

Kay Neild

From: Ben Pycroft <
Sent: 30 October 2020 08:56
To: Haywood, Ben; Rawdon Gascoigne; Simpkin, Rachael.
Cc: Colley, Jane;
Subject: RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge
Attachments: To RS re Taxal Edge - 301020.pdf; FILE_5345.pdf

Importance: High

Dear All

Please find attached our response to Rachael's e-mails of Tuesday and Wednesday, in relation to the extant permissions, policy H1 and trees.

There is no reason for this application to be held back and we would like it to be presented to the November planning committee.

Kind regards

Ben Pycroft BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI
Director



Emery Planning is proud to support the Keaton Emery Memorial Foundation. To find out more about the charity or to make a donation, please visit www.keatonemeryfoundation.com

emery
planning

Emery Planning Partnership Ltd trading as
Emery Planning
Registered in England No. 4471702

Emery Planning
1-4 South Park Court
Hobson Street
Macclesfield
SK11 8BS

Registered
office as above

The contents of this e-mail are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. If you are not the intended recipient (nor the person responsible for delivering to that recipient) be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify Emery Planning on.

From: Haywood, Ben
Sent: 29 October 2020 12:32
To: Rawdon Gascoigne Simpkin, Rachael.

Cc: Colley, Jane <**Subject:** RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Dear Rawdon

Thank you for your email and phone message

I have discussed the case with Rachael this morning and we would be happy to defer the item further until December to allow discussions to continue, particularly with regard to the trees.

I think that the opinion that you have provided does address the fallback position adequately but, notwithstanding whether a fallback exists it doesn't alter our view with regard to the conflict of the scheme with policy H1. However, whilst ultimately we may agree to disagree over the H1 principle of development we would like to work with you to resolve other issues to minimise reasons for refusal and areas for discussion at Appeal in accordance with the advice.

If you are able to agree the necessary time extension I am happy to pull it off the November agenda.

I'm out of the office this PM so if you could copy Rachael into any reply, I'd be grateful.

Many thanks

Ben

Ben Haywood
Head of Development Services
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council / High Peak Borough Council

From: Rawdon Gascoigne <
Sent: 28 October 2020 17:24
To: Simpkin, Rachael. ; Ben Pycroft **Cc:** Colley, Jane >; Haywood, Ben <
Subject: RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Rachael,

I am somewhat astonished by your response below. You appear to have confirmed that irrespective of the additional information you have asked us to respond on, the application would be refused.

You have given us less than 24 hours to respond to the requests for additional information related to the implementation of the previous permissions despite us chasing a response from the Council for the last 3 weeks. The extension of time is not a ransom for whether this information should be considered or not.

With regards to the trees, that matter is in hand but the respective parties only met on site on the 15th and we then needed to await a response from Monica Gillespie after the meeting to allow the reports to be prepared. We understand that Monica and DCC are now effectively satisfied that there will be no adverse impact on the trees and the report which we anticipate being ready by tomorrow/Friday will provide the information to confirm that.

With regards to your email, please confirm what is the basis for you considering the classroom has not been converted and what works you consider may be unauthorised as it is not clear, especially as your own building control records show that what was inspected was a conversion.

Secondly, please clarify how you do not consider the submission of Jonathan Easton to have not dealt with the lawful implantation of the previous permission. This was dealt with at length in the opinion and was based on the Council's own documents that had previously confirmed that the permissions had been implemented. I would remind you that the test is the balance of probabilities and that at present you have not set anything out to contradict what has been submitted by ourselves or what was set out in the opinion.

Given the apparent intransigent position you are now taking, we will submit this additional information ahead of the planning committee and it will have to be dealt with via an update. I am more than happy however to discuss matters further tomorrow to see if we can resolve the position and avoid the need to progress an appeal. I have left a message for Ben Haywood to similar effect.

Kind regards,

Rawdon Gascoigne BA (Hons) MRTPI
Director



Emery Planning is proud to support the Keaton Emery Memorial Foundation. To find out more about the charity or to make a donation, please visit www.keatonemeryfoundation.com



Emery Planning
2-4 South Park Court
Hobson Street
Macclesfield
SK11 8BS

Emery Planning Partnership Ltd trading as
Emery Planning
Registered in England No. 4471702

Registered
office as above

The contents of this e-mail are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. If you are not the intended recipient (nor the person responsible for delivering to that recipient) be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify Emery Planning on.

