 - Summary & Conclusions

## 2 THE SITE

### 2.1 General Location

- 2.1.1 The site is situated to the north of Glossop approximately 1.4km (0.86miles) from the town centre.

**Map 1 – Application Site Edged Red**



### 2.2 The site

- 2.2.1 The site measures circa 5.75ha (circa 14.2 acres) and is presently in use as agricultural land used for grazing of sheep and cattle. The land is graded as category 3b and 4 agricultural and therefore is not best and most versatile agricultural land.
- 2.2.2 The site lies immediately east of North Road and is bounded to the south by existing two storey residential dwellings situated on Heath Road. The northern boundary of the site adjoins open fields, beyond which to the north east are formal laid out sports pitches and changing facilities. The northern boundary is partly made up of an embankment which forms the outer sides of a man made reservoir which is off site. The embankment is

relatively steep sided and is wooded. Beyond the site to the east is a commercial depot storing stone products and to the south of this is a commercial nursery business, both of which are accessed off Cemetery Road.

- 2.2.3 The site comprises 4 fields that are segregated by stock fencing and a drainage channel that is the overflow to the reservoir. Statutory footpath No.155 runs along part of the southern boundary in the intervening area between the rear boundaries of properties on Heath Road. This path links with footpath No.110 that also forms part of the southern boundary to the site. The new residential development will provide a connection to this footpath.
- 2.2.4 The topography of the site slopes generally from the north to south with dwellings on Heath Road being at a lower level than the proposed development site. The boundary of the application site in this location is characterised by rear garden fences interspersed with trees. Further east the boundary of the site adjoins a depot which is currently used for the storage of stone. This boundary is well defined by a mature laurel hedge.
- 2.2.5 The western boundary of the site fronts onto North road and is presently defined by stone walling and barbed wire stock fence. This boundary will be improved with the introduction of new landscaping interspersed with trees.

## **3 THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

### **3.1 Introduction**

3.1.1 The proposed development, and as depicted on the indicative 'Framework Plan', has been informed by the detailed site investigations, technical studies which are referred to at section 1 of this statement and the feedback obtained by way of community consultation.

### **3.2 Public Consultation**

3.2.1 Gladman has undertaken a public consultation exercise during the development and preparation of this application. Details of the consultation and the way in which the submitted proposal responds to the comments received are set out in the Report on Community Involvement.

### **3.3 The Vision – Design Objectives**

3.3.1 The Design and Access Statement (D&A) produced by FPCR demonstrates that the proposals are based on sound design principles that have properly had regard to and addressed the site constraints. The scheme achieves good integration with the existing settlement of Glossop, particularly the surrounding neighbourhood of Heath Road and the Howard Park area.

3.3.2 The D&A addresses the amount of development proposed for the site, the intended uses, layout and proposed hierarchy of built form across the site, and the composition of the scheme within the existing and proposed landscape framework.

3.3.3 The overarching objectives of the Framework Masterplan are to provide a good mix of housing sizes and tenures within a high quality residential environment. The amount of housing together with the proposed mix reflects the accommodation needs of the Glossop community recognising the needs of different people, families and varying age profiles.

3.3.4 Careful consideration has been given to the provision of public open space within the scheme to ensure that the scheme can be assimilated into the existing landscape.

3.3.5 Recognising the value of the local vernacular and architectural character, the proposals respond to this by embracing local distinctiveness throughout the site. Whilst not for determination now the illustrative masterplan demonstrates that the development could

create a high quality and pleasant residential environment that will be a desirable place to live.

3.3.6 The proposals will deliver a transport infrastructure including highways, pedestrian networks and cycle networks throughout the scheme thus delivering a development with good intrinsic accessibility.

3.3.7 The creation of new pedestrian rights of way and cycle ways through the site will make for ease of movement throughout the development and into Glossop town centre thus reducing the need for car borne journeys.

3.3.8 Plan 1 – Illustrative Framework Plan



## 3.4 Delivery

3.4.1 The development of market dwellings will be delivered by private house builders, with affordable housing either provided by or in partnership with a Registered Provider (RP). Following a grant of consent, the site would be marketed immediately and sold as expeditiously as possible to one or more house builders who would submit the requisite reserved matters application(s).

- 3.4.2 It is likely that, subject to market conditions, on average around 25 to 30 market dwellings would be completed per annum. The affordable housing often takes place simultaneously (as required by Planning Condition or Section 106 Agreement) alongside the market dwelling completions. Taking into account infrastructure delivery it is anticipated that the development of the site would take in the order of 5 - 6 years to complete.

### **3.5 Section 106 Obligations**

- 3.5.1 Gladman will seek to enter into constructive dialogue with High Peak Borough Council to agree obligations for any necessary and reasonable on and off site provisions which are related in scale and kind to the proposed development and which meet the statutory tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

## 4 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

### 4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The Government published and brought into force the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012 following an extensive period of consultation and revision. Its aim is to integrate the current suite of Planning Policy Statements, Circulars, Ministerial Statements and guidance notes as well as a raft of 'Letters to Chief Planning Officers' into a single concise document.

