

Kay Neild

From: Ben Pycroft <>
Sent: 01 March 2021 22:05
To: Simpkin, Rachael.; Rawdon Gascoigne; Haywood, Ben; Colley, Jane
Cc: 'Gary Cullen'; 'Samantha-Jane Cullen'
Subject: RE: HPK/2020/0301 ref. Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge
Attachments: Letter to RS re Housing Mix - 010321.pdf; EP2 - Housing Mix Statement.pdf

Importance: High

Dear Rachael

I hope you are well.

Further to your email last week, please find attached our response re: housing mix.

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: Simpkin, Rachael.

Sent: 24 February 2021 11:24

To: Rawdon Gascoigne >; Ben Pycroft ; Haywood, Ben ; Colley, Jane <

Cc: 'Gary Cullen' >; 'Samantha-Jane Cullen' <> **Subject:** RE: HPK/2020/0301 ref. Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Rawdon,

You are aware that officers propose to recommend the scheme for refusal on landscape / design grounds, including amenity impacts and agree that fallback is a material consideration but would not overcome scheme harm.

We are now considering policy mix issues again following the recent Council appeal decision as is attached.

Of course, withdrawal of the scheme is an available option to you.

Kind regards,

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

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

From: Rawdon Gascoigne <

Sent: 24 February 2021 10:24

To: Simpkin, Rachael. ; Ben Pycroft >; Haywood, Ben <>; Colley, Jane <

Cc: 'Gary Cullen' ; 'Samantha-Jane Cullen' > **Subject:** RE: HPK/2020/0301 ref. Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Rachael,

Further to my email below, please could you confirm that the application will be progressed to the March Development Control Committee and that there is no further outstanding information that you are awaiting. As set out below, we had anticipated that the application would have been on January and then the February committee so we are not aware that there is anything further outstanding on our side.

With regards trees, we understand that matters are being progressed and resolved jointly between DCC and High Peak but there isn't anything that is outstanding in terms of taking the matter to committee. Similarly, you have our views on landscape and character and appearance together with the photo images so there is no basis for further delaying the application if the landscape and design consultees have not responded further as that information has now been submitted of almost 2 months.

We look forward to confirmation as soon as possible.

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: Rawdon Gascoigne

Sent: 15 February 2021 18:11

To: Simpkin, Rachael. <>; Ben Pycroft <; Haywood, Ben <; Colley, Jane

Cc: Gary Cullen >; [Samantha-Jane Cullen <>](mailto:Samantha-Jane.Cullen@emeryplanning.com) **Subject:** RE: HPK/2020/0301 ref. Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Rachael,

Further to our exchange of emails below and in particular our email of the 6th January, we note that the above application has not been placed on the development control committee agenda for February. The email of the 6th January clearly requested that the application be progressed to the first available committee which at that point would have been January. We were happy to agree an extension to February in the hope that a positive conclusion could be reached but there has been no further substantive correspondence in the meantime and the expectation was that the application would be progressed to February even if Officer's position had not changed.

I would be grateful if you could confirm why the application is not on the agenda for the February committee as this application has now been with the Council for a significant period of time and without any clear explanation as to why Officers maintain a position which Counsel has set out as clearly untenable. In the absence of the Council progressing the application our client will have no other option but to pursue a non determination appeal which is clearly not ideally as it will undoubtedly lead to additional unreasonable costs.

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible

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: Rawdon Gascoigne

Sent: 26 January 2021 13:10

To: 'Simpkin, Rachael.' <Ben Pycroft <>; 'Haywood, Ben' <>; 'Colley, Jane' <>>

Cc: 'Gary Cullen' <>; 'Samantha-Jane Cullen' <> **Subject:** RE: HPK/2020/0301 ref. Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Importance: High

Rachael,

I note that my covering email to the additional information previously submitted has still not been uploaded to the application website as requested in my email below. The email sets the context for the additional information that has been submitted and why the item is being returned to committee as currently drafted.

Please can you ensure the email is uploaded as soon as possible to ensure the assessment of the application by either committee members or third parties is done with a fair and full understanding of the applicants case.

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: Rawdon Gascoigne
Sent: 19 January 2021 10:28
To: Simpkin, Rachael. ; Ben Pycroft ; Haywood, Ben ; Colley, Jane <colley.jane@emeryplanning.com>
Cc: Gary Cullen <>; [Samantha-Jane Cullen](mailto:Samantha-Jane.Cullen@emeryplanning.com) **Subject:** RE: HPK/2020/0301 ref. Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Rachael,

Thank you for the update and confirmation, however, we note that whilst the attachments to our email have now been uploaded to the website, our email itself has not been. Given the email is essentially the covering letter that sets out the context for the attachments, we would ask that it is also uploaded as soon as possible.

We note that you maintain your position over the principle of the development but we would be grateful if you can confirm that site specific matters such as the trees, the use of dormers which are prevalent in the area and relationship with neighbouring amenity have now been addressed through the additional information that has been submitted and consultations that have been ongoing.

