

Planning Statement

For Loxley Property & Development Limited | 17-452

Section 73 application to vary approved plans and full application for 2 additional dwellings - Bankwood, Glossop, High Peak, SK13 5ER

Project: 17-452
Site Address: Bankwood, Glossop, High Peak, SK13 5ER
Client: Loxley Property & Development Limited
Date: 07 December 2023
Author: John Coxon
Approved by: John Coxon

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.	The applications	2
3.	Context	3
4.	Policy context	6
5.	Planning considerations	7
6.	Conclusions and the planning balance	19

Appendices

EP1. Table of volume calculations for each building



1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement supports a proposal to redevelop the former chicken sheds at Bankwood Mill for 9 dwellings and new stables. There are extant consents for 7 dwellings and new stables at the site.
- 1.2 The site comprises previously developed land in a mix of commercial / non-agricultural uses. The proposal would involve the redevelopment of the site for market housing. The proposal would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, provided that it would not have a greater impact on openness on the Green Belt than the existing development, and it does not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.
- 1.3 The proposed development would result in a reduction in the volume of built development (-3%), a significant reduction in floor area (-42%) and a significant reduction in hardstanding (-81%) in comparison to the existing development. Whilst the proposed dwellings would be taller than the existing buildings on site, the proposed buildings would have a significantly reduced footprint, reducing the spread of built form. Visual permeability would increase with far greater spaces between the buildings. This effectively offsets the increase in height, meaning that there is no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt when the scheme is assessed as a whole.
- 1.4 The proposed development would also remove areas of open storage. This includes several containers as well as external storage of equipment and goods associated with the existing commercial uses. Whilst the proposed residential development would introduce gardens which would inevitably include some residential paraphernalia, the impact of such paraphernalia on openness would be very significantly less than the storage uses and containers which currently exist at the site.
- 1.5 The reduction in the amount of built development, together with the removal of the significant areas of open storage across the site and visual increase in openness, means that the proposed development would not result in a site that is more built up, and the proposed development would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. It would also not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. As such, the proposal accords with Green Belt policy and is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 1.6 The layout and design of the development would remain consistent with the principles approved under previous applications, with the overall design approach on reflecting a converted agricultural complex set within a high-quality landscaping scheme.
- 1.7 The proposed development therefore accords with the development plan and should be approved without delay.



2. The applications

- 2.1 This statement supports two linked planning applications. Firstly, a Section 73 application to vary the approved plans in relation to planning permission HPK/2022/0504, for 7 dwellings and stables. Secondly, a full planning application for an additional 2 dwellings, which would sit within the layout as proposed to be varied under the S73 application. The area of the two additional dwellings subject to the full planning application is clearly highlighted on the proposed plans for the S73 application. As the proposals are clearly designed to integrate with each other, there would be no conflicts between the planning permissions and the scheme for 7 dwellings can still be delivered in accordance with its terms.
- 2.2 The 7 dwellings and stables proposed under the S73 application would result in reductions in the scale, floor area and volume of those buildings compared to planning permission HPK/2022/0504. Notably the largest approved dwelling (plot 1) has been reduced in scale and height and from 3-storeys to 2-storeys, but all of the proposed dwellings have been subject to reductions in scale. The 2 additional dwellings to be considered under the full application would clearly provide additional built development within the site. The impact on the openness of the Green Belt should be viewed as a whole. The acceptability of the scheme in Green Belt terms is addressed in Section 5 of this statement.
- 2.3 Full details of the proposed development are shown on the proposed plans. The layout and design of the development would remain consistent with the principles approved under previous applications, with the overall design approach reflecting a converted agricultural complex set within a high-quality landscaping scheme.
- 2.4 Planning permission HPK/2022/0504 contains various conditions relating to various technical matters. Conditions can be used to ensure that details of the ecological mitigation, tree protection measures, landscaping and drainage details are provided to reflect the revised scheme.



