

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

NMA/2026/0002
Valid 20/01/2026

**FORMER SHIRE HILL
HOSPITAL BUTE STREET
GLOSSOP**

**NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT
IN RELATION TO
APP/H1033/W/21/3286543 TO
AMEND PROPOSAL
DESCRIPTION**

**(NON MATERIAL
AMENDMENTS)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Is the proposed amendment non material?

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

Shire Hill Hospital is located to the North east of Glossop, approximately 1.6km from the town centre, and to the north of Old Glossop. The hospital closed in 2018 and was until recently a vacant site comprising 1.7 hectares of land made up of several buildings, access roads and car parking. The site formerly comprised the former Glossop Union Workhouse constructed between 1832 and 1834, along with an infirmary building added in 1890's-1920's, a former barn (of unknown date) and other more modern buildings and associated ancillary structures such as an electricity substation, bin stores and gas store all surrounded by car parking.

PROPOSAL

This non-material amendment application seeks to amend the description of development as provided on the original outline consent, HPK/2019/0316. The proposed amendment to the description of development is as follows:

Redevelopment of the Shire Hill Hospital site for residential development including partial demolition and partial rebuilding of the former Administration Building

The original description of development as set out on the appeal decision issued in September 2022, reads as follows:

Redevelopment of the Shire Hill Hospital for residential development including the retention and conversion of the for Administration Building

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2026/0026 - Application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) to Vary Conditions 1 and 2 of Reserved Matters Permission Reference HPK/2023/0337 – Pending

HPK/2023/0337 – Application for the approval of reserved matters in relation to HPK/2019/0316 seeking approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 41 dwellings (use class C3) together with associated access, parking and landscaping – approved 07/05/2024

HPK/2019/0316 – Redevelopment of the Shire Hill Hospital for residential development including the restoration and conversion of the for Administration Building – Refused, allowed at appeal 05/09/2022

NMA/2024/0035 - Non material amendment relating to outline consent
HPK/2019/0316 - Wording of Conditions – Approved 31/12/2024

NMA/2025/0025 - Non material amendment in relation to HPK/2023/0337 - amendments to roof structures – Approved 12/08/2025

NMA/2025/0003 - Non material amendment relating to HPK/2023/0337 - alteration to site access from Bute Street - Pending

CONSULTATIONS

N/A

OFFICER COMMENTS

Background

In September 2025, the Council received a complaint that works were underway at the site involving the demolition of the former Administration Block. A site visit revealed that of the four walls of the building, three had been demolished with only the front wall remaining. As such the Council considered that the removal of three of the four walls amounted to a breach of the outline planning consent, ultimately concluding that the consent could no longer be implemented. The developer was advised to stop all works. Since this time, scaffolding has been erected to ensure that the single wall is stable and all other works at the site have ceased. On the 26th November 2025, the Council wrote to the developer advising that due to the extent of demolition, a fresh application would be needed to regularise the works to date.

Discussion

There is no statutory definition of 'non-material'. This is because it will be dependent on the context of the overall scheme – an amendment that is non-material in one context may be material in another. The local planning authority must be satisfied that the amendment sought is non-material in order to grant an application under

section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This application seeks to amend the description of development to refer to the partial demolition and partial rebuilding of the former Administration Building.

Planning permission was granted in September 2022 for the redevelopment of the site, at appeal, whereby the Planning Inspector addressed the matter of the description of development at paragraph 2 of the appeal decision. Specifically, the Inspector stated that:

The appellants confirmed at the Hearing that the proposals seek to demolish all buildings apart from the former Administration Building.

With respect to the Administration Block, the Planning Inspector concluded that:

“The Administration Block is the most prominent building when entering into the site. Its retention, as part of the scheme, along with the modified access road and vegetation either side would preserve a key part of the site’s character. Moreover, the associated historical interest of the former workhouse building would be preserved. The removal of detracting elements would also be a benefit of the proposed development.

It is evident that the Planning Inspector considered that the former Administration block would be retained and converted and this was material to his assessment of the overall planning balance in the application. However, just one wall now remains, which is considered to go well beyond the description of development which specifically refers to the “retention and conversion” of the building. It is no longer possible to convert the building as only a single wall remains.

The loss of historic fabric, a key issue identified by the Planning Inspector, coupled with the level of local interest in and objection to the demolition of the building indicate that this is a material change. The only matter for consideration is whether the proposed changes to the description of development are non material or not, which for the above reasons are considered to be a material change. Whether the proposed change to the description of development is acceptable or not would be a matter for a fresh planning application.

Moreover, the viability of the overall scheme was discussed at length at the Informal Hearing and the Council would wish to reexamine the viability of the development which was previously accepted and consented on the basis of retention of the administration block.

As set out in paragraph 17a-009-20140306 of the PPG the non material amendment procedure cannot be used to make a material amendment.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In conclusion, it is considered that within the context of the application, the proposed amendment to the description of development is material. The proposed changes to are not minor in nature and therefore should be considered as a fresh planning application.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : **Refuse as a non-material amendment**

Case Officer: Jane Colley

Recommendation Date: 05/02/2026

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council