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: 18 January 2021 11:45
To: Rawdon Gascoigne ; Ben Pycroft >; Haywood, Ben <; Colley, Jane
Cc: Gary Cullen [Samantha-Jane Cullen >](#) **Subject:** RE: HPK/2020/0301 ref. Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Dear Rawdon,

Comments noted, however, do not overcome our fundamental concerns and therefore we will return the item to committee as you have requested.

The additional information will be added to the public file.

Kind regards,

Rachael

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

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

From: Rawdon Gascoigne <

Sent: 06 January 2021 17:07

To: Simpkin, Rachael. >; Ben Pycroft <>; Haywood, Ben <; Colley, Jane

Cc: Gary Cullen >; [Samantha-Jane Cullen >](#) **Subject:** RE: HPK/2020/0301 ref. Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Dear Rachel,

We refer to our previous correspondence in this matter and in particular our previous Counsel's opinions, the meeting in November and your subsequent email of the 7th December. I have responded as, as you are aware, Ben is currently tied up with a Public Inquiry. We have referred to Counsel's opinion again as we are very disappointed that officers have once again sought to justify a negative position based on isolated assessments and snapshots from previous applications despite the overwhelming evidence that supports the grant of planning permission. We would refer you back to those earlier opinions which remain completely relevant to the assessment of this case and, with respect, still contradict the position you have sought to take within your email of the 7th December.

Turning to your email, you now appear to be suggesting that 3(2?) units would need to be deleted from the proposed scheme to make it acceptable rather than the 1 that was potentially identified at our meeting, notwithstanding the extant permissions for the site allow for up to 11, 7 of which have already been accounted for in the Council's housing land supply figures as set out in the appendix to the adopted Local Plan. This is a significant reduction and change to the proposed scheme which is simply not acceptable or viable to our client at this stage and nor, we consider, justified by policy or any other material considerations such as detailed design, layout and impact on trees etc. which we address in a bit more detail below. Fundamentally, we request that the application is now dealt with on the basis of the submitted layout and the additional detail submitted since the application was made up to and including that contained within and attached to this email.

Your response of the 7th December has focussed on an approach which seeks to restrict the extent of what can be consider the previously developed part of the site for the purposes of policy allowing the redevelopment of previously developed sites in the open countryside. However, that ignores the still relevant consideration that Local Plan Policy H1 allows the use of greenfield land adjacent to settlements and that remains a relevant consideration as rehearsed in detail in the Counsel's opinions previously submitted. Whilst the discussion in our meeting focused on an approach more closely related to the site being redevelopment of PDL that was without prejudice to our view that it could also still be viewed as a site adjoining the settlement and we consider that the information submitted has demonstrated that point. As explained at the meeting we do not accept that the footpath between the site and the neighbouring residential area means that the site is not adjacent to the settlement. The comparison with the Tunstead Milton appeal is unjustified because in that case the Inspector concluded the site did not adjoin the settlement due to it being on the opposite side of Manchester Road. The focus on PDL was led by a belief that officers were leading consideration in that direction to seek a positive outcome for the scheme broadly as drafted which now appears not to be the case. Notwithstanding, we consider that your approach to restricting the site based on the information attached to your email is flawed as it does not properly take into account all the documents associated with the 2009 and 2013 permissions as well as that from 2008 which show that various different red edges were taken into account and that the land between the former school building and the detached classroom was to be used for residential purposes and included as curtilage and/or amenity land. We attach the further documents which demonstrate that to be the case. In addition, given that the site was never previously in a greenfield use, it is clear that the ground of what was previously a school facility extended to the entirety of that shown as blue edged land on the various plans as that was the entity that was purchased by the previous and current owners. That forms the planning unit and whilst we would concur that Policy advice is that it may not be appropriate to develop the site to its full extremity, that is not what is being proposed here and we cannot accept that infilling between existing buildings in this context raises concerns over the use of that area. The planning unit is part and parcel of what should be consider as the developable site and we would remind you that the Council were

recently suggesting that the relevant current lawful use was in fact the school use which extended over the entirety of the blue edged area as the grounds were used by residents for amenity purposes and that is the clear intention of the previously approved residential schemes as well. The land was not to be in agricultural use or similar and that is the only way it could be considered greenfield or not previously developed.

Turning to the matter of landscape impact and character which we understand still remains a point on which you await further consultation responses, we do not agree that the proposed scheme is either out of character with the area nor has any greater impact on the character of the area or the surrounding landscape. We have enclosed aerial digital images which illustrate the existing site and proposed schemes(including the proposed landscaping) and the context of the surrounding area. The Images clearly show that the site:

- Forms part of the established built up area of Whaley Bridge;
- Reflects the crescent and linear patterns of existing residential development adjacent to the site;
- The mix in scale and form of dwellings in the vicinity of the site including 3 storey dwellings as proposed;
- The presence of dormer windows as a feature of the surrounding area
- The containment of the site in terms of its appearance in the wider landscape through the existing and proposed landscaping in and around the site.;
- The scale of existing built form on site reflective of the scale of built form proposed with no incursion beyond what is currently perceived as the developed part of the site.
-

With regards matters of amenity, we have previously submitted sections which demonstrate that the proposed scheme meets or exceeds the relationship that has previously been found acceptable when approving the extant permissions for the residential development of the site. The limited number of letters that refer to matters of residential amenity, some of which do not actually object but merely pass comment, need to be viewed in the context of their varying relationships to the site, the extant scheme and the letters that have been submitted in support of the proposals. We do not consider there to be any material objections on amenity grounds to the scheme. If you consider there are, we would ask that this is explicitly set out with reference to the submitted sections and supporting information and where you consider there are deficiencies.

