

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0111
Valid 25/03/2025

2ND GLOSSOP SCOUTS
HALL EDWARD STREET
GLOSSOP

APPLICATION FOR OUTLINE
PLANNING PERMISSION WITH
DETAILS OF ACCESS,
APPEARANCE, LAYOUT &
SCALE (ALL OTHER
MATTERS RESERVED) FOR
THE DEMOLITION OF
EXISTING LIGHT INDUSTRIAL
BUILDING AND ERECTION OF
3NO. DWELLINGHOUSES.

(OUTLINE - MINOR APPS)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design, Character and Appearance
- Amenity
- Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain
- Parking Provision and Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to a parcel of land that is situated at the junction of Edward Street and Arundel Street, within the built-up area boundary of Glossop. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with the site being within easy walking distance of the nearby large public car park, and a variety of shops, facilities and other day to day amenities and public transport links in Glossop Town Centre.

The site contains an existing building, constructed in a traditional stone, with slate tiled roof, which has a two storey aspect fronting Arundel Street, which is characterized by an entrance door, and two similar windows and ground and first floor level, supplemented by traditional headers and sills. A large window fronts the junction, whilst the elevation fronting Edward Street contains a number of windows of similar scale and appearance.

The aspect of the building closest to the junction is defined by a form of hipped roof, before reverting to two distinct dual pitched gables on the aspect fronting Edward Street.

Prior to 2005, this building is understood to have been used as a Scout Hut before planning permission was granted by the Council under HPK/2005/0356 for the change of use of the building to accommodate an Antique and Restoration Business with associated storage.

An inspection of the building and a review of the 2005 application shows that the owner of the business Mr John Hetherington is also the prospective applicant associated with this enquiry.

The supporting Planning Statement that accompanies the enquiry states that the building has been vacant for a 'considerable amount of time'. From our face-to-face meeting, I understand that the antique furnishing business ceased approximately 5 years ago.

In light of the 2005 permission being implemented, the lawful use of the building falls within the Class E(g)(iii) Use, which is defined as "any industrial process, being a use, which can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit."

The existing use therefore has an industrial/commercial element, irrespective of whether the current business within that premises is operational or not.

For the purposes of the Local Development Plan, the site is situated within the built-up area boundary of Glossop and is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designations.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Further to pre-application advice being issued in relation to this proposal, this application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of 3no dwellings with their associated amenity areas.

The Proposed Plans shows that the dwellinghouses would be laid out in a row of three terraced two storey properties fronting Edward Street, with residential gardens to the rear.

Each property is shown to have a principal elevation that has a degree of symmetry with its neighbour, made up of an entrance door and habitable window at ground floor level, and two windows at first floor level above. The rear elevation is characterized by bi-fold doors with first floor windows above.

The Floor Plans show each ground floor to comprise a Lounge and Kitchen/Dining Area, with the first floor containing 2no. Bedrooms (1 x Single and 1 x Double) with the double benefiting from an En-Suite, together with a shared Bathroom. A third bedroom is shown to be contained in the roof area, supported by velux roof lights to the front and rear.

The proposed dwellings appear to be shown to be constructed from a traditional stone, with dual pitched roof above finished in a slate tile.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taking into consideration any material considerations relevant to the determination of the application.

The Local Development Plan for this site comprises the High Peak Local Plan (2016). Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance documents and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are also material considerations in determining applications.

