

PLANNING POLICY COMMENTS

Date: 24th November 2022

Application Number: HPK/2022/0456

Location: Land at Dinting Vale (known as Adderley Place in HP Local Plan), Glossop

Proposal: Proposed residential development comprising 100 dwellings including areas of public open space, landscaping and associated works.

Background / History:

The site is part of an allocation for housing in the High Peak Local Plan. It is currently undeveloped.

Policy Considerations:

National Policy

Para 11 NPPF – Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development, approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. (The Council can currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites:

https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/media/7546/High-Peak-5-year-Housing-Land-Supply-April-2022/pdf/High_Peak_5_year_Housing_Land_Supply_April_2022.pdf?m=1664443954337).

(Plus all other paragraphs relevant to a housing application).

High Peak Local Plan

Policies of particular relevance include:

Policy H2 (Housing Allocations) – includes Adderley Place (G32) as a housing allocation to accommodate 130 dwellings.

Policy DS4 (Adderley Place, Glossop) – Lists specific measures required in relation to development of the site:- new access and transport assessment, affordable housing, contributions towards infrastructure, services and other community needs, contamination and ground condition survey, site specific FRA, comprehensive landscaping plan including retention of mature trees, archaeological evaluation, wildlife survey.

Policy S5 (Glossopdale Sub-Area Strategy) - states that Transport Assessments in support of developments in the Glossopdale area should be scoped with Highways England (now National Highways) and the highways authority in order to determine whether the assessment should consider impacts on A57/A628 junction and to identify mitigation measures as appropriate. (NB the A57 link road was approved by the Secretary of State in November 2022).

Policy H3 New Housing Development – Requires affordable housing and an appropriate range and mix of housing. Support is given for dwellings designed to provide flexible

accommodation which is capable of future adaptation by seeking to achieve adequate internal space for the intended number of occupants in accordance with the Nationally Described Space Standard and delivered to meet accessibility standards set out in the Optional Requirement M4(2) of Part M of the Building Regulations.

Policy H4 Affordable Housing – 30% affordable housing on sites of 25 units or more. 80% of this requirement is for rented accommodation and 20% for intermediate housing. These proportions can be varied when justified. (NB - recently deemed out of date for development management purposes - see below).

Policy CF7 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy – Provision of infrastructure or reasonable costs to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Policy EQ1 Climate Change - adopt strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change in the move to a low carbon future and plan for new development in locations and ways that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Policy EQ6 Design and Place Making - All development should be well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to both its environment and the challenge of climate change, whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place by requiring development to be well designed to respect the character, identity and context of High Peak's townscapes and landscapes.

Policy EQ9 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows - seeks to protect existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows, in particular, ancient woodland, veteran trees and ancient or species-rich hedgerows from loss or deterioration.

Policy EQ11 Flood Risk Management - The council will only permit development within areas at risk from flooding as defined by the Environment Agency if:

.....a site specific flood risk assessment shows that the site is protected adequately from flooding, or the scheme includes adequate flood defences or flood risk management measures

[etc]

Other Relevant documents

High Peak Design Guide SPD 2018 – seeks to promote high quality design and identifies the overarching principles in securing good design. It provides further detail to the policies relating to Design and Place Making and achieving high quality development within the adopted High Peak Local Plan.

Comments

Compliance with Local Plan Policy

This application raises a number of policy issues for consideration during the determination process.

Principle of Development

As the proposed site is within the Glossop development boundary and part of an allocation (Adderley Place – G32) the general principle of development is acceptable from a policy point of view.

Proposed Site in relation to LP Allocation

The proposed site does not cover the whole Local Plan allocation. It excludes the south eastern part of the allocation which is owned by High Peak Borough Council. In terms of housing numbers, the LP allocation is for 130 dwellings in total, so the 100 dwellings proposed for this part of the site is acceptable provided that access to the rest of the site is not compromised. Looking at the submitted layout plans, there are two cul-de-sac heads on the eastern boundary which are immediately adjacent to the remainder of the allocation. The case officer should check out their suitability for access to the rest of the site with the Highway Authority and applicant. Looking at the landscaping plan it appears that there are existing trees in front of these cul-de-sac heads so would this prevent them from being used as an access point? It is critical that the access is suitable to ensure that the rest of the allocation can come forward at a later date.