From: Simpkin, Rachael. <
Sent: 28 October 2020 15:33
To: Rawdon Gascoigne >; Ben Pycroft <**Cc:** Colley, Jane < Haywood, Ben <
Subject: RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Dear Rawdon,

To clarify our position:

The scheme has only been time extended to the next committee being the 14th November 2020 and goes to print this Friday 30th October 2020.

The scheme is contrary to LP Policy H1 i.e. it does not adjoin the development boundary, neither is it well related with the existing pattern of development and surrounding land uses nor is it of an appropriate scale for the settlement.

Then we turn to the fallback position regarding the 2009 and 2013 permissions. We have simply asked you to evidence the works undertaken to implement either of these schemes – this of course includes the classroom ‘conversion’.

Then we turn to the other material considerations in the decision making process that even if a robust fallback position can be established for the 2009 and 2013 schemes i.e. mostly conversion of existing buildings within a more contained and level site area –

It is clear that the proposed scheme is fundamentally different for the fallback position as a material consideration in the planning balance to carry any significant weight to overcome such LP Policy H1 objections.

We were under the impression that you wished to resolve the trees issues, however, the relevant information has not yet been submitted to allow this to occur and therefore this reason for refusal stands.

Given there is no time extension beyond the 14th November 2020 to encompass the next committee i.e. 14th December 2020 we will proceed with a recommendation of refusal for the 9th November 2020 meeting.

Kind regards,

Rachael Simpkin
Senior Planning Officer (Majors & Commercial)
Development Services

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

From: Rawdon Gascoigne
Sent: 28 October 2020 14:51
To: Simpkin, Rachael.; Ben Pycroft
Cc: Colley, Jane; Haywood, Ben;
Subject: RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Rachel,

Further to your email below, I am not sure what your reference to the extension of time being required in view of print deadlines actually means. Agreeing an extension of time should not and cannot be related to what the actual recommendation on decision on the application will be i.e. it will be refused if we do not agree an extension of time at this point. The council have already accepted that the previous recommendation to refuse was flawed in response to the opinion from Jonathan Easton and that you require the additional information to come to a reasoned conclusion. We will collate that information but we do not consider that it is reasonable for a formal extension of time to determine to be linked to the decision to be reached.

I am still awaiting instruction and will respond when we have had a response from our client.

Kind regards,

Rawdon Gascoigne BA (Hons) MRTPI
Director



Emery Planning is proud to support the Keaton Emery Memorial Foundation. To find out more about the charity or to make a donation, please visit www.keatonemeryfoundation.com

emery
planning

Emery Planning
2-4 South Park Court
Hobson Street
Macclesfield
SK11 8BS

Emery Planning Partnership Ltd trading as
Emery Planning
Registered in England No. 4471702

Registered
office as above

The contents of this e-mail are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. If you are not the intended recipient (nor the person responsible for delivering to that recipient) be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify Emery Planning on.

From: Simpkin, Rachael.
Sent: 28 October 2020 13:33
To: Rawdon Gascoigne ; [Ben Pycroft](#) <[Cc: Colley, Jane](#)<; [Haywood, Ben](#)<
Subject: RE: [HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge](#)

Dear Rawdon,

Thank you for your email response.

We consider that the points raised require clarification as has been set out.

The scheme submission has not yet addressed tree concerns to once again constitute a reason for refusal.

The time extension agreement should be received today in view of print deadlines.

Kind regards,

Rachael Simpkin
Senior Planning Officer (Majors & Commercial)
Development Services

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

From: Rawdon Gascoigne
Sent: 28 October 2020 12:25
To: Simpkin, Rachael.; Ben Pycroft
Cc: Colley, Jane; Haywood, Ben;
Subject: RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Dear Rachael,

Further to your email below I can confirm that we will be responding to the various points you raise albeit we consider they have all already been dealt with through the information and Counsel's opinion previously submitted.

With regards the extension of time, I am currently seeking our client's instructions and will confirm as soon as I am able, however I am tied up with Inspector calls preparing for an imminent Public Inquiry and as you know Ben is also on leave until tomorrow.