We discussed housing mix at the meeting. Our view is that we have already addressed this point by providing you with the report we prepared for Barratt Homes on their site in close proximity to this site and the latest information from the one estate agent in Whaley Bridge. If officers are minded to change their recommendation to approval and an extension of time is agreed as set out below then we will formalise this into a report.

Finally, with reference to the trees on site, we understand that Monica Gillespie and Ruth Baker are now satisfied that the proposals will not have any adverse impact on the existing trees and that the landscape and tree management scheme will lead to the long term management and enhancement of the trees on site. The one area that may still be of concern with regards trees was the proximity of the proposed garage serving the former classroom to the adjacent tree. We consider this matter can be controlled by condition requiring an adjustment to the location of the proposed garage or otherwise a condition preventing the construction of that garage as part of this proposal.

We trust that the above has summarised our client's position and that the application will proceed to planning committee on the 18th January. Given the scheme essentially remains as submitted there should be no reason to delay consideration. We remain firmly of the view as previously articulated through Counsel's advice that there is no justifiable reason to refuse this application and the additional information submitted with this email addresses the concerns that were raised in your previous committee reports and your email of the 7th December. Our client is clear that they wish the scheme as now drafted to be considered so that they have the option of having the matter considered at appeal if that proves necessary. Any further amendments will be considered by way of an alternate application.

We note that you have asked for an agreement on a formal extension to the time for considering the application. Our client will be happy to agree this to allow a positive recommendation to be made and the details of conditions to be agreed, however, if you remain of the view that the proposals are unacceptable we will not agree an extension to the determination period and ask that the matter goes to the first available committee. In the absence of these

two alternates our client will be forced to consider a non determination appeal with the obvious implication of additional costs arising from that which they will have to recover through the appeal process

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: Simpkin, Rachael. <

Sent: 07 December 2020 17:51

To: Ben Pycroft <>; Haywood, Ben >; Colley, Jane <

Cc: Gary Cullen <>; Samantha-Jane Cullen <; Rawdon Gascoigne <

Subject: HPK/2020/0301 ref. Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge

Hi Ben,

In response, please find points raised as follows:

- Plots 5 and 6 clearly fall within the greenfield, wooded area of the site (refer to NPPF definition previously developed land).
- Furthermore, there will be a clear distinction between property curtilage and planning unit.
- This wooded area was excluded from the red edge of the 2009 and 2013 permissions – noting the annotation 'Existing Mature Trees to be Protected (see Tree Survey).

- The proposed garage / study and widened access to the classroom 'conversion' (the conversion being subject to enforcement investigation) partly falls outside of the red edge.
- Two aerial photographs as well as the 2009 approved site plan are attached which assist in illustrating these points.
- Matters of character / appearance, amenity and tree protection require further plan information before the LPA can comment any further.

Accordingly, the proposed sketch scheme does not attract support in these regards. Any further discussion should be done within the context of an agreed time extension as we have previously advised.

The current scheme is scheduled for the 18th January 2021 DC Committee Meeting with a print deadline of the 8th January.

Kind regards,

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

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

From: Ben Pycroft
Sent: 25 November 2020 15:11
To: Simpkin, Rachael. ; [Haywood, Ben](#)
[<>](#); [Colley, Jane <>](#)
Cc: Gary Cullen >; [Samantha-Jane Cullen <>](#); [Rawdon Gascoigne <](#)
Subject: RE: Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge - Residential application

Dear Rachael / All

We agreed at our meeting last week that we would consider sketching up a revised scheme at the site, which we would send to you on an informal basis for comment to see if it is something Council officers could support before we would then consider amending the current scheme formally.

Our client's architect is busy this week, but Gary has provided a sketch. Without prejudice to the scheme that is currently before you, please find this sketch attached, which shows the following potential amendments:

- 1 – Removal of plot 7 - this is the detached dwelling next to the converted classroom
- 2 – Removal of plot 1 – instead the conversion of the garage to a dwelling under the extant permission would be built out – this could have a potential benefit on tree routes in this location. Plot 2 would become detached.
- 3 – The remaining plots (shown as 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6) could all be moved forward 1 to 2m. This would increase the garden area to the rear and change the layout slightly
- 4 – The garages would be moved back and would have green roofs, again to increase amenity. This would also remove the balconies.
- 5 – the garage for the converted classroom would be moved back to protect the tree roots – albeit there is permission in the location it is currently proposed for a retaining wall anyway.