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S1 Sustainable Development Principles
S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S2 Settlement Hierarchy
EQ5 Biodiversity
EQ6 Design and Place Making
EQ10 Pollution and Unstable Land
EQ11 Flood Risk Management
E4 Change of Use of Existing Business Land and Premises
H1 Location of New Housing Development
H3 New Housing Development
CF6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Design Guide SPD (2005)
Design Guide SPD (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework 2024

Achieving Sustainable Development	Chapter 2
Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes	Chapter 5
Building a Strong Competitive Economy	Chapter 6
Promoting Sustainable Transport	Chapter 9
Achieving Well Designed Places	Chapter 12
Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change	Chapter 14
Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment	Chapter 15

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2005/0356 Change Of Use From Former Scout Hut H.q. To Antique
Restoration And Storage (Approved 4th July 2005)

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 30th April 2025
Neighbour consultation period ends: 21st April 2025
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

1no objection has been received in connection with this application. Ground of objection are summarised as follows:

- Impact on residential amenity (privacy and overlooking) due to windows and door situated directly opposite habitable windows on other side of Edward Street
- Disruption during demolition and construction process
- Lack of parking provision

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Environmental Health

No objections subject to conditions:

1. Contamination Land
2. Dust.
3. Waste Disposal
4. Piling
5. Operation times Construction and Demolition
6. On-site Radio

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust

Initial Response:

We have reviewed the Small Sites Metric dated 24.03.25, habitat maps and draft Gain Plan.

The baseline habitats are stated as ruderal/ephemeral vegetation and sealed surface. No photographs are included in the metric, hence the error has been flagged. These should be submitted to evidence the habitat types. The site contains a building, which from Google Street View, appears suitable for roosting bats and should be subject to a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment, in line with survey guidelines (Collins, 2023).

The building will be demolished and onsite habitats replaced with houses and gardens. Hedgerows are proposed at the garden boundaries, which are welcomed, but unfortunately these cannot be included in the metric as they are within the residential curtilage and cannot be secured for the long-term. The habitat plans indicate trees within the gardens, however these are not included in the metric, as per the guidance. A net loss of -0.04 habitat units (57.10%) is predicted by the metric.

A draft Gain Plan has been submitted, which does not match the figures in the metric and states that gains will be delivered on site, with trading rules satisfied. Clarity should be provided regarding the BNG figures and whether offsite units will be required, and all bat work is required prior to determination.

Further Response:

I have reviewed the following reports:

- Preliminary Roost Assessment for Bats (Pennine Ecological, June 2025)
- Small Sites Metric (20/06/2025)
- Biodiversity Gain Plan (Draft) (20/06/2025)
- Biodiversity Plans (Baseline and Post Development)

I note in the first instance that the Preliminary Bat Roost for Bats has identified that the building has moderate suitability for roosting bats. The building contains numerous potential features that bats could use for roosting. **The report clearly recommends (section 5.2.ii) that at least two dusk emergence surveys are undertaken** in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust's Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists Good Practice Guidelines (Collins *et al.*, 2023).

Paragraph 99 of Circular 06/2005 states, "*it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before planning permission is granted, otherwise all material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision. The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances*".

In this case **further surveys are now necessary in accordance with best practice to determine presence / absence of bats**. The species of bat, type of roost and number of bats present could have a significant impact the proposed development and it is essential that this information is available to the LPA prior to determination.

Biodiversity Net Gain

The information submitted indicates that a small loss of biodiversity is likely to result from the development. There are proposals set out within the Draft Biodiversity Gain Plan for the purchase of off-site biodiversity units. Given that the number of units required is small and the habitat affected is low distinctiveness delivery of the units outside of the LPA area it is of lower concern. A total of 0.0481 habitat units will need to be delivered off-site. In this respect the Small Sites Metric and the Draft Biodiversity Gain Plan are in alignment. The Gain Plan includes an Availability Certificate from BNGx that shows purchase of 0.1 habitat units at a cost of £1902. The final Biodiversity Gain Plan will need to confirm the purchase of the units including details of the site. The Small Sites Metric will also need to be updated to include the purchase of the off-site units.

The proposals include the creation of vegetated gardens on-site. These are not considered to be significant on-site gains and as the gains fall within what will be private ownership cannot be secured for the long term. Therefore, an on-site habitat management plan is not necessary in this case.

Once the issue of the outstanding bat surveys is resolved we can provide further comments and recommendations for conditions.