3. Context

Site location and description

- 3.1 The site is located at the former Bankwood Mill complex, near Charlesworth. It is accessed via a private road off Long Lane.
- 3.2 The site comprises a total of 5 main buildings, including 4 very large former chicken sheds currently in a mix of different commercial / non-agricultural uses. The 5th unit is a substantial metal industrial unit, which is also in commercial use. In addition to the 5 main buildings, there is also an additional smaller single storey building used as a services unit adjacent to the industrial unit. The site also contains a number of historic vehicular tracks, and substantial areas of hardstanding used for open storage and occupied by numerous steel storage containers.
- 3.3 To the west of the site is the former Bankwood Mill, which has now been demolished. That site benefits from an extant planning permission for two dwellings, with one of those dwellings completed and occupied (known as Besthill). The other dwelling remains under construction.

Relevant planning history

- 3.4 The site benefits from a number of extant planning permissions for redevelopment to 7 dwellings and stables. The key relevant planning history is summarised below:
- There have been a series of planning permissions relating to the existing lawful uses of the buildings for commercial (HPK/2006/0290, HPK/2013/0023 & HPK/2016/0693) and stables (HPK/2005/0786).
 - Full planning permission was granted in April 2019 for the demolition of the existing buildings and hard standing on site and the erection of 7no. dwellings with associated ancillary development (HPK/2018/0290).
 - Planning permission was granted in March 2020 for changes to the visual appearance of the dwelling on Plot 3 and vary the wording of Condition 27 (HPK/2019/0580).
 - Planning permission was granted in September 2021 for the variation of conditions on both HPK/2018/0290 & HPK/2019/0580, allowing the permissions to be implemented prior to detailed schemes relating to drainage and land remediation being agreed (HPK/2021/0361 & HPK/2021/0362). Full planning permission was also granted in September 2021 for a revised scheme for 7 dwellings and stables (HPK/2021/0313).
 - Full planning permission was granted in April 2022 for the Variation of Condition 2 relating to HPK/2021/0313 that included minor changes to the layout and house types (HPK/2021/0676).



- Full planning permission was granted in January 2023 for the Variation of Condition 2 relating to HPK/2021/0676 that included minor changes to the layout and house types (HPK/2022/0504).
- The applicant sought a non-material amendment of condition 2 on HPK/2022/0504 to retain the existing stable building on site (NMA/2023/0008). However, the NMA application was withdrawn. The reasons for the withdrawal and the implications of this are discussed below.

3.5 At the present time the commercial uses remain on the site. However, pre-commencement conditions have been discharged and development has lawfully commenced through the construction of foundations. Consequently, a number of the planning permissions remain extant and can be implemented.

Planning permissions HPK/2021/0676 & HPK/2022/0504

3.6 The most recent planning permissions for the redevelopment of the site are HPK/2021/0676 & HPK/2022/0504. Each is for the redevelopment of the site for 7 dwellings and stables.

3.7 Application NMA/2023/0008 sought the retention of the existing stable building as part of the scheme, as opposed to its demolition and replacement with a new stable building. There are no conditions on planning permission HPK/2022/0504 (or indeed any earlier consent) requiring the demolition of those buildings at any stage of the development. However, the NMA application was withdrawn after the LPA agreed that the retention of the building does not in its own right comprise development, and furthermore that if the applicant intends to retain the stable block, then the applicant could partially implement the consent insofar as to deliver the housing only (and thus the existing stable building can lawfully be retained). As such the NMA was not required. The same principle must also apply to the storage building, which is located to the south of the stables and outside of the footprint of any of the proposed dwellings.



- 3.8 The calculations for the scale of approved development, including the options whereby the existing stables and storage buildings are retained, are shown below:

	HPK/2021/0676	HPK/2022/0504	HPK/2022/0504 with the retention of the stable and storage buildings	HPK/2022/0504 with the retention of the stable and storage buildings
Total volume	6,448 m3	6,316 m3	9,403 m3	9,271 m3
Total floor area	1,272 m2	1,272 m2	2,183 m2	2,183 m2
Total hardstanding	504 m2	518 m2	504 m2 ¹	518 m2 ²

Table 1 – Calculations for extant planning permissions / fall-back position

¹ This would depend upon which parts of the existing hardstanding are retained around the existing buildings.