The red line plan submitted by the applicant varies from the allocation boundary in the Local Plan in three places. The north western boundary (at Adderley Road) differs slightly from the LP allocation in two places. It goes off at a point incorporating an extra piece of land at the north and follows a different boundary at the south, again incorporating a small extra piece of land. Additional land has been included at the proposed access point and along the eastern boundary. However, as these areas of land are still within the Glossop Development Boundary this does not raise a particular issue in principle.

In terms of compliance with LP Policy DS4, the applicant's planning statement (from para 9.15) addresses this. It is noted that a Transport Assessment has been submitted. The Case Officer will need to check that it has been scoped with National Highways and Derbyshire County Council (in line with Policy S5). Note that the A57 Link Road which forms part of the Trans-Pennine Upgrade as proposed by National Highways has now been approved. In light of this, it would be particularly appropriate to have improved walking and cycling linkages from the development closer to the Trans-Pennine Trail. The applicant's plans currently only show a walking route to the east of the site. This could also be a cycling route and be linked to the wider infrastructure. This could offer safe and accessible sustainable transport infrastructure for residents of the new properties bearing in mind that Dinting Vale Road to the north of the site is a busy road.

Affordable housing, developer contributions, flood risk, trees, archaeology and ecology are discussed below.

Residential Development

On 23rd June 2022, the Executive agreed that High Peak Local Plan Policy S3 (Strategic Housing Development), Policy S4 (Maintaining and Enhancing an Economic Base) and Policy H4 (Affordable Housing) are deemed out of date for development management purposes, meaning that less weight will be given to them when determining planning applications.

In practice, policies S3 and S4 specify development requirements for housing and employment as well as setting general principles for both types of development. As such, aside from input into future housing land supply statements, applying less weight to these policies is unlikely to have a significant impact on the majority of applications.

In relation to Policy H4, the Council has effectively already been applying less weight to this policy for some time due to conflict with the NPPF. H4 calls for affordable housing contribution on sites of 5 units or above (or 0.16ha+). In line with the latest iterations of the NPPF, contributions are now only sought for major developments. The forthcoming Developer Contributions SPD will also provide guidance on the appropriate housing mix having regard to the need for First Homes.

For the avoidance of doubt, all other policies within the High Peak Local Plan should continue to be given full weight until further notice.

This application proposes a total of 100 new dwellings.

Housing Mix

Housing mix information was provided to the applicant at pre-app stage. However, new evidence has since been published. In September 2022, the Council published the Housing and Economic Land Needs Assessment (HELNA) that was commissioned to inform the review of the Local Plan. The study provides an updated analysis of the housing mix required across the Borough as well as providing a more fine grained assessment of the recommended housing mix across each of the Local Plan Sub-Areas. This includes Glossopdale within which the site in question is located.

Accordingly, the HELNA is deemed to be a “successor document” to the SHMA as referenced in Policy H3 and it should therefore be taken into account when determining the application.

The recommendations from the 2022 HELNA in relation to the mix of market and social housing for Glossopdale are outlined below alongside the proposed housing mix from the application and existing housing stock in Simmondley Ward (which most of the site lies within – a small part of the site to the north is within Dinting Ward) from the 2011 Census.