Latest Comments:

Following comments sent to the Council in July I have now received a bat emergence survey report as below:

- Bat Activity Survey Results Report (Pennine Ecological, August 2025)

I previously commented on the reports below:

- Preliminary Roost Assessment for Bats (Pennine Ecological, June 2025)
- Small Sites Metric (20/06/2025)
- Biodiversity Gain Plan (Draft) (20/06/2025)
- Biodiversity Plans (Baseline and Post Development)

The latest bat survey report has confirmed that the light industrial building to be demolished does not support bat roosts. The report is considered to provide the Council with reasonable confidence that bats will not be adversely impacted by the demolition.

The report has made recommendations regarding enhancements for bats and for sympathetic lighting. I support the recommendations and suggest a condition for lighting and installation of a bat box is attached to any planning permission (see below).

Biodiversity Net Gain

As previously stated in July the information submitted indicates that a small loss of biodiversity (ephemeral vegetation) is likely to result from the development. There are proposals set out within the Draft Biodiversity Gain Plan for the purchase of off-site biodiversity units. Given that the number of units required is small and the habitat affected is low distinctiveness, delivery of the units outside of the LPA area is of lower concern. A total of 0.0481 habitat units will need to be delivered off-site. In this respect the Small Sites Metric and the Draft Biodiversity Gain Plan are in alignment. The Gain Plan includes an Availability Certificate from BNGx that shows purchase of 0.1 habitat units at a cost of £1902. The final Biodiversity Gain Plan will need to confirm the purchase of the units including details of the site. The Small Sites Metric will also need to be updated to include the purchase of the off-site units.

As units are to be purchased from a registered Habitat Bank there will already be a legal agreement in place between the Habitat Bank and a local council or a responsible body. The Council is advised to request details of the existing legal agreement for the habitat bank so that this can be recorded and referred to, if necessary, in relation to future monitoring and reporting. Details of the site registration with Natural England should also be provided.

The proposals include the creation of vegetated gardens on-site. These are not considered to be significant on-site gains and as the gains fall within what will be private ownership cannot be secured for the long term. Therefore, an **on-site habitat management plan is not necessary** in this case.

If approved the applicant will need to provide the Council with a Biodiversity Gain Plan.

The statutory framework for biodiversity net gain requires a Biodiversity Gain Plan to be submitted and approved by the planning authority to discharge the mandatory biodiversity gain condition prior to the commencement of development.

A revised final small sites metric should be submitted with the Gain Plan.

The following conditions are recommended: -

Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP)

1. A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the LPA prior to the commencement of the development. If the standard HMMP template is not used, the HMMP checklist shall be consulted to ensure all appropriate information is included. The HMMP shall identify the habitats to be retained, created and / or enhanced on the site and specify the appropriate management prescriptions to secure the predicted condition targets, as per the approved biodiversity metric for the application. The HMMP shall also set out a monitoring schedule to ensure targets are met and remedial actions to take if not.
2. Prior to building works commencing above foundation level, a Species Enhancement Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Approved measures shall be implemented in full and maintained thereafter. The Plan shall clearly show positions, specifications and numbers of features, which will include (but are not limited to) the following:
 - 3 integrated swift bricks (universal nest boxes) at ratio of 1:1, in line with British Standard 42021:2022.
 - 1 integrated bat box

A statement of good practice including photographs should be submitted to the local planning authority prior to the discharge of this condition, demonstrating that the enhancements have been selected and installed in accordance with the above.

3. Prior to the installation of external lighting fixtures, a detailed lighting strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA to safeguard bats and other nocturnal wildlife. This should provide details of the chosen luminaires, their locations and any mitigating features such as dimmers, PIR sensors and timers. Dependent on the scale of proposed lighting, a lux contour plan may be required to demonstrate acceptable levels of light spill to any sensitive ecological zones/features. The Strategy should refer to Guidance Note 08/23 - Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night (BCT and ILP, 2023) and explain how proposals have been designed in compliance with this document. Such approved measures will be implemented in full.