We would like to know if this is something officers could support as soon as possible. Could you reply by the end of the week so that we can advise our client and subsequently get back to you in terms of potential extensions of time?

Many thanks

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
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.

From: Simpkin, Rachael. <
Sent: 25 November 2020 11:14
To: Ben Pycroft <; Haywood, Ben >; Colley, Jane <
Cc: Gary Cullen <; Samantha-Jane Cullen <>; Rawdon Gascoigne
Subject: RE: Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge - Residential application

Hi Ben,

Following our TEAMS meeting last week, would you kindly update me and by return as to whether the applicant intends to submit a revised sketch scheme within the context of an agreed time extension, which I suggest should be the 18th January 2021 DC Meeting.

Kind regards,

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

From: Ben Pycroft <
Sent: 17 November 2020 11:03
To: Haywood, Ben >; Colley, Jane <>; Simpkin, Rachael. >; de Bruin, Nicola <
Cc: Gary Cullen ; Samantha-Jane Cullen <>; Rawdon Gascoigne <
Subject: Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge - Residential application

Hi All

To assist our discussion tomorrow, please find attached:

- 1 – A plan which shows how our red line and the built up area boundary as shown on the proposals map to aid our discussions re: policy H1; and
- 2 – An e-mail from the only estate agent in Whaley Bridge (Gascoigne Halman) which supports the need for family homes to aid our discussions on housing mix.

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
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.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.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/YourData>

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

1st March 2021

EP ref: 19-429

Rawdon Gascoigne

Dear Ms Simpkin

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

We respond to your e-mail of 24th February 2021 which stated that officers are now considering adding housing mix to the recommended reasons for refusal following a recent decision regarding an appeal made by Alliance Living Limited against the failure of the Council to determine a planning application within the prescribed period for the demolition of the existing buildings and erection of 14 dwellings at land off Bingswood Road, Whaley Bridge (LPA ref: HPK/2017/0254, PINS ref: 3244957).

Firstly, we have contacted the agent for the appeal (Iceni) who have confirmed that they did not submit any substantial evidence in relation to housing mix in Whaley Bridge for the appeal. Indeed, we understand that the scheme which was originally submitted at that site was for 14 no. 3-bed units but following the receipt of the Council's Appeal Statement the housing mix was changed to be in line with the SHMA requirements to a scheme for 10 no. 3-bed units and 3 no. 2-bed units. However, as confirmed in paragraph 5 of the appeal decision, the Inspector did not consider the revised scheme.

Secondly, at paragraph 12 of the appeal decision the Inspector notes that the SHMA was published in 2014 (7 years ago), has not been updated and does not in any event indicate that its requirements should be rigidly applied. The Inspector also accepts in this paragraph that housing requirements may have altered since 2014. However, there was no firm evidence before the Inspector to support a housing mix which excludes 2-bedroom units in line with the identified need.

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



This contrasts to the evidence we have submitted for the application at HPK/2020/0301, which is in summary:

1 – Our e-mail of 1st October 2020, which for ease of reference stated the following:

“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."

2 – The report that we prepared for Barratt Homes, which for ease of reference is enclosed with this letter, is dated October 2017 and is therefore more recent than the 2014 SHMA. Our report was accepted by the Council in its consideration of the Barratt Homes' application.

3 – An e-mail from the Branch Manager (Lorraine Batty) at Gascoigne Halman (the only Estate Agents in Whaley Bridge) dated 13th November 2020, states the following:

"Thank you for asking me to look at your potential development site and give advice on the current market conditions in the Whaley Bridge area. As discussed with you, the market, and certainly the last 6 months has been exceptionally buoyant with increased buyer demand which has resulted in gazumping and multiple offers on family homes. To date this continues and I can confirm we do not have sufficient family homes to offer our potential buyers. There are currently local buyers looking for larger properties due to the fact that they are now working from home and need more family space and also The High Peak has become one of the most popular places to live in the countryside and in particular Whaley Bridge, as it has regular train links and not too far from the new A555 road which links to the airport. I have no doubt that should larger family homes be built there would be plenty of interest which would result in sales."

Indeed, we note that the 2 no. 4-bedroom detached homes on the Shallcross / Foundry Lane Development (LPA ref: HPK/2017/0654) which were put on the market in January 2021 and are not even built yet have already been sold / reserved.

In addition to the above, we note that the approvals that were granted on Reservoir Road for 6 dwellings, did not include a mix of dwellings and singularly delivered family housing on what was a small windfall site in the same context as our client's site. Similarly, although the nature of housing differed, the Peaks and Plains scheme currently under construction at Bridgemont also did not include mix of housing in accordance with what have been required by the SHMA. This clearly indicates that the policy is more correctly addressed to larger scale housing sites and cannot be applied logically to smaller scale sites where the Council demands a mutually exclusive approach to ensuring developments reflect the character of the surrounding area – in this case, family housing largely in the form of detached dwellings in individual plots. That is the approach taken on Reservoir Road and in our view would be the correct and consistent approach to take at Taxal Edge. There is no sustainable reason for refusal based on housing mix and the circumstances of the Bingswood appeal – where there was no substantive evidence on the point – are completely different.