² This would depend upon which parts of the existing hardstanding are retained around the existing buildings.



4. Policy context

Development plan context

4.1 The High Peak Local Plan was adopted in April 2016. The following policies of the Local Plan are considered to be relevant:

- S1 – Sustainable Development Principles
- EQ2 – Landscape Character
- EQ3 – Rural Development
- EQ4 – Green Belt Development
- EQ6 – Design and Place Making

National planning policy and guidance

4.2 The relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the National Planning Practice Guidance are addressed under Section 5 of this Statement. Of key relevance is Chapter 13 of the Framework which relates to Protecting Green Belt land.

Other material considerations

Landscape Character Assessment SPD (2006)

4.3 The Landscape Character Assessment was adopted in March 2006. It provides guidance for the design of new developments and alterations to existing developments, including associated landscape design. The SPD was produced to support superseded Policy OC4, which has been replaced by Policy EQ2 of the adopted Local Plan.

Design Guide SPD (2018)

4.4 The Design Guide SPD was adopted on 20 February 2018. It identifies the overarching principles in securing good design whilst respecting traditional built forms and provides advice on designing proposals in the borough, including access space, external works and materials.



5. Planning considerations

Green Belt

5.1 Local Plan Policy EQ4 states that within Green Belt locations, *‘planning permission will not be granted unless it is in accordance with national planning policy’*.

5.2 Paragraph 149 of the Framework states:

“149. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
- not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.”

5.3 The site comprises previously developed land. The proposal would involve the redevelopment of the site for market housing. The proposal would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, provided that it would not have a greater impact on openness on the existing development, and it does not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. This is assessed below.

Impact on openness

5.4 Paragraph 64-001 of The National Planning Practice Guidance, regarding the assessment of the impact of a proposal on the openness of the Green Belt states:

“Assessing the impact of a proposal on the openness of the Green Belt, where it is relevant to do so, requires a judgement based on the circumstances of the case. By way of examples, the courts have identified a number of matters which may need to be taken into account in making this assessment. These include, but are not limited to;

- openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects – in other words, the visual impact of the proposal may be relevant, as could its volume;



- the duration of the development, and its irremediability – taking into account any provisions to return land to its original state or to an equivalent (or improved) state of openness; and
- the degree of activity likely to be generated, such as traffic generation”.

5.5 The interpretation of openness has been considered by the courts, including *Turner v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2016] EWCA Civ 466 and *Euro Garages Ltd v The Secretary of State for Communities And Local Government & Anor* [2018] EWHC 1753 (Admin). It was found that openness is not bound by one factor or approach and a variety of matters can be considered relevant depending on the specifics of the case. This can include how built up the Green Belt is now, and how built up the Green Belt would be if redevelopment occurs (in the context of which, volumetric matters may be a material concern, but are by no means the only one) and factors relevant to the visual impact on the aspect of openness which the Green Belt presents. The decision-maker must consider whether there is ‘harm’ (not merely change) to the openness of the Green Belt.

5.6 The interpretation of openness was considered further by the Supreme Court in *R (on the application of Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) & Ors) v North Yorkshire County Council* [2020]. The key points from the judgement are as follows:

- The Supreme Court agreed with the conclusions in *Turner v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2016] EWCA Civ 466; [2017] 2 P & CR 1:

“The concept of ‘openness of the Green Belt’ is not narrowly limited to the volumetric approach suggested by [counsel]. The word ‘openness’ is open-textured and a number of factors are capable of being relevant when it comes to applying it to the particular facts of a specific case. Prominent among these will be factors relevant to how built up the Green Belt is now and how built up it would be if redevelopment occurs.... and factors relevant to the visual impact on the openness which the Green Belt presents” (para 14)

- The visual aspect of openness of the Green Belt is capable of being relevant, and paragraph 64-001 of the PPG remains applicable in terms of having due regard for the spatial and visual aspects. However, it is for the decision-maker to make a judgement as to what aspects of openness are most relevant having due regard for the site-specific circumstances of the case in question.