United Utilities

No objection subject to detailed drainage condition.

Derbyshire County Council Highways

It is noted that the application proposes no vehicular access to the site and the proposed development is to be car free.

Considering the locality of the application site, being close to the town centre amenities and with good access to bus stops and the train station, car free developments are welcomed and expected in such sustainable locations.

Based on the analysis of the information submitted and a review of Local and National policy the Highway Authority concludes that there would not be an unacceptable impact on Highway Safety or a severe impact on congestion. There are no justifiable grounds on which an objection could be maintained.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application seeks the demolition of an existing building that has a lawful use as a light industrial/commercial premises, and the erection of new residential development.

Due to the existing lawful use of the building, the starting point for assessing any forthcoming application is Local Plan (LP) Policy E4 which relates specifically to the change of use (or redevelopment in this case) of light industrial/commercial premises to a non-industrial/commercial use, which includes housing, and states the following:

“Development proposals involving the redevelopment or change of use of existing business or industrial land or premises (falling within Use Classes B1, B2 and B8) for non-employment uses will only be permitted where:

- 1. The continuation of the land or premises in industrial or business use is constrained to the extent that it is no longer suitable or commercially viable for industrial or business use as demonstrated by marketing evidence commensurate with the size and scale of development and the proposed use is compatible with neighbouring uses; or*
- 2. An appropriate level of enabling development is required to support improvements to employment premises or supporting infrastructure. In such cases, a viability appraisal should be submitted to demonstrate that a change of use or development of the site is required to fund the improvements. Mixed-use proposals should not create any environmental, amenity or safety issues.*

Proposals that would result in an under-supply of suitable employment land in relation to identified needs will not be permitted.”

Pre-application advice was offered to the applicant in relation to the above policy, and that in order to demonstrate compliance with the above, any forthcoming planning application should be accompanied by a detailed structural survey prepared by a suitable qualified professional, which is made up of

- (i) a report of the existing structure and defects
- (ii) a schedule of works required to address the defects identified; and

- (iii) an assessment of cost associated with the required schedule of works. In addition to the above, it is recommended that a valuation of the site be sought from a suitably qualified quantity surveyor based on the existing context, and (in order to demonstrate full compliance with LP Policy E4) market the site through various channels at this price.

Since pre-application advice was issued, it is now the case that the Council are unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, and therefore policies that restrict the supply of housing, which includes LP Policy E4, are out of date.

As such, whilst appropriate weight must be given to this policy, the application is to be assessed in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out under LP Policy S1a and paragraph 11 of the NPPF, whereby applications will be approved unless there are strong reasons refusing the development in relation to restrictive policy areas, or any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any associated benefits.

The application is accompanied by a Valuation Report prepared by John Seed Chartered Surveyors (dated 13th Feb 2025), and a Structural Survey Report prepared by Healey Consulting (dated November 2024).

The conclusions of the Structural Survey are summarised below:

- State of the building is generally considered to be poor with the exception of the roof
- In order to be made safe, large areas of external walls are required to be rebuilt
- Temporary works required to facilitate the rebuilding of the walls are likely to be substantial and cost prohibitive
- Internally the condition of the building is also poor, with evidence of collapsed floor and excessive cracks in wall junctions requiring repair
- Suspect that other areas are likely to be rotten
- Deterioration in external stone masonry resulting in stone surface areas being delaminated (i.e. stone has begun to perish).
- Highly likely that stone outer leaf cannot be salvaged or reused
- Best and safest option is to demolish and redevelop the building

The conclusions of the Valuation Report, informed by the above findings of the Structural Survey, are summarised as follows:

- Market value of the site in its current form is £142,500
- Value of the site with planning permission for 3 houses is £150,000
- Limited to no demand for ongoing commercial use due to the need to demolish and rebuilt premises
- Likely estimated (indicative) cost of this redevelopment is £360,000

The site has not been marketed as a light industrial/commercial premises. However, given the length of time that the building has been vacant for, and the agreed professional opinion concluding that in order to regenerate any industrial/commercial

use on site would be extremely expensive and likely unviable, Officers are satisfied that in this specific case, the application has demonstrated that the ongoing use of the site for light industrial/commercial purpose is unviable due in the main to the poor condition of the premises being redundant for a considerable amount of time, and therefore the proposed change of use is acceptable having regard to LP Policy E4.