Kind regards,

Rawdon Gascoigne BA (Hons) MRTPI
Director



Emery Planning is proud to support the Keaton Emery Memorial Foundation. To find out more about the charity or to make a donation, please visit www.keatonemeryfoundation.com



Emery Planning Partnership Ltd trading as
Emery Planning
Registered in England No. 4471702

Emery Planning
2-4 South Park Court
Hobson Street
Macclesfield
SK11 8BS

Registered
office as above

The contents of this e-mail are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. If you are not the intended recipient (nor the person responsible for delivering to that recipient) be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use,

dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify Emery Planning on.

i

From: Simpkin, Rachael.
Sent: 27 October 2020 17:57
To: Ben Pycroft
Cc: Colley, Jane ; Haywood, Ben <>; Rawdon Gascoigne <[_____](#)>
Subject: RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Hi Ben,

In response to the points raised, we respond as follows:

You are required to set out whether you have implemented the 2009 or 2013 permission and specifically how?

The classroom conversion appears as a new build and therefore does not comply with the approved scheme. You are required to provide evidence to the contrary.

In terms of LP Policy H1, the scheme does not adjoin the development boundary as would have been corrected in the committee update sheet.

You are required to submit a BS5837 tree report accompanied by a Tree Protection/Method Statement to allow appropriate consultation.

To allow these matters to be further addressed I would suggest that we agree to a further time extension to encompass the 14th December meeting i.e. 18th December 2020.

Please confirm if you agree to the time extension by 1pm tomorrow in view of my committee report deadline.

Kind regards,

Rachael Simpkin
Senior Planning Officer (Majors & Commercial)
Development Services

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

From: Colley, Jane
Sent: 27 October 2020 11:53
To: 'Ben Pycroft'
Cc: Haywood, Ben; Rawdon Gascoigne; Simpkin, Rachael.
Subject: RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Good morning Ben,

Many apologies for the delay in getting back to you, you caught both Ben and I as we were preparing for the Staffs Moorland Planning Committee last Thursday, so we were tied up with that. Myself, Ben and Rachael have reviewed

all of the information you have presented including Counsels Opinion and we will be responding to you later today. There are a number of questions which have arisen and therefore Rachael will set these out to you in her email.

Kind regards,

Jane Colley
Principal Planning Officer

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

From: Ben Pycroft
Sent: 21 October 2020 09:22
To: Rawdon Gascoigne <Colley, Jane <; Haywood, Ben < _____>>
Subject: RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge
Importance: High

Morning Ben and Jane

Could you please respond to Rawdon's email today?

As you know, we only agreed an extension of time until 9th October so that we could get on the October committee and therefore the determination date has passed. I note that the portal now says that the application will be presented to the committee on the 9th November, but as below we have not heard anything from you since the application was withdrawn from October's agenda. As Rawdon says, we would be happy to meet to if required.

In relation to trees, as Monica is aware we are going to provide all of the necessary information to address her concerns outlined in the previous committee report in time for November's committee. This should avoid the need for a pre-commencement condition re: trees.

Kind regards

Ben Pycroft BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI
Director



Emery Planning is proud to support the Keaton Emery Memorial Foundation. To find out more about the charity or to make a donation, please visit www.keatonemeryfoundation.com

Registered office as above

Emery Planning Partnership Ltd trading as
Emery Planning

Registered in England No. 4471702

The contents of this e-mail are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. If you are not the intended recipient (nor the person responsible for delivering to that recipient) be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify Emery Planning on.

From: Rawdon Gascoigne <[\[redacted\]](#)>
Sent: 13 October 2020 17:42
To: Colley, Jane <[\[redacted\]](#)>
Cc: Ben Pycroft **Subject:** RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge
Importance: High

Jane/Ben,

Further to my email below, our client has now arranged to meet on site with Monica Gillespie on Thursday together with DCC and our landscape architect to review the position with regards the trees on site and landscaping generally.

In anticipation that agreement can be reached on those matters please can you advise when we will be able to meet to discuss how the application can now be progressed and what additional information may be required ahead of preparing a revised committee report. Obviously if you are satisfied that the information and Counsel's opinion submitted prior to committee now enables the report to be revised and presented with a positive recommendation then there may be no need to meet but if there are outstanding matters then obviously we need an opportunity to address these well ahead of any report being drafted as that was one of the issues picked up by Counsel in terms of how the application had been dealt with.