4.1.2 At paragraph 1, the introduction to the NPPF states:

*"The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It sets out the Government's requirements for the planning system only to the extent that it is relevant, proportionate and necessary to do so."*

4.1.3 Paragraph 2 makes clear that the NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions:

*"Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise [in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.] The National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions."*

4.1.4 In his Ministerial Foreword, Rt Hon Greg Clarke MP stated that:

*"The purpose of planning is to help achieve sustainable development."*

*Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves doesn't mean worse lives for future generations."*

***Development means growth. We must accommodate the new ways by which we will earn our living in a competitive world. We must house a rising population, which is living longer and wants to make new choices. We must respond to the changes that new technologies offer us. Our lives, and the places in which we live them, can be better, but they will certainly be worse if things stagnate.***

***Sustainable development is about change for the better, and not only in our built environment."***

4.1.5 His introduction continues:

***"So sustainable development is about positive growth – making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations.***

***The planning system is about helping to make this happen.***

***Development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay – a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision. This framework sets out clearly what could make a proposed plan or development unsustainable."***

## **4.2 Achieving Sustainable Development**

4.2.1 The NPPF adopts the Brundtland definition of sustainable development of meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Paragraph 7 highlights the economic, social and environmental elements of delivering sustainable development. Paragraph 8 notes:

***"These roles [economic, social and environmental] should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. Economic growth can secure higher social and environmental standards, and well-designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities."***

4.2.2 Whilst emphasising the need to balance these elements, paragraph 19 states:

***"The Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment***

***to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.”***

- 4.2.3 The NPPF enacts a presumption in favour of sustainable development, the ‘Golden Thread’ as set out at paragraph 14:

***“At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.”***

***“For decision-taking this means:***

- ***approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and***
- ***where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:***
  - ***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; or***
  - ***specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”***

- 4.2.4 Paragraph 17 sets out the ‘Core planning principles’ of which a key objective is to seek the delivery of high quality design. It includes the following clear statements to support growth:

- ***“proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth...”***
- ***“always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;”***
- ***“actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant***

*development in locations which are or can be made sustainable;”*

- 4.2.5 The Gladman proposal strongly accords with the aims of the NPPF in so far as it will deliver sustainable development. The site is located in an accessible location close to the key services and facilities in the town and will provide significant economic support for the vitality and viability of the town of Glossop. **The proposal benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development** (*my emphasis*).
- 4.2.6 The proposal also strongly accords with the Core Planning Principles set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF. These proposals will deliver homes that are required now within High Peak Borough and at the spatially preferable location of Glossop.
- 4.2.7 The development will be of a high quality design and will provide a good standard of amenity and open space. The location of the site allows for a choice of modes of transport to be used to access local facilities.

### **4.3 Promoting Sustainable Transport**

- 4.3.1 Paragraphs 29-41 set out how transport factors should be taken into account when considering development. Transport Assessments should support all developments that generate significant amounts of movement whilst Travel Plans are cited as an important tool to facilitate sustainable transport modes. It also states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where residual cumulative impacts of the development are severe.
- 4.3.2 The Transport Assessment produced by Croft Transport Solutions demonstrates that the site can be accessed satisfactorily and safely in terms of junction design and that the development offers the opportunity for walking and cycling linkages within the proposed development and to the local services at Glossop. Public Transport is also available to future residents of the site a short distance away on Heath Road and Dinting Road by way of a 'Hail & Ride' facility and bus and rail services to Manchester and surrounding areas are readily available within the town centre.

#### 4.4 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

- 4.4.1 The Framework sets out the Government's key housing objective, which is; ***"to boost significantly the supply of housing"***. Paragraph 47 sets out how LPAs should achieve this boost in the supply of housing, including a requirement to:

***"identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land"***

- 4.4.2 Paragraph 49 provides extremely clear guidance on both how this should be achieved and how applications should be considered if it is not:

***"...Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites."***

- 4.4.3 The Gladman proposals entirely accord with this national policy objective in so far as the application will deliver new housing development which will assist High Peak Borough by contributing towards the central government objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing. Housing delivery in High Peak Borough since 2006 (the base date of RSS) has consistently under shot the minimum amount of new homes specified by RSS (300pa), save for two years at the beginning (2006/7 599 dwellings and 2007/8 360 dwellings) giving a shortfall of some 290 dwellings to date. The current position with regard to the requisite minimum 5 year land supply stands at 2.09 years. This figure is also subject to further reduction of 20% given the persistent under delivery of the authority to meet its housing target.
- 4.4.4 The grant of planning permission now, on this site, will improve the Council's portfolio of suitable, available and deliverable housing sites thus contributing toward the remediation of this devastatingly poor housing land supply position.

4.4.5 Paragraph 50 seeks a wide choice of quality homes and on-site affordable provision.

4.4.6 The Gladman proposal will deliver up to 150 homes that will include affordable houses varying in range, size and tenure which entirely accords with the criteria set out in NPPF.

#### **4.5 Promoting Healthy Communities**

4.5.1 Paragraphs 69-70 promote the creation of sustainable, healthy communities by protecting or enhancing community facilities and open spaces. The Illustrative Masterplan that is included with the D&A illustrates how the provision of open space, landscaping, informal open space and the footpath and cycle linkages can be integrated into a detailed design for the site at reserved matters stage. All of these components of the scheme will enable the new resident community, together with the existing resident population who are relatively local to the site, to take exercise and thus the proposed scheme will actively promote general well being for the new and existing resident community.

#### **4.6 Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change**

4.6.1 Paragraph 95 of the Framework seeks *“new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions”*, and urges LPAs to adopt national standards in order to drive for the delivery of sustainable development. The application proposal meets these criteria as it will be delivered to relevant national Code for Sustainable Homes or equivalent standard applicable at the time of permission.

#### **4.7 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment**

4.7.1 Paragraphs 109-115 address the protection of valued landscapes. It requires local authorities to create, protect, enhance and manage networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure, to make effective re-use of previously developed land as well as emphasising the protection of undeveloped coasts and National Parks.

4.7.2 Paragraph 111 also addresses use of agricultural land:

*“Local planning authorities should take into account the economic*

***and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.”***

4.7.3 Paragraph 118 provides guidance to minimise impacts on biodiversity:

***“When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles:***

- ***if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;***
- ***proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted. Where an adverse effect on the site’s notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;***
- ***development proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted;***
- ***opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged;”***

4.7.4 The Ecological report demonstrates that significant harm in respect of biodiversity does not arise as a consequence of the application proposal.