Even if one were to take a stricter line with regards to the requirement for the property to be marketed before any support can be given for its change of use to non-industrial purposes, it is considered that little weight can be given to this out-of-date policy in this instance, given the length of time the site has been redundant and the poor structural quality of the building, unlike perhaps a modern building that is occupied by an active business where significantly more weight could be attributed to policy supporting its retention.

The site lies within a highly sustainable location within the built-up area boundary of Glossop within walking distance of the Town Centre and all associated services, facilities and public transport links. The application is therefore fully supported by LP Policies S1, S2, S3 and H1, which aim to focus housing growth to the larger Market Towns that sit at the top of the settlement hierarchy including Glossop.

In light of the above, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable subject to all other relevant material considerations.

Design Character and Appearance

LP Policy S1 sets out a number of sustainability principles which all new development proposals should incorporate in order to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect, and where possible enhance the environment.

LP Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed to respect and contribute positively to the character, identity and context of High Peak's townscapes, having regard to matters of scale, height, density, layout, appearance and materials.

The High Peak Design Guide SPD (2018) contains further design guidance to ensure that new buildings including new dwellings are appropriately designed for their immediate and wider context.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states amongst other things that decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

The application site is a previously developed (brownfield) site situated within the heart of Glossop, at a prominent corner junction where Edward Street meets Arundel Street.

The proposed plans show a row of three terraced properties which are broadly consistent with regards their scale and height with existing two storey terraced properties situated on the opposite side of Edward Street.

The proposed dwellinghouse is shown to contain further living space in the roof. It is considered that the ratio between wall to roof as a consequence of this additional living space is considered to be acceptable.

When read alongside the orderly symmetrical appearance of the principal and rear elevations and use of high quality traditional materials (stone and slate) with traditional architectural detailing, it is considered that the proposed development fully respects the character and appearance of the street scene and the High Peak more broadly.

Conditions will be necessary to secure details relating to all facing materials and boundary treatment, particularly given the sensitivity of the site on a prominent corner plot.

Subject to appropriate conditions the application is considered to be in full accordance with LP Policies S1 and EQ6, the High Peak Design Guide SPD and relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Amenity

LP Policy H3 requires all new housing development to result in a high standard of amenity for all future occupiers by ensuring that dwellings comply with Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), with regards to the overall internal floor area and size of bedrooms, based on number of storeys, and occupancy.

LP Policy EQ6 requires all new development to have a satisfactory relationship with existing land and buildings and protects the amenity of the area, which includes residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Aspects of residential amenity include impacts such as a loss of sunlight, overshadowing and overbearing impacts, loss of outlook, and loss of privacy.

LP Policy EQ10 seeks to ensure that people and the environment are protected from adverse impacts relating to issues including air pollution, noise, light pollution or any other nuisance or harm to amenity, by securing appropriate mitigation by way of planning conditions and obligations.

The High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD requires extensions to preserve the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, having regard amongst other things to the relationship between existing and proposed development, the positioning of windows, and the change in land levels. A minimum of 21m should be achieved between existing and proposed habitable windows.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that account is taken of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination.

Paragraph 198 of the NPPF goes on to state that decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the

potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development, which includes any impacts arising from noise.

Each property has 3no bedrooms, one of which is a single and two of which are doubles. Each bedroom meets or exceeds the minimum dimensions for a double (11.5m²) and single (7.5m²) and as such are acceptable with regards to the standard of amenity.

