

The Planning Inspectorate
Registry/Scanning Team
3/01 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

12 August 2024
EP ref: 23-289

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Planning Appeal APP/H/1033/W/24/3343660
Land at Forge Road, Chinley, SK23 6ER

I write with reference to the above appeal. We have now received the Local Authorities appeal statement and supporting documents. Whilst the majority of points raised by the LPA have been addressed already within our supporting appeal statement some elements require further clarification. These points are as follows:

- The LPA statement still maintains that the appeal site is classed as employment land, despite the site not being allocated as employment land within the Development Plan. The site lies within the settlement boundary where the Development Plan supports a number of uses one of which includes residential development. As the site does not have an employment allocation there is no conflict with policies E1 and E4 of the Development Plan.
- The LPA has failed to understand the Permission in Principle (PIP) process. The PIP process simply seeks to ascertain whether the principle of permission (in this case residential development) is acceptable on the appeal site. Matters such as the density and design of any possible development is reserved for the technical matters stage.
- The drawings submitted with refused planning application were clearly identified as being indicative, showing one way the appellant could possibly develop the site up to the maximum of 9 dwellings. However, the LPA has assessed the PIP application as though the indicative scheme (for a 3 storey building) was the formal proposal and assuming the appellant wishes to secure the maximum number of dwellings. This is not and never has been the case. The PIP application is simply seeking to ascertain whether the site is suitable for residential development in principle, with the development expressed as a range between 2 and 9 dwellings. The decision maker does not need to determine whether the upper end of the range is achievable and

therefore there is no requirement to assess the indicative material. The number of dwellings and the final design and density of any development on the site, would be addressed in detail at the technical matters stage.

To conclude, the appeal site, which has no formal allocation within the Development Plan and being located within the settlement boundary is clearly acceptable for residential development in the principle and is therefore not contrary to employment policies E1 and E4 as the LPA have indicated.

We trust the above comments clarifies matters and will be taken into account as part of the assessment of this appeal. We respectfully request that this appeal be allowed.

Yours sincerely
Emery Planning

Clare Gascoigne

Clare Gascoigne DIP URP, MRTPI
Senior Consultant

01625 442 792
ClareGascoigne@emeryplanning.com