5.7 A further important point on the assessment of openness is that the openness of the Green Belt should be assessed in terms of impacts on the wider Green Belt, and not just impacts on the site in isolation. We refer to the case *Euro Garages Ltd v The Secretary of State for Communities And Local Government & Anor* [2018] EWHC 1753 (Admin). In assessing the inspector’s conclusion that the erection of a timber fence



would not be as open as the previous palisade fencing, at paragraph 38 of the judgement Justice Jefford states:

“Firstly, in paragraph 14 of the Decision Letter there is reference to the timber fencing around the new container not being as open as the previous palisade fencing. It is not at all clear whether that was a factor that the Inspector took into account but, if she did, then, looked at on its own, it seems to me that that involved a misinterpretation of the policy, in that it was concerned with the openness of the site and not of the Green Belt [our emphasis]. There may, of course, be circumstances in which the replacement of an open fence with a solid structure could impact the openness of the Green Belt but here the open fence surrounded tanks and the solid fence surrounds a container (of lesser height) and it is difficult to see how there could be an impact on the openness of the Green Belt as distinct from the site itself.” (our emphasis)

- 5.8 Turning to this application, the correct starting point for the assessment is the existing development, i.e., the buildings, hardstanding and uses currently present on site, against what is proposed. A comparison between the total volumes, floor areas hardstanding and floor area is provided below³:

	Existing	Proposed	Difference
Total volume	7,985 m3	7,744 m3	-241 m3 (-3%)
Total floor area	2,536 m2	1,478 m2	-1,058 m2 (-42%)
Total hardstanding	4,986 m2	962 m2	-4,024 m2 (-81%)

Table 2 – Comparison between the existing and proposed development

- 5.9 As can be seen from the figures above, the proposed development would result in a reduction in the volume of built development (-3%), a significant reduction in floor area (-42%) and a significant reduction in hardstanding (-81%) in comparison to the existing development. It is very clear that the proposal would result in a site that is less built up than the existing development.
- 5.10 Whilst the proposed dwellings would be taller than the existing buildings on site, they would have a significantly reduced footprint in comparison to the existing buildings, reducing the spread of built form on site. Visual permeability would increase with far greater spaces between the buildings, even before the removal of the significant areas of hardstanding and open storage are considered. This effectively offsets the increase in height, meaning that there is no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt when the scheme is assessed as a whole.

³ A detailed table which includes the calculations for each building is provided in Appendix EP1.



5.11 As per the PPG and established caselaw, it is also necessary to consider other factors relevant to how built up the Green Belt is now and how built up it would be if redevelopment occurs. A key factor in this case is that the proposed development would also remove areas of open storage. There are several containers as well as external storage of equipment and goods associated with the existing commercial uses. This can be seen on the photographs below:



Figure 1 – Aerial photograph showing extent of storage



Figure 2 – Westerly view from within site towards open storage



Figure 3 – Northerly view from within site towards open storage



Figure 4 – Southerly view from within site towards open storage and vehicle parking



Figure 5 – South easterly view of open storage adjacent to the metal industrial unit

5.12 Whilst the containers are not technically buildings, and we have therefore not included them within the volume calculations that have been provided, they are nevertheless substantial features which have a significant impact on the visual openness of the Green Belt. The other stored items also have a material impact on how built up the Green Belt is. The removal of the open storage therefore needs to be considered in the assessment of openness. Whilst the proposed residential development would introduce gardens which would inevitably include some residential paraphernalia, the impact of such paraphernalia on openness would be significantly less than the storage uses and containers which currently exist at the site.

5.13 A further factor is that the existing use involves commercial traffic including vans and HGVs. There are no restrictions upon how much commercial traffic can access the site. The technical note prepared by SCP, submitted in support of the original planning application for the redevelopment of the site (HPK/2018/0290), concluded that the proposed development would reduce the overall level of vehicle movements, and would reduce to movement of larger vehicles relating to existing site deliveries. Therefore, the cessation of the currently unrestricted commercial traffic (with associated parking) and replacement with lesser amounts of domestic traffic would have a positive impact on openness.