Based on maximum occupancy of 5no people, NDSS requires this property to have a minimal internal floor area of 99m². Each property is shown to have an internal floor area of 111swm, thereby exceeding minimum standards, and together with a reasonably sized garden, provides a high standard of amenity for future occupiers in accordance with LP Policy H3.

Turning to neighbouring residential amenity, Edward Street is a narrow street with the large building serving the 'Friendship Inn' Public House and two storey terraced properties situated on the eastern side of the site adjacent to the site.

As is typical for streets of this nature, there would be a distance of 13m separating the principal elevations of the proposed dwellings from the principal elevations of the Public House and nearest residential property No.72 Edward Street.

An objection has been received from the neighbour at No.72 on the grounds that their amenity would be harmed due to the sub-standard distance between their habitable windows and Plot 3. Objections are also made in connection with the construction phase of the development and resultant impacts on amenity.

The Proposed Site Plan helpfully shows the development in context with No.72 and confirms that the only fenestration that stands directly opposite this property is the ground floor entrance door and first floor window above serving the landing, both of which are not habitable. As such, it is not considered that the privacy of this neighbouring property will be compromised or adversely affected by the proposed development. Moreover, at a distance of 13m, it is not considered that there would be any other issues in relation to loss of sunlight or overbearing impacts.

Whilst it is accepted that habitable windows in Plots 1 and 2 would directly face ground and first floor windows in the adjacent Public House, this is a commercial/retail unit and does not contain any ancillary living accommodation for use by the general public at first floor level. As such, it is considered that the relationship between residential development and this neighbouring Public House is acceptable having regard to the amenity of both existing and proposed development. In any event, Glossop is home to a number of older narrower streets whereby a shorter distance between habitable windows is commonplace.

There are no residential properties to the east, west or south of the site that would be materially impacted by the proposed development with regards to overbearing impacts, overlooking, privacy or loss of sunlight.

As such, subject to conditions that require bathroom windows to be obscure glazed, there are not considered to be any adverse harm to neighbouring residential amenity

arising from this proposed development in accordance with LP Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD and paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

Turning to matters of public amenity, the Environmental Health Officer has recommended a pre-commencement condition to deal with matters of land contamination, which is considered to be reasonable and necessary. Similarly, restrictions on the hours of demolition and construction are also required, and satisfactorily addressed concerns raised by neighbouring occupiers. However, there are some recommended conditions which are covered by other environmental legislation and would not therefore meet the relevant tests within the online PPG and paragraph 57 of the NPPF.

Subject to all conditions considered to be reasonable and necessary to make the application acceptable in planning terms, the application is considered to be compliant with regards matters of public amenity, having regard to LP Policy EQ10 and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

Ecology and BNG

The Environment Act (2021) places a legal requirement on all applications unless otherwise exempt, to provide a 10% uplift in Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) either on site, or, if this cannot be achieved, off-site in the form of credits purchased from a registered Habitat Bank.

LP Policy EQ5 requires all new development proposals to demonstrate that any protected species and habitats within the site will not be adversely affected and seeks to promote a nett gain in biodiversity by securing appropriate mitigation and ecological enhancements where appropriate.

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural environment and local environment by (amongst other things):

- d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs;

Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, applications should apply a number of principles, which includes the following:

- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

The application in its original form was not accompanied by any assessment of protected species. Subsequently, a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment has been submitted together with further presence/absence surveys, in light of the recommendations contained within the Preliminary Assessment. The applicant has since also submitted a Biodiversity Net Gain Metric and Gain Plan.

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust have confirmed in their latest response that they are satisfied with the recommendations made within the reports and that conditions are necessary to secure ecological enhancement mitigation and a lighting strategy.

With regards BNG, Derbyshire Wildlife Trust have confirmed that 0.0481 units will need to be delivered off-site, given that there is no scope to deliver this gain on site. The draft Gain Plan shows that the purchase of 0.1 habitat units is available at a cost of £1902.