4.7.5 The application site is not a Site of Special Scientific Interest nor is it close to one. In this regard it does not give rise to any adverse impacts in respect of SSSI.

4.7.6 The Development Framework Plan and Illustrative Masterplan have, wherever possible, been evolved to conserve the existing hedgerows and trees on the peripheries of the site boundary. Additional tree planting and structure landscaping will be introduced into the development which will help to create a legible landscape structure which will help to define a sense of place within the scheme. This approach will provide the potential to enhance biodiversity across the site.

## 4.8 Decision-Taking

4.8.1 Paragraphs 186-187 state:

*“Local planning authorities should approach decision-taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development. The relationship between decision-taking and plan-making should be seamless, translating plans into high quality development on the ground.”*

*Local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. Local planning authorities should work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.”*

4.8.2 Paragraphs 188-191 encourage applicants to engage in good quality pre-application engagement. Gladman has undertaken pre-application community consultation, the details of which are contained in the Statement of Community Involvement.

## 4.9 NPPF Summary

4.9.1 In summary, the proposals achieve demonstrable accordance with the overall objectives and relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular, the golden thread of sustainability thus invoking the '**presumption in favour of sustainable development**'. In accordance with the NPPF, the proposals should be approved without delay.

## 5 THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

### 5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The development plan consists of:

- The High Peak Saved Local Plan Policies (the Local Plan policies were adopted in March 2005, saved by way of Secretary of State Direction until March 2008 and subsequently saved again beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008 also by SoS Direction).

5.1.2 For reference, under the terms of Section 109 of the Localism Act 2011 the Secretary of State has, by order, revoked the Regional Spatial Strategy. It no longer forms part of the development plan.

### 5.2 Weight to be Accorded to the Development Plan

5.2.1 By reference to paragraph 215 of the NPPF the relevant 'saved' policies contained within the adopted Local Plan should be accorded due weight according to their degree of consistency with the Framework.

5.2.2 The following facts demonstrate the reasons as to why the Local Plan cannot be regarded as decisive in this case. It is Prima facie, out of date.

- The Local Plan policies were originally designed to apply to the period 2001 to 2011 and are therefore demonstrably out of date.
- The 'General Framework' cited at the outset of the local plan confirms that; ***"The Council has, for many years, successfully pursued a policy of restricting development outside the existing built-up areas."***
- The Borough is unable to accommodate its present and future housing need within the now historic identified settlement boundaries which are tightly drawn around existing settlements (including Glossop).
- The Local Plan housing need figure was predicated on the now defunct Derbyshire Structure Plan (1991-2011) which specified 275 dwellings per annum for High Peak Borough.
- The RSS increased that annualised housing delivery target to 300 dwellings per annum.

- Crucially, and despite the saving of the Local Plan policies, the Local Plan housing target was not reviewed to account for the increased housing target as set out in RSS; hence the restrictive settlement boundaries that remained extant policy are also out of date.
- The housing target has not been reviewed in light of paragraph 47 and 152 of NPPF which requires Local Authorities to derive their housing target via a full, objective assessment of housing need and demand.

5.2.3 It is therefore evident that the 'due weight' to be accorded to the Local Plan is 'extremely limited'. Its policies cannot be regarded as decisive in the determination of this application.

### **5.3 High Peak Saved Local Plan Policies (Local Development Framework)**

5.3.1 Whilst the policies within the Local Plan are 'saved' they are, on any reasonable and rational interpretation, demonstrably out of date. Nevertheless, the fact that they remain in place as 'Saved' development policies renders the development proposal a 'departure' from the Local Plan.

5.3.2 The matter of the extent to which any prejudice occurs in respect of this departure is dealt with below, but suffices to say, that the consequence of such a departure is inconsequential in planning terms. That is to say, the out datedness of the policies renders them irrelevant in the context of this proposal. Rather, and in accordance with the NPPF, the proposals should be granted planning permission without delay as they constitute sustainable development and therefore benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This proposal will help to remediate the severe shortage of both market and affordable homes within High Peak Borough.

5.3.3 Whilst having regard to the above, for completeness, the proposals are still tested against the relevant policies contained within the Local Plan.

5.3.4 For reference, sections 6 and 7 of this Planning Statement address the matter of 'Other Material Considerations' that weigh heavily in favour of the proposals. It is evident that, when the planning balance is properly applied, these material considerations substantially and demonstrably outweigh any minor harm that may occur in respect of the Local Plan policies as a consequence of the technical departure.

## 5.4 Relevant Policies of the Local Plan

### ***Policy 1 – GD2 Built - Area Boundaries***

5.4.1 Policy 1 is predicated on the approach advocated in the now defunct Derbyshire Structure Plan. The approach as stated in the preamble to **Policy 1** confirms that; ***“The Council has, for many years, successfully pursued a policy of restricting development outside the existing built-up areas.”***

5.4.2 The development proposals sit outside the ‘Built up Area Boundary’ of Glossop and therefore constitute a departure from this policy.

### ***Policy 3 - GD4 – Character, Form and Design***

5.4.3 The policy states that; ***“Planning Permission will be granted for development, provided that: ... it will be sympathetic to the character of the area, and there will not be undue detrimental effect on the visual qualities of the locality or the wider landscape”.***

5.4.4 The Design and Access Statement and Landscape and Visual Assessment demonstrate that the development of the site will be sympathetic to the character of the existing area and will not cause undue detriment to the visual qualities of the locality nor the wider landscape.

### ***Policy 5- GD6 – Landscaping***

5.4.5 The Policy States that; ***“Planning Permission will be granted for development provided that: where appropriate, it will contain a high standard of hard and/or soft landscape treatment in keeping with the character of the area, including the integration of existing features and the use of native species suitable to the location”.***

5.4.6 The proposals will provide for areas for landscaping which will be of high quality and will provide potential for ecological enhancement. Where possible, existing features will be integrated into the scheme.