5.14 In terms of the visual aspects of openness, the following points are also relevant:

- The proposed reduction of bulk of the buildings and removal of hardstanding results in a less developed, more open site.
- The siting and orientation of the proposed dwellings enhances the visual permeability of the site, from both the immediate vicinity, but most importantly from the longer range views to the north and west, across the River Etherow.
- The site currently has very limited vegetation immediately around the buildings. A high-quality landscape scheme (as per the previously approved scheme) would soften the proposed development, particularly when viewed across the valley. It would also create an improved relationship between the site and the River Etherow which is the most sensitive landscape feature on the site.
- The proposed development would result in a much higher quality aesthetic to the built form. It would remove the existing areas of the site which have become an eyesore, notably where three of the chicken sheds have been previously removed and a series of storage containers and other material is stored.

5.15 To conclude, the caselaw is clear that decision maker must consider how built up the Green Belt is now, and how built up it would be if redevelopment occurs. The reduction in the amount of built development, together with the removal of the significant areas of open storage across the site and visual increase in openness, means that the proposed development would not result in a site that is more built up, and the proposed development would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. As such, the proposal accords with Green Belt policy and is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Purposes of including land within the Green Belt

5.16 There is no conflict with the five purposes Green Belt land serves. Addressing each in turn:

- The proposal would not contribute to the sprawl of large built up areas, as the site is located away from any urban area and the proposal involves the redevelopment of a discrete area of previously developed land.



- The proposal would not contribute to neighbouring towns merging into one another for the same reason as above.
- There would be no encroachment into the countryside because the development would be contained within the existing envelope of the previously developed land.
- The purpose relating to the setting and special character of historic towns is not relevant in this location.
- The proposed development involves the redevelopment of previously developed land. Whilst it does not comprise an urban site, the proposal is not inconsistent with the objective of assisting in urban regeneration as national policy expressly supports the use of previously developed land in both urban and rural areas.

5.17 The proposal therefore accords with Policy EQ4 of the Local Plan and paragraph 149(g) of the Framework.

Fall-back position

5.18 The applicant's case on this application (as detailed within Section 5 of this statement) is that the proposed development would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. Therefore, it is not necessary to consider the fall-back position and assess whether the impact on openness would be more or less than that fall-back. The previous planning permissions simply provide an indication of what has previously been considered to be acceptable in the context of what the applicant has proposed. They do not provide a ceiling to the amount of development that can be acceptable.

5.19 However, should the LPA (erroneously) seek to use the extant consents as a benchmark for how much development is acceptable on site, then the fall-back position must not be considered only in light of the development consented in the planning permission, but also the retention of the stable and storage buildings as was correctly accepted by the LPA during the determination of application NMA/2023/0008. As the figures set out in Section 3 demonstrate, the development proposed in this application would involve a material reduction in volume and floor area from the extant consent if the retention of the stable and storage buildings is factored into the assessment. It is also notable that the scale of the dwellings has been reduced from the committee scheme, in particular plot 1 which has been reduced from 3-storeys to 2-storeys.

5.20 It could be argued that the fall-back position represents very special circumstances which outweighs the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm, on the basis that it represents a scheme which the applicant would implement if planning permission is not granted for this development, where the impact on the openness of the Green Belt would be greater than the development proposed in this application. However, it should not be necessary to consider the application in that context given the above conclusions in



relation to the impact on the openness of the proposed development in comparison to the existing development.