I would be grateful if you could respond as soon as possible as I am conscious that the deadline for drafting committee reports will now be fast approaching to get to November's committee.

If you need to discuss anything then please do not hesitate to contact either myself or Ben.

Kind regards,

Rawdon Gascoigne BA (Hons) MRTPI



Emery Planning is proud to support the Keaton Emery Memorial Foundation. To find out more about the charity or to make a donation, please visit www.keatonemeryfoundation.com



Emery Planning
2-4 South Park Court
Hobson Street
Macclesfield
SK11 8BS

Registered office as above

Emery Planning Partnership Ltd trading as
Emery Planning
Registered in England No. 4471702

The contents of this e-mail are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. If you are not the intended recipient (nor the person responsible for delivering to that recipient) be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify Emery Planning on.

From: Rawdon Gascoigne
Sent: 02 October 2020 13:09
To: 'Colley, Jane' <Emma.Bennion>
Cc: Ben Pycroft <>
Subject: RE: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Dear Jane,

Thank you for confirmation that the above application has been deferred from committee on Monday. We agree to the extension of time on the application to allow the application to go to November's committee.

In the meantime we will also look to address the comments contained in the late consultation responses. In particular, the tree officer at DCC (the existing TPO at site is a DCC TPO and work on those trees has been subject to ongoing discussion with Ruth at DCC) is willing to meet on site as soon as possible together with our client and your tree officer. We understand that Monica Gillespie returns from leave next week so would be grateful if she could contact us as soon as possible to arrange a convenient time to meet. On the other consultation responses we will prepare a response of our own and would then be grateful if a meeting can be arranged to work through those points.

I trust this brings things up to date and we will await hearing from you further on a convenient time for the respective meetings.

Kind regards,

Rawdon Gascoigne BA (Hons) MRTPI
Director



Emery Planning is proud to support the Keaton Emery Memorial Foundation. To find out more about the charity or to make a donation, please visit www.keatonemeryfoundation.com



Emery Planning
2-4 South Park Court
Hobson Street
Macclesfield
SK11 8BS

Registered office as above

Emery Planning Partnership Ltd trading as
Emery Planning
Registered in England No. 4471702

The contents of this e-mail are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. If you are not the intended recipient (nor the person responsible for delivering to that recipient) be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify Emery Planning on.

From: Colley, Jane <
Sent: 02 October 2020 12:20
To: Emma Bennion <
Cc: Rawdon Gascoigne
Subject: FW: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge
Importance: High

Dear Emma/Rawdon,

I have received Bens out of office message and therefore I wondered if you could respond to my email below?

Kind regards,

Jane Colley
Principal Planning Officer

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

From: Colley, Jane
Sent: 02 October 2020 12:16
To: Ben Pycroft
Cc: Simpkin, Rachael.

Subject: FW: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge
Importance: High

Good afternoon Ben,

Thank you for the attached Counsel opinion and comments below. We agree that the application should be withdrawn from the October committee, so that the Council can consider the opinion and the details you set out below.

Therefore can we agree a time extension with you until Friday 13th November? The next available committee is scheduled for the 9th November, so hopefully this will give us sufficient time to consider the points raised and discuss this matter further with you.

Kind regards,

Jane Colley
Principal Planning Officer

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

From: Ben Pycroft
Sent: 01 October 2020 13:30
To: Haywood, Ben; Simpkin, Rachael.
Cc: Rawdon Gascoigne
Subject: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge
Importance: High

Dear Ben and Rachael

Principle of development

Further to our earlier correspondence please find attached a legal opinion from Jonathan Easton at Kings Chambers, which addresses the committee report and the three reasons for refusal within it. You will note from this that Counsel concludes that the Applicant benefits from a fallback position due to the lawful use of the building not being as set out in the report and the extant permissions at the site being a valid material consideration. The opinion therefore concludes that the Council should withdraw the application from committee as the report is fundamentally flawed and engage proactively with us and reconsider the application. We consequently ask that the application be withdrawn from the agenda. If the Council does not withdraw the application from the agenda then we ask that the attached opinion be sent to the members of the development control committee as an update along with the section plans. You will also note the potential consequences should our client have to pursue this matter at appeal.