### ***Policy 12 - OC4 – Landscape Character and Design***

5.4.7 The policy states that; ***“Planning Permission will be granted for development considered appropriate in the Countryside”.***

- 5.4.8 Under the terms of this Local Plan policy residential development in the countryside is not appropriate. However it is evident that this policy is out of date and no longer fit for purpose as the housing need and employment need that it was designed for has increased to the extent that development beyond the settlement limits is inevitable. Further the application site has been identified in the emerging Local Plan 'Preferred Options' as a proposed site for housing, which in turn builds on the favourable consideration of the site in the Council's SHLAA. The departure from this policy is therefore both necessary and entirely justified in planning terms.

***Policy 13 - OC5 – Development Conspicuous from the Peak District National Park***

- 5.4.9 The proposal is not conspicuous from the National Park.

***Policy 25 – BC10 - Archaeological and other Heritage Features***

- 5.4.10 The proposals have been assessed in terms of their potential to affect matters of archaeological importance. The investigations show that the site has low potential for archaeological remains. A suitably worded planning condition can be applied to the planning permission to ensure further investigation is conducted during the ground working stage of development and prior to construction.

***Policy 40 – H1- Principles of Housing Provision***

- 5.4.11 The policy states that; ***“Residential development on Greenfield Land (including renewals) will not be permitted except for dwellings approved under policies OC7, H2, H4 and H10”.***

- 5.4.12 The proposals do not accord with the definition of development as specified in the above mentioned policies. It is therefore a departure to this element of the Local Plan. However, given the fact that this policy out of date, the technical departure can be regarded as being of little or no consequence as no development beyond these settlement limits is demonstrably necessary and is now advocated by the Council in its Local Plan Preferred Option.

***Policy 44 - H9 – Affordable Housing for Local Needs***

- 5.4.13 The Policy with regard to affordable housing states; ***“The Council will negotiate with developers to ensure the provision of a proportion of affordable housing for local needs in new residential development schemes...”***

- 5.4.14 Gladman will enter into a positive dialogue with High Peak Borough Council to ensure that affordable housing is delivered as part of the development proposal at an economically viable rate and commensurate with the housing needs of the area.

***Policy 47 – H12 – Public Local Open Space***

- 5.4.15 The policy states that; ***“Planning Permission will be granted for residential development, provided that: the development will provide or have access to sufficient area(s) of public open space to adequately serve residents of the site...”***

- 5.4.16 The proposals provide for onsite public open space, both formal laid out open space in the form of a children's play area and informal open space throughout the scheme. The amount of onsite public open space exceeds the minimum requisite amount for a scheme of this size. The site also has excellent linkages with offsite public open space in the form of playing pitches at Cemetery Road and Howard Park.

***Policy 78 – TR1 – Transport Implications of New Development***

- 5.4.17 The policy states that; ***“Planning Permission will be granted for new development provided that it seeks to; reduce the need to travel, widen transport choice for people and goods, integrate transport and land use”.***

- 5.4.18 The proposals are supplemented by a transport assessment produced by Croft Transport Solutions Limited. The assessment demonstrates that the proposals are sustainably located, thus helping to reduce the need to travel, are well linked to public transport and do not give rise to any unacceptable adverse traffic impacts.

**High Peak Borough Local Plan Summary**

- 5.4.19 Having tested the proposals against the material policies contained within the High Peak Borough Local Plan it is evident that the proposals constitute a departure from the development plan. Crucially it is also evident that the Council cannot accommodate its growth needs within the settlement limits of existing Local Plan boundaries and for this reason the Council is also therefore entirely reliant on windfalls to meet its housing need.

- 5.4.20 Further, the proposed development at Glossop is in a sustainable location and will make a significant contribution towards the remediation of the Borough's deficit in housing land supply.

- 5.4.21 In the overall planning balance of weighing the policy with the other material considerations that support this proposal the Local Plan cannot be regarded as decisive in this case due to it being demonstrably out of date and no longer fit for purpose with regard to housing matters.

## 6 OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

### 6.1 High Peak Local Plan Preferred Options – February 2013

6.1.1 The High Peak Local Plan Preferred Options was published in February 2013 with the Publication Local Plan scheduled for autumn 2013.

6.1.2 The Local Plan is at a moderately progressed stage in its preparation and therefore it can only be attributed limited weight at this stage in terms of decision making.

6.1.3 The Spatial Vision for the High Peak acknowledges that Greenfield development is required on the edge of settlements. The Spatial Vision for Glossop also seeks to build on its growing reputation as a destination for high-quality food and drink to provide a compelling mix of retail and leisure opportunities in an appealing town centre environment. Additional housing and increased population located at Glossop will help to achieve this vision.

6.1.4 It is notable however that Glossop, is regarded in policy terms as a Key Service Centre where a significant proportion of the Borough's growth is planned to occur.

#### **Policy S 1 - Sustainable Development Principles**

6.1.5 This policy states that; ***“The Borough Council will seek to ensure that all new development makes a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protecting, and where possible enhancing, the environment; and mitigating the process of climate change, within the Plan Area.*”**

The policy also specifies a number of criteria against which these proposals demonstrably accord but notably; ***Meeting most development needs within or adjacent to existing communities...*”**

6.1.6 The development proposals accord with Policy S1 in so far as they deliver sustainable development immediately adjacent to the settlement of Glossop which is identified within the Local Plan as a spatially preferable location that should accommodate new housing growth.

6.1.7 It is also relevant that draft policy S1 states that; ***“When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption*”**

***in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework”.***

6.1.8 At section 4 of this statement the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ is examined and it is clearly demonstrated that it applies to this proposal. In this regard the proposal accords with draft policy S1.