Consequently, we maintain that a recommended reason for refusal in relation to housing mix is unjustified.

Turning to other matters, we would re-iterate that the proposals are completely in character with the surrounding area and constitute an appropriate form of development. The size of the amenity space related to the dwellings reflects that which can be found in the surrounding area and which was deemed acceptable at Reservoir Road. Notwithstanding that point, the location gives immediate access to the surrounding countryside and there would be no adverse consequence of approving the development as currently set out. Our client's experience as a local developer shows that there is a demand for this size of dwelling with the amount of amenity space as shown and not every homeowner wants the responsibility of maintaining large amenity areas simply because they may have a larger house. The form and size of the plots does not give rise to any adverse relationship with

neighbours and has been shown to be an improvement over the extant scheme and commensurate with the existing relationships surrounding the site. With regards landscape matters, we consider that the aerial imagery enclosed with our submissions in January clearly demonstrates that this site's context is that of the built up area of Whaley Bridge and there cannot be any sustainable landscape objections to the proposals, especially when regard is had to the fall back position.

We will not be withdrawing the planning application and therefore we look forward to the application being on the agenda for the meeting of the Planning Committee on 22nd March 2021.

Yours sincerely
Emery Planning

Rawdon Gascoigne

Rawdon Gascoigne BA (Hons), MRTPI
Director

Enc



Statement in relation to housing mix

Residential development of 107 dwellings – Land at
Linglongs Road, Whaley Bridge

for Barratt Homes

Project : 17-154
Site address : Land at Linglongs Road,
Whaley Bridge
Client : Barratt Homes

Date : 02 October 2017
Authors : John Coxon / Ben
Pycroft

This report has been prepared for the client by Emery Planning with all reasonable skill, care and diligence.

No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Emery Planning.

Emery Planning Partnership Limited
trading as Emery Planning.

Contents:

1. Introduction	1
2. Proposed housing mix	1
3. Policy considerations	2
4. Summary and conclusions	12

1. Introduction

1.1 Emery Planning is instructed by Barratt Homes to provide this statement in support of its application for reserved matters at land off Linglongs Road, Whaley Bridge (LPA ref: HPK/2017/0247). This statement provides further justification for the proposed housing mix at the site and in particular responds to the comments made by the planning policy officer (Hilary Senior) dated 4th September 2017. It should be read alongside our original planning statement.

2. Proposed housing mix

2.1 From the outset, it should be noted that the proposals would provide a range and mix of new homes as shown in the following table:

Table 2.1 – Proposed housing mix by type, tenure and size

Name	Type	Size (no. of bedrooms)	Size (Sq ft)	Quantity
Affordable units				
Woodley	Apartment	1	490	6
Washington	Semi-detached	2	614	16
Barton	Mews House	3	706	10
Subtotal				32
Open market units				
Derwent	Detached	3	907	4
Folkestone	Semi-detached	3	830	7
Ennerdale	Semi-detached	3	917	2
Eskdale	Detached	3	1,058	1
Malvern	Detached	5	1,665	6
Radleigh	Detached	4	1,317	2
Hale	Detached	4	1,319	15
Haltwistle	Detached	4	1,488	11
Hertford	Detached	4	1,527	7
Alderney	Detached	4	1,225	9
Tamerton	Detached	4	1,300	11
Subtotal				75
Total				107

- 2.2 As can be seen from the above, the open market houses proposed vary considerably in terms of size. The proposed 3-bed houses for example range from 830 to 1,058 square feet and the proposed 4-bed houses range from 1,225 to 1,527 square feet.

3. Policy considerations

Housing land supply

- 3.1 The policy officer's comments state that the Council has a 5 year supply of housing land and at April 2017, the Council can demonstrate a 6.97 year supply. It is important to note that the application site is included within the Council's supply and all 107 dwellings are expected to be delivered by 31st March 2022. Indeed, the Council's latest trajectory assumes that the site will deliver 30 dwellings by 31st March 2018. Consequently, whilst the Council claims to have a healthy five year supply it relies on sites such as the application site to deliver in the short term.
- 3.2 As we have set out in our original planning statement, in addition to the five year supply, the Council also relies on the delivery of this site to assist the Council in meeting its overall housing requirement, but the requirement for Whaley Bridge in particular, which has only one allocation i.e. the application site. The remainder of the town's housing needs will only be met by small windfall sites, which are expected to deliver 100 dwellings in the plan period.

Policy H3: New Housing Development

- 3.3 The planning policy officer's response refers to policy H3 of the High Peak Local Plan (HPLP): "New Housing Development" and in particular the following parts:

"The Council will require all new residential development to address the housing needs of local people by:

....b) Providing a range of market and affordable housing types and sizes that can reasonably meet the requirements and future needs of a wide range of household types including for the elderly and people with specialist housing needs, based on evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment or successor documents

c) Providing a mix of housing that contributes positively to the promotion of a sustainable and inclusive community taking into account the characteristics of the existing housing stock in the surrounding locality...."