Design

- 5.21 Local Plan Policies S1, EQ2, EQ3 and EQ6 together require new development proposals in the rural areas to be of a high-quality design that preserves or enhances the immediate and wider rural landscape character.
- 5.22 The proposed development would remove the existing buildings, which are large unattractive sheds, and tidy up areas of site which have become an eyesore, notably where three of the chicken sheds have been previously removed and a series of storage containers and other material is stored. This eyesore would be replaced with a bespoke development of high-quality design, which is appropriate to the location and a significant improvement to the character and appearance of the site.
- 5.23 The layout and design of the development would remain consistent with the principles approved under previous applications, with the overall design approach on reflecting a converted agricultural complex set within high-quality landscaping. Plot 1 would remain as a Georgian-style farmhouse typical of those seen in Derbyshire, reflecting other development in the immediate locality (in particular the two dwellings consented under planning permission references HPK/2022/0555 & HPK/2020/0111; Besthill House is complete, and the other larger dwelling is under construction). The other plots have been designed to appear as agricultural buildings which have been converted to a high specification.
- 5.24 The scale, height and massing of several of the proposed dwellings has been reduced to ensure that the 2 additional dwellings can be accommodated whilst still achieving a reduction overall in the amount of built volume on site.

Loss of employment uses

- 5.25 The loss of the existing employment uses has already been established through the extant consents. The removal of the existing uses will bring about benefits in terms of the removal of unsightly open storage areas and unattractive buildings, and providing uses which are compatible with the surrounding dwellings.

Accessibility

- 5.26 The site is located in an accessible location, with links to public footpaths and public transport providing opportunities for modes of transport other than the private car. The site also provides good opportunity for linked trips, with rail and bus services being only a short drive from the site. In summary:



- The site is located a short distance from Broadbottom where a number of shops and services, including restaurants, public house, church, primary school, post office, sports facilities and garden centre, are located.
- Broadbottom train station, which is on the Manchester-Hadfield and Glossop line, is approximately 1.4km from the site and provides a regular service between Manchester and Glossop. Park and ride facilities are available at the station, with links to the more immediate area available via local bus services.
- The closest bus stops (serviced by the above routes) are only around 10 minutes' walk from the site (approximately 850 metres), which meets the Chartered Institute of Highway and Transportation (CIHT's) recognised walkable neighbourhood's catchment of around 800m. There are many opportunities for walking trips and the walk along Long Lane is considered to be the type of walk that is commonly expected in a rural location.

5.27 Consequently, the site has easy access to a range of essential facilities and is accessible via a number of sustainable transport options. The level of parking provision and access arrangements are in line with the requirements of Local Plan policies TF1 and S1. The accessibility of the site is also confirmed through the previous granting of planning permission for 7 dwellings.

Flood risk and drainage

5.28 The site is shown to be located within Flood Zone 2 based on the Environment Agency (EA) Flood Map for Planning with the source being the adjacent River Etherow to the north and west; however, to ascertain the site-specific risks and mitigation more detailed hydraulic analysis has previously been undertaken. The hydraulic modelling work was included within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted and approved with the original application (HPK/2018/0290).

5.29 The more refined assessment of the detailed flood risk in this location demonstrates that the site remains flood free in the 1 in 1000yr return period event and can therefore be considered to be within Flood Zone 1 (with the Sequential Test being satisfied). The EA were consulted on this, and the approach was confirmed acceptable by the Council, on the original application approval (HPK/2018/0290).

5.30 The letter from Betts Associates which accompanies this application confirms the above, and also that there are no increased flood risks to others resulting from the development site changes, either the revisions to the approved 7 dwellings or the additional 2 dwellings, as the proposed rates of surface water discharge remain constrained to the original greenfield runoff rates already agreed within the approved FRA.



Other technical matters

- 5.31 Matters relating to ecology, trees and land contamination were fully considered under the original application and within HPK/2021/0676, where a full suite of assessments and surveys were commented on by relevant consultees, and conditions updated to take account of these comments. These conditions are reflected in planning permission HPK/2022/0504. Similar conditions can be used to ensure that details of the ecological mitigation, tree protection measures, landscaping and drainage details are provided to reflect the revised scheme. However, the extant consents demonstrate that there are no fundamental constraints that need to be re-assessed in the context of what amounts to a redesign, to provide 2 additional dwellings within the developed envelope of the site.

Other benefits of development

- 5.32 There are a number of other benefits associated with the proposed development, which should be considered in the planning balance. These are summarised below.