6.1.9 The related Design and Access Statement produced by FPCR also deals with the relevant site specific and design elements of policy S1 but suffices to say the proposals accord with policy S1.

**Policy S 2 – Settlement Hierarchy**

6.1.10 Policy 2 confirms that Glossop is identified as one of the five ‘Market Towns’ which will be; ***“the main focus for housing”***. The proposals accord with the spatial preference for development at Glossop.

**Policy S 3 – Strategic Housing Development – Housing Land Supply and Distribution**

6.1.11 High Peak Borough Council is planning to deliver 1,040 new dwellings in Glossopdale by 2028. These proposals will make a positive contribution toward meeting this minimum housing delivery target. It is likely that, subject to market conditions, on average around 25 to 30 market dwellings would be completed per annum. Therefore, assuming a commencement of development in late 2014 (allowing for planning approval, site disposal and approval of reserved matters) construction should complete be around 2019.

**Policy S 5 – Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy**

6.1.12 The policy for Glossopdale states that; ***“The Council will seek to promote the sustainable growth of Glossopdale whilst promoting and maintaining the distinct identity of its settlements, provide an increasing range of employment opportunities, promote the growth of a sustainable tourist economy and meet the housing needs of the local community...”***

6.1.13 With specific regard to Housing in Glossopdale, policy S5 states that; ***“PROVIDING FOR THE HOUSING NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY BY PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABLE HOUSING AND MIXED USE DEVELOPMENTS BY... IDENTIFYING SUFFICIENT***

***HOUSING LAND TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY, INCLUDING THE DELIVERY OF APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING...***

6.1.14 It is also notable that draft Policy S5 seeks to support development of new homes on primarily Brownfield land within the built up area boundary. This policy is inconsistent with Policy S 1 that specifies that; ***"Meeting most development needs within or adjacent to existing communities..."***

6.1.15 Notably, this policy is the subject of objection and can only therefore be regarded to be of very limited weight at this stage.

**Policy EQ 1 - Climate Change**

6.1.16 Policy EQ1 requires new homes in residential developments of five dwellings or more to achieve the highest viable Code for Sustainable Homes rating which would at least meet or exceed the requirements of the current Building Regulations. This matter will be dealt with at detailed design stage and an appropriately worded condition can be applied to the outline planning permission.

**Policy EQ 2 - Landscape Character**

6.1.17 The Council will seek to protect, enhance and restore the landscape character of the Plan Area for its own intrinsic beauty and for its benefit to the economic, environmental and social well-being of the Plan Area. In this regard Policy EQ 2 seeks to ensure that ***"development proposals preserve or enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape"***.

6.1.18 The Landscape Assessment submitted alongside these proposals and produced by FPCR demonstrates that the proposals can be sensitively assimilated into the landscape and surrounding residential area without unacceptable detriment. The proposals will introduce new landscaping which will also serve to soften the visual impact of the development and enhance the character of the area in the long term.

**Policies EQ 7 & 8 - Green Infrastructure & Trees Woodlands and Hedgerows**

6.1.19 The policy seeks to develop, protect and enhance networks of Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure. The proposals involve the retention, wherever possible, of existing

hedgerows present on site and also involve the introduction of additional tree planting and landscaped areas to create an attractive landscape framework to compliment the development. These areas will also provide the potential for biodiversity enhancement within the development.

**Policy EQ 9 - Pollution and Flood Risk**

- 6.1.20 The Flood Risk Assessment produced by Lees Roxburgh Limited demonstrates that the proposals do not give rise to any unacceptable flood risk. An appropriate surface drainage strategy will be agreed with the Environment Agency.
- 6.1.21 The Phase I ground investigation produced by Johnson Poole & Bloomer Limited demonstrates that the site is not contaminated and that there are no incumbent problems in terms of the facilitating residential development on the site.

**Policy H 1 - Location of Housing Development**

- 6.1.22 Policy H1 states that; ***The Council will ensure provision is made for housing by... Prioritising new housing development on previously developed land in preference to greenfield land. Development on greenfield land, other than the sites allocated in the plan, will not normally be permitted***.
- 6.1.23 The application site is identified as a proposed allocation in the draft Local Plan. The proposals therefore accord with draft Policy H1.

**Policy H 2 - Phasing Housing Development**

- 6.1.24 Policy H2 seeks to deliver an annual quantum of housing broadly in accordance with the annualised target of delivery. The purpose of this is to ensure that infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner and that new development does not cause undue pressure as a consequence of being delivered ahead of such infrastructure.
- 6.1.25 Delivery of the application site is not contingent upon the delivery of any strategic infrastructure and therefore can proceed without delay.

### **Policy H 3 - Housing Allocations**

- 6.1.26 Policy H3 proposes the allocation of North Road (G6) for 60 dwellings.

**Map 5 G6 North Road, Glossop (Policy H3)**



- 6.1.27 The principle of residential development on the application site is therefore supported in policy terms. The area of the draft allocation G6 is larger than the application site but notably is much less dense at around 7 dwellings per hectare. By contrast the proposal represents an efficient use of part of the proposed allocation site and is well related in character and scale to the existing pattern and form of the surrounding residential area.

### **Policy H 4 - New Housing Development**

- 6.1.28 The proposal positively seeks to provide housing to meet local need. The indicative housing mix (as specified in the Socio Economic Report – Regeneris) is derived by reference to the SHMA which addresses the requisite types of new homes needed to support the growth of the community during the plan period. The proposals therefore accord with draft policy H4.

**Policy H 5 – Housing**

- 6.1.29 Policy H5 specifies that; ***“In order to address the need for affordable housing, residential developments should ensure that at least the following proportions of residential units are provided as affordable housing as follows... 30% affordable housing on sites of 25 units or more”.***
- 6.1.30 The proposals will deliver affordable dwellings on site or an equivalent and proportionate of off-site provision will be made should the council prefer. The applicant will enter into a positive dialogue with the Council to ensure the amount of affordable housing delivered via these proposals ensures that the permission remains viable.