3.4 From the outset, it should be noted that there appears to be some tension between these two parts of policy H3. On the one hand, criterion b) states that the range of housing types and sizes should be based on the SHMA (which recommends a re-balancing of the existing housing stock from small terraced properties and 3-bed accommodation to 2-bed dwellings) and on the other hand criterion c) states that the mix of housing should take into account the characteristics of the existing housing stock in the surrounding locality. Consequently, if the surrounding locality is characterised by large 3 and 4 bed roomed properties, providing the majority of new dwellings as 1 and 2 bed properties (i.e. 55%) in accordance with the recommendations of the SHMA would mean that there would be conflict with criterion c) of the policy. Nevertheless, we address each of the points as follows.

SHMA Policy Advice

3.5 Firstly, with regard to the SHMA, as set out in the planning policy officer's response, the 2014 SHMA and Housing Needs Study recommended a re-balancing of the housing stock away from small terraced properties and 3-bed accommodation, towards 2-bed dwellings. We have addressed the reasons for this in our original planning statement. However, importantly, the SHMA states:

*"It is recommended that HPBC Officers take a flexible approach to applying this advice when dealing with housing applications in their Borough, as relatively lower levels of housing viability in certain urbanised parts of the Borough, could be compromised by an unsuitable housing mix. **This advice, which is primarily needs based, must be subjected to further detailed assessment through the Council's ongoing housing viability work to test the deliverability of these rates.**"*

3.6 As we set out in our original planning statement, the Council appears to have taken a flexible approach to applying the advice on other sites in the Borough. Please refer to the examples on pages 19-21 of our original planning statement. For the avoidance of doubt, a number of the examples we provided were approved after the HPLP had been adopted and since the Council has claimed that it can demonstrate a five year supply of housing land:

- South of Manchester Road, Chapel-en-le-Frith (capacity = 47 dwellings)
- Land rear of Hallsteads, Dove Holes (capacity = 104 dwellings)
- Woods Mill, Glossop (capacity = 57 dwellings)
- Charlestown Works, Glossop (capacity = 97 dwellings)

3.7 In terms of the section from the SHMA highlighted in bold above, the Viability Study (April 2014) did not test the suggested mix as set out in the SHMA. It tested the proposed housing allocations against a mix based on existing permissions (please refer to paragraph 3.40 and table 3.12 of the Viability Study). The two mixes are set out in the following table:

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed
SHMA	10%	45%	25%	10%
Viability Study	5%	25%	45%	25%

3.8 Consequently, it is unclear on the Council's own evidence whether the mix set out in the SHMA is viable given that the housing allocations were not tested against this mix. Despite being an allocation in the plan, the Viability Study did not test the viability of the application site because there were pre-application discussions taking place at the time the Viability Study was prepared.

3.9 Nevertheless, as the planning policy officer's response states, the Viability Study did look at the context of the Borough and assessed each area. Paragraph 4.54 of the Viability Study explains that interviews took place with estate agents in summer 2013 (i.e. over 4 years ago). Paragraph 4.56 of the Viability Study is referred to and this states:

"Local agents have indicated that areas such as Whaley Bridge is currently in need of semi-detached 2 and 3 bed dwellings, therefore it is anticipated that any new build development incorporating these would do particularly well"

3.10 It is unclear which local estate agents were interviewed, but given that these were made over 4 years ago, we have contacted the two estate agents based in Whaley Bridge (Rowcliffes and Gascoigne Halman) who have provided the following information:

Rowcliffes (20-22 Market Street, Whaley Bridge)

3.11 We spoke to Rowcliffes on 22nd September 2017. They advised us that whilst there was a need for 2 bedroom bungalows, there was a particular need for 3 and 4 bedroom family homes. Indeed they informed us that they currently have an advertisement in their shop window asking for people looking to sell their 3 or 4 bedroom detached home to contact Rowcliffes as there are buyers waiting. A copy of the advertisement is below:



Gascoigne Halman (15 Market Street, Whaley Bridge)

3.12 Lorraine Batty, Manager of Gascoigne Halman in Whaley Bridge responded by e-mail on 27th September 2017 as follows:

"I can confirm that we currently have a high demand in particular for 3/4 bed homes within the Whaley Bridge area. I have recently sold properties where clients wish to remain in Whaley Bridge but unfortunately there have been no family homes available to buy within Whaley Bridge. I currently have 271 potential buyers registered between £180,000/350,000. In my opinion there is a particular spotlight on Whaley Bridge at the moment as an excellent Town to live in and I feel with the new by-pass opening later this year to the Airport has increased the interest in the area."

3.13 Consequently, these views differ from those set out in the Viability Study and confirm that there is current demand for 3 and 4 bedroom family homes in Whaley Bridge.

Existing stock survey

3.14 In terms of the existing housing stock, the Council has provided us with links to the relevant data from the 2011 Census. This is shown in the tables below.