Housing Mix

In Rachael's e-mail yesterday, it was indicated that the Council is also likely to add an additional reason for refusal in relation to Housing Mix. We respond as follows:

Firstly, we ask whether this policy applies in this case given that it asks for all residential development to provide a range of market and affordable housing types and sizes but in this case there is no requirement for any affordable housing due to the fact it is for only 6 dwellings (net). Clearly the policy is relevant to much larger sites where affordable housing is to be provided. If the preferred housing mix of 1 and 2 bed terraced houses is pursued (we have deduced this from the documents as the committee report has neither narrative nor analysis of what would be

an appropriate mix), that would also result in demolition of the existing buildings and a property type which is out of character with its surroundings, both of which are something the Council is seeking to resist as part of this proposal.

Secondly, whilst we note the comments made in the Officer's Report, the Council is aware that we provided a statement on housing mix on behalf of Barratt Homes for their site off Macclesfield Road / Linglongs Road in close proximity to the application site (LPA ref: HPK/2017/0247). Our report, which was accepted by the Council concludes the following, which are equally relevant to the application site:

- Whilst the policy advice set out in the SHMA proposed a mix of 10% 1-bedrooms, 45% 2-bedrooms, 25% 3-bedrooms and 10% 4-bedrooms, this is based on a housing needs survey which is over 10 years old and does not take into account up to date evidence on people's aspirations;
- Nevertheless, the policy advice in the SHMA is to be applied flexibly and the Council has clearly done this elsewhere in the Borough, including where permission has been granted since the HPLP has been adopted;
- The policy advice in the SHMA also stated that the mix set out should be subject to viability testing. However, the viability study did not test the proposed mix in the SHMA. It tested the mix based on existing permissions, which resulted in a higher proportion of 3 and 4 bedroom properties than the SHMA proposes;
- The Viability Study however did look at the context of the Borough and assessed each area. Following interviews with local estate agents in summer 2013, the Viability Study concluded that there was a demand for 2 and 3 bedroom properties in Whaley Bridge. However, up to date information from the two estate agents based in Whaley Bridge is that there is a high level of demand for 3 and 4 bedroom detached family homes in Whaley Bridge;
- We have looked at the existing housing stock and note that there is a higher proportion of larger properties (i.e. 4 and 5 bedroom properties) in Whaley Bridge than in the rest of High Peak. Taking into account the completions and commitments since 2011 and applying the proposed mix of the application site, there would be no material difference between the make-up of the housing stock in 2011 and now; and
- Whilst on the one hand policy H3 seeks to secure a range of housing based on the policy advice set out in the SHMA (criterion b) on the other hand, it seeks to ensure that the mix of housing takes account of the characteristics of the existing housing stock in the surrounding locality (criterion c). In this case, whilst there are smaller terraced and semi-detached along both sides of Macclesfield Road, the characteristics of the existing development behind Macclesfield Road are predominantly detached 3, 4 and 5 bedroom properties and consequently the proposed housing at the application site would be fully in accordance with this.

Our report, which you will be aware of is available on the Council's portal:

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/AttachmentShowServlet?ImageName=415227>. On this basis, a reason for refusal on housing mix in this location would not be justified.

Next steps

Please confirm how the Council intends to proceed today.

Kind regards

Ben Pycroft BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI
Director



Emery Planning is proud to support the Keaton Emery Memorial Foundation. To find out more about the charity or to make a donation, please visit www.keatonemeryfoundation.com



Emery Planning
1-4 South Park Court
Hobson Street
Macclesfield
SK11 8BS

Registered office as above

Emery Planning Partnership Ltd trading as
Emery Planning
Registered in England No. 4471702

The contents of this e-mail are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. If you are not the intended recipient (nor the person responsible for delivering to that recipient) be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify Emery Planning on.

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/YourData>

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/YourData>

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>

Ms Rachael Simpkin
High Peak Borough Council - Planning
Buxton Town Hall
Market Place
Buxton
Derbyshire
SK17 6EL

30 October 2020

EP ref: 19-429

Rawdon Gascoigne

Dear Rachael

Re: HPK/2020/0301 - Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

We write in response to your e-mails of 27th and 28th October 2020. In doing so, we refer to our letter of 18th September 2020 and the legal opinion of Mr Easton. We have set this information out in full notwithstanding the email of yesterday from Ben Haywood in respect of the fall-back and implementation of the consents as we had already commenced drafting this response when that email was received.