**Policy CF 4 - Provision of Open Space and Recreation Facilities**

- 6.1.31 Policy CF4 states that; ***“The Council will seek to protect, maintain and where possible enhance existing open spaces and recreation facilities in order to ensure their continued contribution to the health and well being of local communities”.***
- 6.1.32 The application proposals deliver both formal laid out open space and informal open space on site in excess of the Council’s draft requisite standards. The proposals accord with draft policy CF4 in this regard.

**Policy CF 6 - Accessibility and Transport**

- 6.1.33 Policy CF6 states that; ***The Council will seek to ensure that development is managed in order to minimise the need to travel, particularly by unsustainable modes of transport and help deliver the priorities of the Derbyshire Local Transport Plan.***
- 6.1.34 The development proposals at North Road, Glossop offer a good range a travel choice by modes other than the private car. The local area is well served by public transport which is within easy walking distance of the site. Train provision to Manchester from Glossop is good. The town centre, local schools and employment areas within Glossop are all accessible from the site by walking and cycling. In terms of accessibility the proposals are demonstrably sustainable. In this regard the proposals accord with Policy CF6.

## **7 HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL – CURRENT HOUSING LAND SUPPLY**

- 7.1.1 The Council, by its own admission, does not have a 5 year supply of deliverable dwellings. Housing land supply was considered at a Public Inquiry that commenced on 23 April 2013 in respect of the Council's refusal of outline planning permission (contrary to the recommendation of Officers) for a mixed use scheme including up to 182 dwellings at Forge Works, Chinley (PINS Reference: APP/H1033/A/13/2189819/NWF).
- 7.1.2 Core Document (CD) 56 to the above Inquiry comprises a housing land supply assessment undertaken by the Council on 31 September 2012 and records that over the period 1 April 2006 to 31 March 2012 a total of 1,522 dwellings had been completed against the RS requirement of 1,800 dwellings (300 per annum); the shortfall over the period being 278 dwellings. For reference the RS requirement for the Plan period 2006 – 2026 was 6,000 dwellings (residual requirement for the remaining RS period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2026 = 4,478 dwellings (6,000 – 1522).
- 7.1.3 In terms of supply CD56 identified 215 dwellings under construction as of 31 March 2012 and 532 dwellings with planning permission as of 31 March 2012 (747 dwellings in total). A further 371 dwellings are identified by the Council in CD56 as having obtained planning permission between 1 April 2012 and 31 September 2012 (giving an identified supply of 1,118); although no attempt was made by the Council to estimate completions for this period which undermines the credibility of including the 1 April to 31 September planning permissions data in the Council's calculation.
- 7.1.4 In CD56 the Council went on to suggest that previous under-performance should be spread across the then remaining RS period to 2026 whereas our preference would be to spread the under performance across the next five years (2012 – 2017) in accordance with recent appeal decisions reflecting the sentiments of the Framework to boost significantly housing land supply in England. The Council then went on to calculate the housing land supply position in CD56 (using a residual method) as of 31 September 2012 applying a 5% and 20% buffer in accordance with the Framework. As set out below, 20% is the appropriate buffer to adopt in the High Peak and on this basis (and spreading previous under performance across the remainder of the RS period) the Council concluded that the deliverable supply was 2.8 years as of 31 September 2012.
- 7.1.5 This position closely reflected that established in the appeal by Barratt Homes at Manchester Road / Crossings Road, Chapel-en-le-Frith, High Peak.

7.1.6 The basis for the Council's calculation is set out below:

- Regional Strategy requirement (2006-2026) = 6,000.
- Minus completions (2006 – 2012) =1,522.
- Residual requirement (6,000 – 1,522) = 4,478.
- Annual residual requirement (4478/13.5 (remainder of plan period)) = 332.
- 5 year requirement 332 X 5 = 1,658.
- Actual supply 1,118/332 = 3.4 years.
- Plus 5% buffer 1,118/349 =3.2 years.
- Plus 20% buffer 1,118/398 = 2.8 years.

7.1.7 The proof of evidence relating to planning matters produced by Mr Forrester on behalf of the Council and submitted to PINS on 28 March 2013 attempts to project the housing position forward to December 2012. Mr Forrester's calculation as it appears at Appendix 1 of his proof of evidence is summarised here for ease of reference:

- Regional Strategy requirement (2006-2026) = 6,000.
- Minus completions (2006 – 2012) =1,522.
- Residual requirement (6,000 – 1,522) = 4,478.
- Annual residual requirement (4478/13.25 (remainder of plan period)) = 338.
- 5 year requirement 338 X 5 = 1,690.
- Actual supply 1,212/338 = 3.6 years.

7.1.8 Mr Forrester made no attempt in his evidence to address the issue of buffer as required by the Framework and hence his answers to the questions put by David Manley QC on behalf of the Appellants are of relevance in determining the Council's position on buffer etc; in this respect Mr Forrester agreed under cross-examination that:

- The housing policies of the HPBLP are out-of-date as the LPA cannot demonstrate 5 year supply of deliverable housing land.
- There is no other evidence to suggest that anything other than the 20% buffer should apply in High Peak.
- At best the housing land supply position is around 2.8 years.
- The weight to be attributed to a deficient housing land supply increases with the severity of shortfall.