Tenure by household size by number of bedrooms in Whaley Bridge (2011)

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed+	Total
Owned outright	34	329	405	219	88	1,075
Owned with a mortgage or loan or shared ownership	15	245	426	283	100	1,069
Social rented: rented from Council	93	35	90	3	2	223
Social rented: other	13	3	4	1	0	21
Private rented: private landlord or letting agency	48	173	81	21	7	330
Other private rented or rent free	11	38	18	8	1	76
Total	214	823	1,024	535	198	2,794
Percentage of total	7.7	29.5	36.6	19.1	7.1	

Source: Census 2011, Table DC4405EW

Tenure by household size by number of bedrooms in High Peak (2011)

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed+	Total
Owned outright	405	3,903	6,186	2,471	728	13,693
Owned with a mortgage or loan or shared ownership	288	3,376	6,526	3,419	986	14,595
Social rented: rented from Council	1,293	1,209	1,227	84	23	3,836
Social rented: other	435	338	314	18	4	1,109
Private rented: private landlord or letting agency	920	2,203	1,202	272	109	4,706
Other private rented or rent free	143	392	331	99	42	1,007
Total	3,484	11,421	15,786	6,363	1,892	38,946
Percentage of total	8.9	29.3	40.5	16.3	4.9	

Source: Census 2011, Table DC4405EW

3.15 As can be seen from the above, the characteristics of the existing stock in Whaley Bridge compared to the rest of the High Peak are as follows:

- Smaller proportion of 1-bed properties;
- The same proportion of 2-bed properties;
- A smaller proportion of 3-bed properties; and
- A higher proportion of 4 and 5 bed properties.

3.16 We included within our original planning statement 2 tables (tables 5.2 and 5.3), which set out the completions in Whaley Bridge since 2011 and the housing supply in Whaley Bridge at 30th September 2016. Now that the new housing supply evidence has been published, these tables can be updated to show the position at 1st April 2017 as follows:

Housing completions in Whaley Bridge since 2011

Address	Reference	Completions	Year
25 Orchard Avenue	2009/0694	1	2011-12
Land adjoining 83 Chapel Road	2009/0468	1	2011-12
2 Bingswood Avenue	2011/0473	1	2011-12
20 Orchard Avenue	2009/0690	1	2012-13
4 Browside Farm, Stoneheads	2010/0367	1	2012-13
21 Cotton Close	2015/0331	1	2015-16
Reddish Farm	2011/0611	1 5	2015-16 2016-17
Land at Paddock House	2009/0113	1	2016-17
Folds Farm Barn, Fold Lane	2010/0655	1	2016-17
Cadster Mill	2010/0645	1	2016-17
5-7 Stoneheads	2014/0069	1	2016-17
	Total	16	

Commitments in Whaley Bridge at 1st April 2017

Address	Reference	Dwellings	Comments
184 Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road	2013/0503	7	Conversion of gym to form 5 apartments and 2 semi-detached houses Under construction at 01/04/17
Navigation Inn, Johnson Street	2014/0264	3	Conversion of pub to 2 no. 1 bed and 1 no. 2 bed dwellings. Under construction at 30/09/16
143 Buxton Road	2011/0671	1	Conversion of 1 no. 3-bed dwelling to 2 no. 1-bed dwellings Under construction at 30/09/16
Horwich Farm, Eccles Road	2014/0368	1	Outline permission for 1 no. agricultural workers dwelling
Shallcross Foundary	2014/0523	9	Outline permission for 2 no. 3-bed houses and 7 no. 4-bed houses
20 Old Road	2015/0082	-1	Conversion of a house to a shop
87 Chapel Road	2015/0525	1	Permission for 1 no. 4-bed house
Shallcross Mill House	2015/0533	3	Permission for 3 no. 4-bed houses
10-12 Bridgemont	2015/0634	3	Demolition of 2 no. 4+ bed houses and erection of 5 no. 3-bed houses

Address	Reference	Dwellings	Comments
Whaley Bridge Service Station	2014/0151	0	Outline permission for 3 no. 3-bed houses – now expired
Reservoir Road	2016/0249	4	Outline – indicative 3 or 4 bed houses
3/5 Lower Macclesfield Road	2016/0278	4	Conversion of storeroom to 4 no. 1 bed units
	Total	35	

3.17 Bringing these two tables together and including the application site, the mix of the new housing in Whaley Bridge in the plan period is as follows:

Mix of new housing in Whaley Bridge since 2011

Address	No. of bedrooms				Total
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed	
25 Orchard Avenue			1		1
Land adjoining 83 Chapel Road			1		1
2 Bingswood Avenue		2		-1	1
20 Orchard Avenue			1		1
4 Browside Farm, Stoneheads				1	1
21 Cotton Close				1	1
Reddish Farm		4	1	1	6
Land at Paddock House				1	1
Folds Farm Barn, Fold Lane		1			1
Cadster Mill			1		1
5-7 Stoneheads				1	1
184 Taxal Edge, Macclesfield Road		2	2	3	7
Navigation Inn, Johnson Street	2	1			3
143 Buxton Road	2		-1		1
Horwich Farm, Eccles Road			1		1
Shallcross Foundary			2	7	9
20 Old Road	-1				-1
87 Chapel Road				1	1
Shallcross Mill House				3	3
10-12 Bridgemont			5	-2	3
Whaley Bridge Service Station			0		0
Reservoir Road			2	2	4
3/5 Lower Macclesfield Road	4				4
Subtotal	7	10	16	18	51
Linglongs Road	6	16	24	61	107
Total	13	26	40	79	158