Implementation of the previous permissions

Your e-mail of 27th October states: *"You are required to set out whether you have implemented the 2009 or 2013 permission and specifically how"*. By 2009 permission, we understand you mean permission HPK/2009/0689, which was for *"the conversion of single dwelling house to provide seven apartments and conversion of classroom block and disused garage into two detached houses"* approved on 29th March 2010. As we set out in our planning statement for the current application:

"The permission has been part implemented through the conversion of the classroom block to a residential dwelling, and work on the conversion of the building to apartments and work on the conversion of the garage building"

To evidence this, we refer to the following documents:

Emery Planning is proud to support the Keaton Emery Memorial Foundation. To find out more about the charity, please visit www.keatonemeryfoundation.com



- the attached letter from your colleague, Jayne Goddard in Building Control Support dated 5th October 2020, which explains that several site visit inspections were carried out in October, November and December 2011 in relation to the conversion of the dwelling to 7 no. apartments and the conversion of an outbuilding into one dwelling (building control ref: FP/2011/0212);
- a letter from your colleague, Hayley Gallacher in Planning Support dated 9th September 2013, which we attached to our letter of 18th September 2020. It explains that as works had already started on permission HPK/2009/0689 the 2013 application could not be dealt with as an amendment to the previously approved application and must be dealt with as a new scheme;
- the design and access statement for HPK/2013/0503, which explains that one of the apartments had already been completed by the time that application was made;
- the case officer's report for application HPK/2013/0503, dated 25th November 2013 (i.e. 8 months after permission HPK/2009/0689 would have expired had development not commenced before 29th March 2013), which explains that work has commenced and that permission HPK/2009/0689 is extant;
- our letter of 18th September 2020, which explains the position regarding the conditions; and
- the legal opinion of Mr Easton, which clearly explains that HPK/2009/0689 has been part implemented and could be fully implemented.

The 2013 permission is for the conversion of Taxal Edge to 5 no. apartments and the construction of 2 no. semi-detached houses where the gymnasium was located. It was approved on 25th November 2013. As we set out in our planning statement for the current application:

"This is also extant because the gym has been demolished for the 2 no. semi-detached dwellings and work has commenced on the conversion of the building to apartments."

To evidence this, we refer to the following documents:

- the e-mail from my colleague, Ben Pycroft to you on 21st September 2020, which included the initial notice served to the Council in July 2016 from the approved inspector for the building regulations. Your building regulation department should have the same;
- page 232 of the Local Plan, which explains that the site was under construction in December 2014 with reference to permission HPK/2013/0503; and
- the legal opinion of Mr Easton, which clearly explains that HPK/2013/0503 has been part implemented and could be fully implemented.

As explained in the opinion from Mr Easton, the previous permissions are extant and therefore the Applicant benefits from a fallback position. The former classroom block can be used as a dwelling house, the former garage could be converted to a dwelling, 2 no. semi-detached dwellings could be constructed where the gymnasium stood and the main building could be converted to 5 or 7 apartments, depending on which permission is relied on.

Policy H1

You now state that the proposal is contrary to policy H 1 of the Local Plan: "*Location of Housing Development*". You state:

"It does not adjoin the development boundary, neither is it well related with the existing pattern of development and surrounding land uses nor is it of an appropriate scale for the settlement"

Firstly in relation to whether or not the site adjoins the “development boundary”, we assume you mean the “built up area boundary” as this is referred to in part of policy H 1. You accepted this in the report for the October planning committee. Paragraph 7.12 of your report states: “*The site adjoins the built up area boundary to the east*”. Paragraph 8.1 of your report also states: “*The scheme would meet the first criterion of the third part of LP Policy H1, which requires development to adjoin the built-up area boundary*”.

This was consistent with the case officer's report for permission HPK/2013/0503, which also states:

“Whilst the site does lie in an area of countryside as defined by the High Peak Saved Local Plan Policies 2008 it lies outside of the green belt and adjoins the built up area of Whaley Bridge”. (our emphasis)

Nevertheless, you now suggest that the site does not adjoin the built up area boundary. We disagree and would ask how and why the previously expressed professional opinion of a number of Officers in a public document has now changed. The site clearly adjoins the built up area boundary. This can be seen when comparing the site location. The site clearly adjoins the built up area boundary. This can be seen when comparing the site location plan and the proposals map for the Local Plan. The access to the site from Macclesfield Road directly coincides with the built up area boundary.

