

High Peak Borough Council
Buxton Town Hall
Market Place
Buxton
Derbyshire
SK17 6EL

First Floor
9 Bond Court
Leeds
LS1 2JZ
T: 0113 242 5155

Your ref: HPK/2024/0481
Our ref: J0050400

rachael.simpkin@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk

25th July 2025

Dear Rachael,

OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON LAND AT TALBOT ROAD, GLOSSOP (LPA REF. HPK/2024/0481)

We write in relation to the above outline planning application for the proposed development of up to 110 residential dwellings on land comprising the former Glossopdale Community College Lower Site, Talbot Road, Glossop (application ref: HPK/2024/0481).

Following our previous correspondence regarding the Planning Policy Team comments, site sections, and extension of time, we have also recently provided additional details and updates relating to air quality and highways. We now write in response to comments raised by yourself, Sport England, HPBC's Leisure and Environment Team following receipt of their comments.

Lawful Use

We wish to make several clarifications and comments in light of the consultation response from Sport England.

Firstly, we welcome Sport England's acknowledgement that they are a non-statutory consultee for this application.

On the matter of the lawful use of the site, Sport England comment that "*the lawful planning use of a disused playing field site is still that of a playing field...*". We wish to take this opportunity to clarify that the use of the playing field was ancillary to the previous educational use at the site. The playing field was not a standalone, separate playing field and we understand from the applicant that the play areas were only open and available to school pupils and not for public/community use. As such, we consider that the lawful use of the site is for education i.e. Use Class F1, and not playing fields, which fall within Use Class F2.

The site has not been used as a playing field in the last 5 years (i.e. since September 2018) nor is it allocated as such in the development plan.

Replacement Provision

As you are aware, the school previously operating from this site relocated in accordance with relevant planning permission (ref. CD1/0216/137) and consequently the use of the playing field ceased upon relocation of the

school to the replacement Hadfield school, which contains appropriate replacement sport provision to meet the needs of school pupils who have transferred from this site.

Therefore, as previously set out, the application site has been unavailable and unused since September 2018 when the school closed, and pupils transferred to the replacement school at Hadfield. The school buildings were demolished and the site cleared in line with HPBC's approval under application reference DET/2019/0008. The approved plan advised that all existing tarmacadam car parks and hard landscaped areas would be removed, which has now occurred.

Sport England now seeks the retention/replacement of playing fields/pitches which do not exist and have not done so since the demolition and clearance of the site as approved by HPBC. We are not aware that the LPA raised any concerns at that stage in respect of the loss of playing fields or in respect of the proposed restoration works and did not request, for example, that the site be levelled/graded and laid to grass e.g. to provide a grass playing field.

Planning Appeal & Judgment

Sport England reference an appeal decision (appeal ref. APP/Q3115/W/22/3292619) although we consider this is not directly relevant to this proposal. Whilst it relates to a proposal for residential development of a site, that site was in use as a recreation ground/club, which would fall within Use Class F2, unlike this application site, which has a lawful use falling within Use Class F1.

We note that you have referred to a recent High Court judgment and would welcome your clarification as to which part(s) of this you intend to rely on in your recommendation to refuse the application and how this applies to this application.

Planning Balance

Notwithstanding the above, we consider that the proposed benefits of the scheme, as listed below, are sufficient to outweigh any perceived harm through the loss of playing field and that the council's lack of five-year housing land supply is such that the tilted balance (Paragraph 11d of the NPPF) applies to the decision-making process.

Paragraph 11d requires that:

"where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date⁸, granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance⁷ 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 combination⁹."*

Footnote 7 refers to policies relating to matters including habitats sites, SSSIs, Green Belt, Local Green Space, National Landscape, National Park, designated heritage assets, and flood risk. We consider that none of these policies are applicable to this site.

Footnote 9 identifies those policies as those within paragraphs 66 (affordable housing), 84 (isolated homes in the countryside), 91 (town centre uses), 110 (sustainable transport), 115 (sustainable transport and

accessibility), 129 (efficient use of land), 135 (design), and 139 (design) of the NPPF. Again, we consider that the development does not contradict any of these policies and note that paragraph 104 is not included in the list of footnote 9 policies.

As such, we consider that the tilted balance afforded by paragraph 11d is applicable and supports this development, which we consider does not create any adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme as set out in the policy tests above.

We consider that there are several significant benefits of the scheme, including:

- Delivery of up to 110 dwellings
- Delivery of 30% affordable dwellings
- Redevelopment of a previously developed land in a sustainable location
- Biodiversity Net Gain of up to 140%

Further to the above, the proposed indicative site layout and associated parameters plan indicate areas of open space totalling circa 1.6ha to be provided within the site.

In light of recent national planning reforms, the LPA is required to significantly increase housing delivery, and therefore planning permissions for residential development, in order to meet the housing needs for the district and to demonstrate the required five-year supply of housing sites. This development will provide a significant and valuable contribution towards meeting the housing needs of the district and Glossop sub-area, which we consider should be afforded significant weight.

The site constitutes previously developed land which is located within the existing urban area of Glossop and represents a well-located and well-connected, sustainable site for residential development. The site would make a significant contribution towards the council's housing need without encroachment into the Green Belt and open countryside surrounding Glossop.

As the council cannot demonstrate the necessary five-year housing land supply, and that the tilted balance provided by NPPF paragraph 11(d) applies, we consider that significant weight should be afforded to the delivery of much-needed housing in a sustainable and accessible location.

We look forward to your response and confirmation in response to the points noted above.

Yours sincerely,



Richard Holliday MRTPI
Associate Partner

E: richard.holliday@carterjonas.co.uk

T: 0113 824 2379

M: 07977 914 141