The applicant has confirmed that the intention is to purchase this credit from a registered Habitat Bank. As such, subject to a standard pre-commencement condition requiring the submission and approval of a Biodiversity Gain Plan, there is no requirement for a Habitat Management Plan condition.

Subject to compliance with relevant conditions, the application achieves the legal 10% uplift in BNG and is acceptable with regards any potential impacts to protected species, in accordance with LP Policy EQ5, relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 15 of the NPPF, and the Environment Act (2021).

Parking Provision and Highway Safety

LP Policy CF6 seeks to ensure that development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner and that all new development is located where it can be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing highway network and provides suitable off-street parking provision in accordance with guidelines set out under Appendix 1 of the Local Plan.

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that in assessing sites for specific applications, it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF goes on to state that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impact impacts on the road network would be severe.

The application site is situated off Edward Street within the heart of Glossop, within walking distance to the Town Centre. The proposals do not include any provision for off-street parking, which are grounds for objection from the neighbouring property. Parking guidelines contained under Appendix 1 of the Local Plan state that 3no bedroom properties should be supported by a minimum of 2no parking spaces, thereby resulting in a shortfall of 6no spaces. There is therefore technical conflict with LP Policy CF6 in this regard as the development would lead to an increase in on-street parking.

However, it is important to consider the specific characteristics of the site and its context. It is widely common for properties adjoining narrow streets such as Edward Street to not benefit from any off-street parking provision.

When considering this characteristic of Glossop, alongside its highly sustainable location within the built-up area boundary of the town within walking distance of the Town Centre, being well served by public transport, it is considered that in case, the absence of off-street parking provision does not generate a credible or sustainable reason for refusal that could be defended at appeal, particularly given that there are no objections from the Highways Authority.

As such, whilst there is a degree of conflict with LP Policy CF6, it is not considered that the absence of off-street parking would lead to any unacceptable impacts to highway safety, and thus the application is acceptable having regard to relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

Flooding and Drainage

LP Policy EQ11 refers to Flood Risk Management and requires all applications to demonstrate that the proposed development will not give rise to any unacceptable increase in flood risk either onsite or elsewhere in the Borough. Chapter 14 of the NPPF contains the national planning policies aimed at meeting the challenge of climate change including flood risk.

The application site lies within Flood Zone 1 and therefore owing to the scale of development, is not required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. However, in light of comments received from United Utilities, it is considered both reasonable and necessary to apply a planning condition as recommended which secures a detailed drainage strategy for the site prior to commencement of development.

Subject to compliance with this condition, there are not considered to be any adverse impacts to flood risk or drainage arising from this development in accordance with LP Policy EQ11 and relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 14 of the NPPF.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

LP Policy S1a reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means:

- approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
- where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
 - i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or

- ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of a redundant light industrial/commercial unit that is considered to fall under Class E(g) and the erection of 3 no dwellinghouses with associated amenity spaces.

The application is supported by professional surveys and reports that demonstrate to the satisfaction of Officers that despite the building not being offered on the open market, the ongoing use of the premises in its current form is unlikely to be financially viable, given the structural damage and need for demolition and significant rebuilding works. As such, the principal of development is acceptable having regard to LP Policy E4.

In any event, this policy is one that restricts the supply of housing, and is therefore out-of-date in light of the fact that the Council cannot at the time of writing demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land. As such, given the fact that the building has been redundant for a considerable amount of time, and requires a significant amount of restoration works to be re-used for its current lawful use, little weight can be given to this policy in the overall balance.

For the reasons outlined in detail within this report, the proposed development is acceptable in all other aspects and is therefore fully compliant with the Local Development Plan, relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance, and relevant paragraphs contained within the NPPF.

Therefore subject to conditions, the application is found to constitute a sustainable form of development and in line with LP Policy S1a and paragraph 11 of the NPPF is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

Case Officer: James Stannard

Recommendation Date: 13th October 2025

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council