7.1.9 It is also worthy of note that the parties in the Forge Works case were asked by the Inspector to comment on the implications of the RS revocation in the context of housing land supply matters. It is worthy of note that both parties agreed that the RS headline

figure of 300 dwellings per annum remains relevant to the determination of planning applications until such time as an alternative figure has been submitted for examination and found sound by an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

7.1.10 As set out above we disagree with the residual approach preferring to spread under-performance across the next five years (known as the Sedgefield approach). Adopting the Sedgefield method we consider that at best the deliverable supply is between **2.7 and 2.9 years**. Of course this assumes that all sites in the identified supply will deliver as expected (which is optimistic) and also takes no account of completions from 1 April 2012. Clearly any continued under-performance would have the effect of increasing the adjusted annual requirement. The basis of our calculation is set out below:

- Regional Strategy requirement (2006-2026) = 6,000.
- Regional Strategy requirement (annualised) = 300.
- Regional Strategy Requirement 2006 – 2012 (6 x 300) = 1,800
- Minus completions (2006 – 2012) = 1,522.
- Under performance (2006 – 2012) = 278.
- Under performance over spread over 5 years = 56 per annum.
- Annual requirement 300 (Regional Strategy requirement) + 60 (20% buffer) + 56 (previous under performance over 5 years) = 416.
- Identified supply 1,118 (CD56) /416 = 2.7 years.
- Identified supply 1,212 (Mr Forrester for the Council) /416 = 2.9 years.

7.1.11 On any fair assessment of the headline housing land supply figures, it is evident that the Borough has a chronic shortage of market and affordable housing.

7.1.12 While the decision in respect of the Forge Works case is awaited housing land supply issues were considered in another case in the High Peak in 2012 in relation to a proposal by Barratt Homes for 105 dwellings on land at Crossings Road, Chapel-en-le-Frith. We would draw the Council's attention to the following conclusions made by the Inspector in relation to the Crossings Road case:

Paragraph 9:

***“The Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for 2010/2011 at p67 shows that housing delivery was below RSS target level in 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. In relation to the RSS housing requirement, the Council had, at the time of its consideration of the application the subject of the current appeal, a housing***

***land supply of 4.25 years as at 27 May 2011; 2.25 years as at 15 August 2011; and 2.4 years as at December 2011. Clearly, these figures fall far short of a 5-year supply. At the Inquiry the Council's case was that it had a housing land supply of 5.9 years. However, this total includes sites without planning permission".***

- 7.1.13 The Inspector went on to conclude that the Council's calculation of its deliverable housing land did not comply with Footnote 11 of the Framework and that High Peak Borough is persistently under delivering in respect of housing and that consequently a 20% buffer should be applied (Paragraph 14). The appeal was subsequently allowed.
- 7.1.14 In summary, it is fair to conclude that the deficient deliverable housing land supply situation in the High Peak is serious and significant as the Council has persistently underperformed against the RS requirements and does not have a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. The application proposals would help to boost significantly the supply of housing and would help to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. These are matters to which significant weight should be afforded.

---

## 8 KEY BENEFITS OF THE SCHEME

### 8.1 Planning for Housing

8.1.1 The proposals accord with the government's policies enshrined within the NPPF in so far they will deliver sustainable development to meet the growth needs of Glossop and the High Peak.

8.1.2 The site is located in an accessible location close to the key services and facilities in and around Glossop town centre and will provide significant economic support that will reinforce the vitality and viability of the town and its community.

8.1.3 **The proposals benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development** (*my emphasis*).

### 8.2 Housing Land Supply

8.2.1 The Borough has experienced significant under delivery in terms of market and affordable housing during the last plan period.

8.2.2 This proposal will make an immediate and positive impact towards remediating the Borough-wide chronic shortage of both market and affordable housing.

### 8.3 Affordable Housing

8.3.1 The application proposal will deliver affordable housing on site which will immediately assist the Borough in helping to begin to remediate the shortage of affordable homes within the Borough. The level of affordable housing will be agreed with the Borough Council during the determination period of the planning application.

## 8.4 Accessibility

8.4.1 The site can be accessed satisfactorily and safely in terms of junction design and the development offers the opportunity for walking and cycling linkages within the proposed development and to the local services at Glossop. Public Transport is also available to future residents of the site a short distance away on Heath Road and Dinting Road by way of a 'Hail & Ride' facility and bus and rail services to Manchester and surrounding areas are readily available within the town centre.

8.4.2 In conclusion, the proposals for a residential development will provide a sustainable development in transport terms and planning permission should be granted in accordance with the Framework.

## 8.5 Green Space

8.5.1 The existing site is characterised by poor grade pasture and periphery hedgerows interspersed with semi and mature trees. The existing hedgerow and tree features will, wherever possible, be integrated into the areas of formal and informal public open spaces. Where appropriate, these will be maintained, managed and enhanced as part of the housing scheme.

8.5.2 These features, together with new structure planting will provide for a high quality environment for the benefit of the future community. The formal open spaces will be linked by a series of green networks that will inform the layout of the estate roads and will provide pleasant and attractive routes that will encourage people to walk and cycle throughout the scheme.

## 8.6 New Homes Bonus

8.6.1 Using the Department for Communities and Local Government New homes Bonus calculator High Peak Borough Council would gain in the order of 1.45 million pounds. The materiality of this is recognised in the Localism Act 2011.

## 9 SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

### 9.1 The Application

9.1.1 This application seeks Outline Planning Permission for a residential development of up to 150 dwellings with all matters reserved, save for that of access. Whilst an indicative masterplan is provided within the Design and Access Statement that illustrates how the site could be developed and demonstrates an appropriate development capacity linked to density, it is not for determination at this stage.

### 9.2 Vision - The Design Objectives

9.2.1 The Design and Access Statement (D&A) produced by FPCR demonstrates that the proposals are based on sound design principles that have properly had regard to and addressed the site constraints and opportunities. The scheme achieves good integration with the existing settlement of Glossop, particularly the surrounding neighbourhood of Heath Road and the Howard Park area.

9.2.2 The overarching objectives of the Development Framework plan and Illustrative Masterplan that are shown within the D&A are to provide a good mix of housing sizes and tenures within a high quality residential environment. The amount of housing together with the proposed mix reflects the accommodation needs of the Glossop community recognising the needs of different people, families and varying age profiles.