Redevelopment of previously developed land

- 5.33 The site is previously developed land (PDL). The PDL status of the site provides a strong policy basis for the site's redevelopment because:
- Government policy is very clear on the need to promote the redevelopment of PDL;
 - all local authorities have to have a brownfield register (reinforcing the above stance); and,
 - the Local Plan is very supportive of the redevelopment of PDL.
- 5.34 The proposed development would regenerate a previously developed site. It would also assist the Council in meeting its housing requirements through the redevelopment of PDL. This is a significant benefit of the proposed development.

Housing Delivery

- 5.35 The Government's recognition of the important role that small sites play in achieving housing delivery targets is reflected in the Framework, which states at paragraph 69 that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. Part c) of paragraph 69 states that Local Planning Authorities should support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions.



- 5.36 High Peak Council relies upon 400 units on small windfall sites coming forward within the Glossopdale sub-area to meet the housing requirements identified with the adopted Local Plan. To date a significant shortfall has accrued against what the Local Plan housing trajectory, and this includes a shortfall in the delivery of windfall sites.
- 5.37 The application site would therefore positively contribute towards housing delivery, and specifically the need to bring forward windfall sites.

Highways benefits

- 5.38 The technical note prepared by SCP, submitted in support of the original planning application for the redevelopment of the site (HPK/2018/0290), concluded that the proposed development would offer significant betterment of the site in highways terms compared to the existing situation, as it would reduce the overall level of vehicle movements and reduce to movement of larger vehicles relating to existing site deliveries. The Transport Technical Note considered that this would benefit the wider local highway network, particularly in relation to Long Lane and the A626 Marple Road. The existing access is less than ideal for commercial uses with regular HGV movements.



6. Conclusions and the planning balance

- 6.1 This statement supports a proposal to redevelop the former chicken sheds at Bankwood Mill for 9 dwellings and new stables. There are extant consents for 7 dwellings and new stables at the site.
- 6.2 The site comprises previously developed land in a mix of commercial / non-agricultural uses. The proposal would involve the redevelopment of the site for market housing. The proposal would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, provided that it would not have a greater impact on openness on the Green Belt than the existing development, and it does not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.
- 6.3 The proposed development would result in a reduction in the volume of built development (-3%), a significant reduction in floor area (-42%) and a significant reduction in hardstanding (-81%) in comparison to the existing development. Whilst the proposed dwellings would be taller than the existing buildings on site, the proposed buildings would have a significantly reduced footprint, reducing the spread of built form. Visual permeability would increase with far greater spaces between the buildings. This effectively offsets the increase in height, meaning that there is no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt when the scheme is assessed as a whole.
- 6.4 The proposed development would also remove areas of open storage. This includes several containers as well as external storage of equipment and goods associated with the existing commercial uses. Whilst the proposed residential development would introduce gardens which would inevitably include some residential paraphernalia, the impact of such paraphernalia on openness would be very significantly less than the storage uses and containers which currently exist at the site.
- 6.5 The reduction in the amount of built development, together with the removal of the significant areas of open storage across the site and visual increase in openness, means that the proposed development would not result in a site that is more built up, and the proposed development would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. It would also not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. As such, the proposal accords with Green Belt policy and is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 6.6 The layout and design of the development would remain consistent with the principles approved under previous applications, with the overall design approach on reflecting a converted agricultural complex set within a high-quality landscaping scheme.
- 6.7 The proposed development therefore accords with the development plan and should be approved without delay.