3.18 Once the new housing in this table is added to the existing stock as at 2011, there would in reality be very little difference between the percentage of housing as shown in the following table:

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed+	Total
Housing stock in Whaley Bridge at 2011	214	823	1,024	535	198	2,794
Percentage of total at 2011	7.7	29.5	36.6	19.1	7.1	
Commitments and completions since 2011 (including application site)	13	26	40	73	6	158
Total including commitments and completions	227	849	1064	608	204	2,952
Percentage of total	7.7	28.8	36	20.6	6.9	

Characteristics of the surrounding locality

3.19 As above, criterion c) of policy H3 states that the housing mix should take into account the characteristics of the existing housing stock in the surrounding locality.

3.20 Whilst along Macclesfield Road there are smaller terraced and semi-detached houses, the housing behind Macclesfield Road is predominantly detached and semi-detached 3 and 4 bedroom houses.

3.21 The existing housing stock to the west of the application site is characterised by predominantly detached dwellings as shown on the following plan:



3.22 This area comprises the following roads:

- **Linglongs Road** – The Zoopla website confirms that there are 11 dwellings on Linglongs Road. The Zoopla website provides information in relation to 6 of the properties (3 semi-detached and 3 detached houses). Of these 1 house has 2 bedrooms, 2 houses have 3-bedrooms, 1 house has 5 bedrooms and 1 house has 7 bedrooms. The number of bedrooms for the 6th house is not known.
- **Linglongs Avenue** – The Zoopla website confirms that there are 34 dwellings on Linglongs Avenue. All of these are detached. The Zoopla website provides information in relation to 17 of the properties. Of these 1 house has 2 bedrooms, 2 houses have 3-bedrooms and 9 houses have 4 bedrooms. The number of bedrooms for the remaining house is not known.
- **Beech Rise** – The Zoopla website confirms that there are 9 dwellings on Beech Rise. The Zoopla website provides information in relation to 4 of the properties (3 detached and 1 terraced). Of these 1 house has 2 bedrooms, and 1 house has 3 bedrooms. The number of bedrooms for the remaining houses is not known.

3.23 Similarly, the existing housing stock to the north of Macclesfield Road is characterised by predominantly detached and semi-detached dwellings as shown on the following plan:



3.24 This area comprises the following roads:

- **Reddish Lane** – The Zoopla website confirms that there are 16 dwellings on Reddish Lane. The Zoopla website provides information in relation to 8 of the properties (3 semi-detached, 2 detached houses and 3 terraced). The number of bedrooms is only known for two of the dwellings (both 3-bed).
- **Waterfoot Lane** – The Zoopla website confirms that there are 8 dwellings on Waterfoot Lane. All of these are detached. The Zoopla website contains details relating to 4 houses (3 have 4 bedrooms and 1 has 5 bedrooms).
- **Mereside Gardens** – The Zoopla website confirms that there are 26 dwellings on Mereside Gardens. All of these are detached. The Zoopla website provides information in relation to 10 of the properties. Of these 5 house have 4 bedrooms and 5 have 5 bedrooms.
- **Reddish Road** – The Zoopla website confirms that there are 19 dwellings on Reddish Road. There are 2 no. semi-detached houses, 11no. detached houses and 6 no. flats. The Zoopla website provides information in relation to 6 of the houses and confirms that of these 1 house has 2 bedrooms, 1 house has 3 bedrooms, 1 house has 4 bedrooms and 3 houses have 5 bedrooms.
- **Park Road** – The Zoopla website confirms that there are 29 dwellings on Park Road, which appear to be semi-detached. The Zoopla website only provides details in relation to 3 dwellings (3 no. 3 bed semi-detached houses).

- **Reddish Avenue** – The Zoopla website confirms that there are 42 dwellings on Reddish Avenue, which are predominantly detached and semi-detached, but there are 8 terraced houses. The Zoopla website only provides details for 11 dwellings (1 house has 2 bedrooms, 9 have 3 bedrooms and 1 has 4 bedrooms).

3.25 Consequently, the proposed mix of housing types and sizes is fully in accordance with the characteristics of the existing housing stock in the surrounding locality on those existing developments set back behind Macclesfield Road.

4. Summary and conclusions

4.1 To conclude, we maintain that the proposed range and mix of housing is fully justified for the following reasons:

- As shown in table 2.1 above, the proposal would deliver a range and mix of housing, including apartments, terraced housing, semi-detached and detached housing, properties with 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedrooms and includes affordable homes.
- 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 as we set out in our original planning statement, 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 as shown in the examples in our original planning statement, 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 (i.e. the one housing allocation in Whaley Bridge), there would be no material difference between the make-up of the housing stock in 2011 and now.
- 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.