The remainder of the eastern boundary of the red line is only separated from the built up area boundary line as shown on the proposals map by a footpath. Beyond the footpath are dwellings which front onto the Rise, Beech Rise and Linglongs Avenue. The site clearly adjoins this part of Whaley Bridge and is well located with the existing pattern of development and surrounding land uses.

There is no requirement for the site to adjoin the built up area boundary on all sides as clearly no site on the edge of a settlement would and nor does policy require a certain proportion of the site to adjoin the boundary.

In terms of the proposal being an appropriate scale for the settlement, the application is for 7 no. dwellings. According to the 2011 Census, there are 2,794 dwellings in Whaley Bridge. The scale is therefore entirely appropriate for the settlement. Furthermore, the site could be developed for up to 10 no. dwellings (not including the converted classroom which is outside the red line) as we have evidenced above.

Secondly, the first part of policy H 1 of the Local Plan states

“The Council will ensure provision is made for housing taking into account all other policies in this Local Plan by:

- *Supporting the development of specific sites through new site allocations in the Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan*
- *Promoting the effective reuse of land by encouraging housing development including redevelopment, infill, conversion of existing dwellings and the change of use of existing buildings to housing, on all sites suitable for that purpose*
- *Supporting housing development on unallocated sites within defined built up area boundaries of the towns and larger villages*
- *Encouraging the inclusion of housing in mixed use schemes where housing can be accommodated in an acceptable manner without compromising other planning objectives*
- *Supporting development identified through a Community Right to Build Order*

- *Supporting self build housing schemes"*

The proposals clearly accord with the second bullet point of the first part of policy H 1 as the site is previously developed land. This bullet point clearly relates to sites outside the built up area boundary anywhere in the plan area as the third bullet point already deals with unallocated sites within the built up area boundary. Indeed, residential development on previously developed sites outside of the settlement boundaries is already allowed under policy EQ 3: "Rural development". The site is clearly suitable for residential purposes as there remain extant consents for residential use on the site and your previous reports have confirmed its suitability and sustainability for that purpose

Trees

As explained in my e-mail to you on 28th October, the work on trees is in hand and will be submitted to you in advance of the committee meeting on 9th November. Indeed, Monica Gillespie already has the draft documents.

We consider that the above has addressed all outside matters although we would ask that the additional plan sections that have been submitted which address neighbour comments are posted on the website as they are clearly material. Additionally, we would also question why the plans on the interactive planning applications map of the website now appear to have amended the site boundary to omit the access as included on the red edge plan submitted with the application. This point goes to the heart of the point you have sought to make on policy H1 and whether the site adjoins the built up area boundary which as explained above, it clearly does.

Yours sincerely
Emery Planning

Rawdon Gascoigne

Rawdon Gascoigne BA (Hons), MRTPI
Director



High Peak Borough Council

working for our community

05/10/2020

Ray Butler
184 Taxal Edge
Macclesfield Road
Whaley Bridge
Derbyshire
SK23 7DR

Dear Mr Butler

Reference No FP/2011/0212
For Conversion of dwelling into seven flats and conversion
 of outbuilding into one dwelling
At 184 Taxal Edge Macclesfield Road Whaley Bridge
 Derbyshire SK23 7DR

Please find below a list of site visit inspections carried out to date on the Conversion of dwelling into seven flats and conversion of outbuilding into one dwelling

Date of Inspection	Inspection Type
24.10.2011	Floor joists
10.11.2011	Pre Plaster
15.11.2011	Meeting with Builder & Agent on site re: builders who have taken advice from Sheffield Insulation & floating floor.
15.11.2011	Meeting with Agent (office based) re: application & external fire exits
14.12.2011	Outgoing Telephone Call to Agent to chase up re-submission
26.11.2013	Roof
16.01.2014	Roof Carcass

Yours sincerely
Jayne Goddard

Jayne Goddard
Building Control Support
When calling please telephone 0345 129 0210