EP1

BANKWOOD MILL 7 UNIT SCHEME - VOLUME/SQM INFO

					NEW APPLICATION
(HPK/2018/0290) (HPK/2021/0313) (HPK/2021/0676) (HPK/2022/0504)					Proposed 7 Unit Scheme
Existing Outbuildings & Hardstanding					
Chicken Sheds x 4					
Floor Area (m2)	2362 m2	2362 m2	2362 m2	2362 m2	2362 m2
Volumes (m3)	7203 m3	7203 m3	7203 m3	7203 m3	7203 m3
Metal Industrial Unit					
Floor Area (m2)	169 m2	169 m2	169 m2	169 m2	169 m2
Volumes (m3)	772 m3	772 m3	772 m3	772 m3	772 m3
Service Building					
Floor Area (m2)	4.3 m2	4.3 m2	4.3 m2	4.3 m2	4.3 m2
Volumes (m3)	9.9 m3	9.9 m3	9.9 m3	9.9 m3	9.9 m3
Hardstanding					4986 m2
Total Floor Area	2536 m2	2536 m2	2536 m2	2536 m2	2536 m2
Total Volume	7985 m3	7985 m3	7985 m3	7985 m3	7985 m3
Proposed Scheme					
Proposed Hardstanding					
Plots 1 to 7 & Stables			504 m2	518 m2	818 m2
Plot 1					
Floor Area (m2)	148 m2	148 m2	147 m2	150 m2	134 m2
Volumes (m3)	1001 m3	1002 m3	1001 m3	933 m3	766 m3
Plot 2					
Floor Area (m2)	147 m2	148 m2	133 m2	133 m2	120 m2
Volumes (m3)	808 m3	809 m3	732 m3	741 m3	632 m3
Plot 3					
Floor Area (m2)	142 m2	143 m2	147 m2	148 m2	134 m2
Volumes (m3)	817 m3	817 m3	845 m3	817 m3	766 m3
Plot 4					
Floor Area (m2)	146 m2	147 m2	133 m2	133 m2	120 m2
Volumes (m3)	836 m3	837 m3	735 m3	741 m3	632 m3
Plot 5					
Floor Area (m2)	144 m2	145 m2	148 m2	144 m2	134 m2
Volumes (m3)	799 m3	799 m3	822 m3	800 m3	701 m3
Plot 6					
Floor Area (m2)	112 m2	113 m2	148 m2	144 m2	134 m2
Volumes (m3)	640 m3	640 m3	822 m3	800 m3	701 m3
Plot 7					
Floor Area (m2)	112 m2	113 m2	147 m2	150 m2	134 m2
Volumes (m3)	640 m3	640 m3	845 m3	838 m3	766 m3
Proposed Stables/Store X 2					
Floor Area (m2)			270 m2	270 m2	314 m2
Volumes (m3)			646 m3	646 m3	1382 m3
Proposed Total Floor Area			1272 m2	1272 m2	1224m2
Proposed Total Volume			6448 m3	6316 m3	6346 m3

BANKWOOD MILL PLOTS 8 & 9 ONLY - VOLUME/SQM INFO

					New Application
(HPK/2018/0290) (HPK/2021/0313) (HPK/2021/0676) (HPK/2022/0504)					Proposed 9 Unit Scheme
Existing Outbuildings & Hardstanding					
Chicken Sheds x 4					
Floor Area (m2)	2362 m2	2362 m2	2362 m2	2362 m2	2362 m2
Volumes (m3)	7203 m3	7203 m3	7203 m3	7203 m3	7203 m3
Metal Industrial Unit					
Floor Area (m2)	169 m2	169 m2	169 m2	169 m2	169 m2
Volumes (m3)	772 m3	772 m3	772 m3	772 m3	772 m3
Service Building					
Floor Area (m2)	4.3 m2	4.3 m2	4.3 m2	4.3 m2	4.3 m2
Volumes (m3)	9.9 m3	9.9 m3	9.9 m3	9.9 m3	9.9 m3
Hardstanding					4986 m2
Total Floor Area	2536 m2	2536 m2	2536 m2	2536 m2	2536 m2
Total Volume	7985 m3	7985 m3	7985 m3	7985 m3	7985 m3
Proposed Scheme					
Proposed Hardstanding					
Plots 8 & 9					144M2
Plot 8					
Floor Area (m2)				N/A	134 m2
Volumes (m3)				N/A	766 m3
Plot 9					
Floor Area (m2)				N/A	120 m2
Volumes (m3)				N/A	632 m3
Proposed Total Floor Area					254 m2
Proposed Total Volume					1398 m3