Recommendations with a market adjustment are also provided. This results in a 15% reduction in the number of smaller (1-2 bed) dwellings and a commensurate increase in the number of 3 and 4 bedroom properties to reflect *“the very pronounced socio-economic shock precipitated by the pandemic and the strong (and what appears to be a permanent) shift towards homeworking and the need for larger properties to accommodate this.”* (HELNA, para 12.34)

	1-bed	2-bed	3-bed	4-bed	5 or more bed
2014 SHMA	10%	45%	35%	10%	n/a
Market HELNA Glossop	7%	37%	46%	9%	1%

Market HELNA Glossop (with market adjustment)	-	6%	31%	49%	12%	1%
Social HELNA Glossop	-	41%	36%	22%	1%	0%
Social HELNA Glossop (with market adjustment)	-	35%	31%	28%	7%	0%
% of existing housing stock in Simmondley ward		1%	13%	46%	34%	6%
Indicative application mix (all market)		6%	41%	32%	21%	0%

As can be seen above, the indicative mix would:

- Align with the need for 1-bed market properties recommended in the HELNA and proportionately increase these property types in the Simmondley Ward.
- Over-provide 2-bed properties in the context of the HELNA recommendation. However, this significantly improves the proportion of these properties in the Ward, which is beneficial as existing proportions are relatively low. The proportion of 3-bed properties appears to under-provide in relation to HELNA recommendations. However, it is noted that of the 41% 2-bed properties proposed 21% of these are 2 bed plus a study which could easily be used as a small third bedroom / nursery (provided they meet NDSS) so this potentially balances out the apparent over-provision of 2 beds and under-provision of 3 beds.
- Over-provide in relation to 4-bed properties in the context of HELNA recommendations but this can be supported given the relatively high percentage of larger properties already within the ward.

The above data and analysis indicates that the indicative mix is broadly in line with requirements. Use of the market adjustment scenario for benchmarking is considered preferable as this takes account of the increase in demand for larger properties in response to post-pandemic working patterns and related home-working requirements. It is noted that no affordable housing is proposed in this scheme. If negotiations result in the provision of any affordable housing note that there are separate proportions in this table to cover affordable housing.

Self-Build Housing Demand

The Council has a legal duty to meet the demand for the number of entries (plots) demanded on its self-build register overall; and should also consider the geographic areas of the Borough specified by applicants.

In the case of Glossop at the time of writing there are 2 entries for self-build plots, a further 8 self-build plots are specified for Glossop and other locations, with a further 3 for Glossopdale (1 of which also specified other locations). This is out of a Borough-wide plot demand of 54. As demand exists, it is suggested that this is raised with the applicant.

Affordable Housing

The proposal constitutes a major development so for policy compliance affordable housing is required. No affordable housing is proposed. The applicant suggests that this issue will be dealt with through the course of the planning application. The applicant has submitted a viability assessment which concludes that the provision of affordable housing is not viable. As the applicant appears to be arguing that there is a viability issue with all contributions (see below), it is recommended that the applicant's viability assessment is independently reviewed and that this issue is investigated with the Housing Strategy Officer.

S106 Agreement

A S106 agreement should consider the provision of affordable housing, open space and outdoor sports provision, education, highways and any other planning obligations in line with adopted Policy CF7. It is noted that public open space is included within the scheme to be maintained by a management company. Service Commissioning will advise on the adequacy of this proposal and the potential requirement for contributions towards other types of open space (e.g. play provision). It is noted that the applicant states "financial contributions towards local infrastructure and services will be discussed throughout the course of the planning application. The Applicant will make contributions towards social infrastructure where the contributions sought meet the CIL Regulations and it is viable to do so; again reference should be made to the submitted Viability Assessment."

The case officer will need to negotiate with the developer in relation to these contributions, potentially informed by a third party view of the submitted Viability Assessment. In determining the application the issue of viability / priorities for developer contributions will be key.

Other Issues

There is a designated Air Quality Management Area in Glossop and it is noted that an Air Quality Assessment has been undertaken. In addition, a number of technical studies have been submitted alongside the application e.g. Flood Risk Assessment, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Ecological Assessment. It appears that information has been submitted in relation to all the points raised in Policy DS4. These documents will be examined by relevant consultees who will feedback to the Case Officer.