### 9.3 Delivery

9.3.1 Following a grant of consent, the site would be marketed by Gladman and sold to one or more house builders who would submit the required reserved matters application(s).

9.3.2 It is likely that, subject to market conditions, on average around 25 to 30 market dwellings would be completed per annum.

### 9.4 Accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework

#### **Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes**

9.4.1 The Gladman proposal strongly accords with the aims of the NPPF in so far as it will deliver sustainable development. The site is located in an accessible location close to

the key services and facilities in the town and will provide significant economic support for the vitality and viability of the town of Glossop. **The proposal benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development** (*my emphasis*).

- 9.4.2 The proposal also strongly accords with the Core Planning Principles set out in paragraph 17 of NPPF. These proposals will deliver homes that are required now within High Peak Borough and at the spatially preferable location of Glossop.
- 9.4.3 The development will be of a high quality design and will provide a good standard of amenity and open space. The location of the site allows for a choice of modes of transport to be used to access local facilities.
- 9.4.4 The Framework sets out the Government's key housing objective, which is; ***"to boost significantly the supply of housing"***. Paragraph 47 sets out how LPAs should achieve this boost in the supply of housing, including a requirement to:

***"identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land"***

- 9.4.5 It is evident that High Peak Borough Council does not a five year housing land supply and further it is evident that it has suffered persistent under delivery over a sustained period. It therefore should make provision for a buffer of 20% over and above the specified annual housing target.
- 9.4.6 In this circumstance, paragraph 49 of the Framework provides extremely clear guidance on both how this should be achieved and how applications should be considered if it is not:

***"...Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites."***

- 9.4.7 The Gladman proposals entirely accord with this national policy objective in so far as the application will deliver new housing development which will assist High Peak Borough by contributing towards the central government objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing.
- 9.4.8 Housing delivery in High Peak Borough since 2006 (the base date of RSS) has consistently under shot the minimum amount of new homes specified by RSS (300pa), save for two years at the beginning (2006/7 599 dwellings and 2007/8 360 dwellings) giving a shortfall of some 290 dwellings to date. The current position with regard to the requisite minimum 5 year land supply stands at best at around **2.7 to 2.9 years** which also takes account of the further reduction of 20% given the persistent under delivery of the authority to meet its housing target. However a cautionary note must be applied to these figures as it assumes 100% delivery of all sites coming forward that the Council is counting within the deliverable supply. To allow for no attrition rate is highly inadvisable as schemes often may falter, be re-planned or not come forward at all.
- 9.4.9 The grant of planning permission now, on this site, will improve the Council's portfolio of suitable, available and deliverable housing sites thus contributing toward the remediation of this devastatingly poor housing land supply position in the High Peak.
- 9.4.10 Paragraph 50 seeks a wide choice of quality homes and on-site affordable provision.
- 9.4.11 The Gladman proposal will deliver up to 150 homes that will include a significant proportion of affordable houses varying in range, size and tenure which entirely accords with the criteria set out in NPPF.
- 9.4.12 In summary it has been demonstrated that the proposals achieve demonstrable accordance with the overall objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular, the golden thread of sustainability thus invoking the '*presumption in favour of sustainable development*'. On any fair reasonable assessment of the current deficit of housing land supply, these proposals should be granted planning permission without delay.

## 9.5 Development Plan & Emerging LDF

### High Peak Borough Local Plan 'Saved Policies'

- 9.5.1 The Local Plan cannot be regarded as decisive in this case. It is Prima facie, out of date.

- 9.5.2 Having tested the proposals against the material policies contained within the High Peak Borough Local Plan it is evident that the proposals constitute a departure from the development plan. However it is also evident that the Council cannot accommodate its growth needs within the settlement limits of existing Local Plan boundaries and for this reason the Council is also therefore entirely reliant on windfalls to meet its housing need.
- 9.5.3 Further, the proposed development at Glossop is in a sustainable location and will make a significant contribution towards the remediation of the Borough wide deficit in housing land supply.
- 9.5.4 In the overall planning balance of weighing the local policies with other material considerations that support this proposal it is evident that the Local Plan cannot be regarded as decisive in this case due to it being demonstrably out of date. The weight of other material considerations demonstrably and significantly outweighs any non-compliance with the now historic local plan policies.

## **9.6 High Peak Local Plan – Preferred Options – February 2013**

- 9.6.1 The High Peak Local Plan Preferred Options was published in February 2013 with the Publication Local Plan scheduled for autumn 2013.
- 9.6.2 The Local Plan is at a moderately progressed stage in its preparation and therefore it can be attributed only limited weight at this stage in terms of decision making.
- 9.6.3 The Spatial Vision for the High Peak acknowledges that Greenfield development is required on the edge of settlements. The Spatial Vision for Glossop also seeks to build on its growing reputation as a destination for high-quality food and drink to provide a compelling mix of retail and leisure opportunities in an appealing town centre environment. Additional housing and increased population located at Glossop will help to achieve this vision.
- 9.6.4 It is notable however that Glossop, is regarded in policy terms as a Key Market Town where a significant proportion of the Borough's growth is planned to occur. It is further noted that the Local Plan intends the allocation of the site for housing.

- 9.6.5 These proposals demonstrably accord with the policies contained within the emerging Local Plan. In this regard, and given the out datedness of the adopted Local Plan policies, the fact that the proposals accord with the key tenets of emerging planning policy should be given some weight.

## **9.7 Overview**

- 9.7.1 Having demonstrated that the proposals accord with the key objectives and policies laid down within existing adopted and emerging development plan policies, and having identified the strong accord with the NPPF and the matters of housing delivery and land supply, in accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, it is appropriate that planning permission should be granted now based on the significant weight of material considerations that outweigh any departure from the out of date Local Plan.