

As residents of Fauvel Road, we support the LPA's decision to refuse application HPK/2024/0481. The reasons for refusal are robust, sound and relate to genuine planning matters and specific adopted planning policies.

We made comments to the planning application, and those comments still stand and we would be grateful if the Inspector would review these in detail and take them in to consideration as part of their assessment.

Notwithstanding our previous comments we would like to make the following additional comments on the basis of the Appellant's SOC and the updated Parameters Plan.

Firstly, as we have stated previously, whilst we accept the principle of residential development at the Former Glossopdale School site, it would be our preference that at least a portion of the site could be redeveloped to provide some form of community amenity, such as a Medical Centre or Leisure Centre to meet the ever-growing needs of the population of Glossop. Nevertheless, we make the following comments on the appeal scheme:

### **Scale of Development**

We support the cap of development at 100 units; this must be written in to the Description of Development and we would ask the Inspector to ensure this.

The previously circulated information and indeed information contained in some of the outline submission documents state (and stated) that after consideration of the site constraints, impact on neighbours, change in levels, appropriateness of scale, density and massing it was concluded that a density of 33 dwellings per hectare is appropriate at this site. Therefore, a total of 100 units was proposed.

The supporting documents to the application and subsequent appeal have been ambiguous and misleading around the proposed density and capacity of the site, with documents referring to a range from 100 units at 33dph, 105 units at 33dph and 110 at 35dph. This needs to be crystallised by the appeal.

The true scale and extent of the development needs to be made clear so that a proper and thorough assessment can be carried out.

### **Design Parameters**

Another area of concern is the potential height of proposed dwellings and in particular Feature Buildings and corner turners. Notoriously, such properties tend to be of an increased height and an alternative design so as to create a "sense of place". We would comment that generally what results is actually a building that stands at odds with the neighbouring properties and appears at odds with the character of the area.

As part of the parameters of the appeal, we respectfully request that dwelling heights are limited to 2 storeys by condition, should the Inspector be minded to allow the appeal. This would ensure the development accords with Local Plan policy EQ6.

We would also comment that in order to reflect the street pattern of the surrounding area, density should actually decrease the further north one travels through the development site. Street patterns in the locality are fairly rigid and formal with high density closer to the town centre, i.e. in the south. Travelling northwards, in particular along Fauvel Road and Talbot Road the street pattern is linear, single sided with spacious plots, the same should be reflected in any new development. Equally it is important to acknowledge that the site sits between two Conservation Areas therefore design and material palette will be important details to consider, consult on and get right.

In refusing the application the LPA cited Reason for Refusal 2 which relates to insufficient information being provided to demonstrate how the scheme can achieve both high quality design and acceptable amenity standards. The LPA refer back to policies S1, S5, H1, H2 and EQ6 of the Adopted Local Plan, the High Peak Design Guidance 2018 and Residential Guidance 2005 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This reason for refusal still stands.

It is understood that the application was made in outline and therefore detailed design matters are to be dealt with at the Reserved Matters stage, however this site is sandwiched between two Conservation Areas in the northern, verdant part of Glossop. This area has not been subjected to large scale residential development to date and as such appears as a pocket of Victorian charm in the town. Rightly so, the LPA has in the past sought to prepare a Development Brief for this site, unfortunately this was not adopted however it does provide a direction of travel and some context and it should be considered in the assessment of any proposed development scheme on this site as a material consideration (the weight that can be applied to this document will be at the decision maker's discretion).

With regard to the revised Parameters Plan (Drawing 10592-LDA-XX-XX-DG-UD-3001-P01) we remain concerned and unclear why the entire extent of the site of features a green buffer between the proposed Residential Development area and the existing dwellings bar those on two sections of Fauvel Road. On review of the previous iteration of the Parameters Plan and indeed the Comparison Plan contained at Appendix O to the appellant's SOC, it can be seen that the Residential Development area previously shown went right up to the boundary to the west of the site and almost right up to the boundary to the east. Why has this offset been provided elsewhere around the entire development parcel but not in these two sections on Fauvel Road? If a buffer and offset is relevant and applicable to the north, west and south, why is the same not required to the east? A 6 metre buffer is apparent between the rear of North Road properties and the edge of the Net Developable Area boundary, but no such buffer is afforded to Fauvel Road properties.

We request that the Parameters Plan is amended to show a green buffer, commensurate with that shown to the existing properties on the western boundary with North Road is reflected along the eastern boundary with the rear of properties on Fauvel Road. In particular the section to the rear of numbers 36-42 Fauvel Road, as if one actually reviews the rear garden

sizes of these dwellings, they are in fact much shorter than those elsewhere on the road and indeed compared to those on North Road, where a significant buffer has been deemed necessary. It appears unjustified to provide a buffer around the entire development parcel perimeter except in this location. Ensuring that development contributes positively to the relationship with adjacent buildings, and does not result in visual intrusion, overlooking and an overbearing effect are key requirements of Local Plan policy EQ6 and therefore this should be addressed.

It is appreciated that the appeal relates to an outline application with the only detailed matter being access. However, if the Inspector is minded to allow the appeal, as above we respectfully request the Parameter Plan is amended as noted above and we request that condition is attached to any such permission to require a Design Code to be prepared, submitted and approved by the LPA in advance of a Reserved Matters application. This would ensure that sufficient guidance is set to control the Reserved Matters application in due course and to deliver a scheme that is appropriate in this location.

A Design Code would be relevant in accordance with Local Plan policies:

- S1 – which notes development must take account of the distinct Peak District character, landscape, townscape, roles and setting of different areas and settlements in the High Peak; and it must protect and enhance the natural and historic environment of the High Peak and its surroundings.
- S5 – which highlights the need to promote and maintain the distinct identity of the settlements that make up Glossopdale and to protect and enhance the historic environment.
- EQ6 – which requires all development to be well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to both its environment and the challenge of climate change, whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place. The policy continues that that development will be required to contribute positively to an area's character, history and identity in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials, and the relationship to adjacent buildings and landscape features.

Such a condition could be worded as follows:

*“No application for Reserved Matters shall be submitted until a comprehensive Design Code for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*The Design Code shall be prepared generally in accordance with the principles set out in the Parameter Plan [Drawing Reference] and shall include details regarding:*

- *The layout of streets, blocks, and movement networks;*
- *Single-sided roads with spacious plots;*
- *Density to reduce to the north;*

- *Tree-lined roads;*
- *Building typologies, heights, massing, and scale parameters;*
- *Architectural detailing and the palette of external materials;*
- *Victorian Villa style elevations and roof pitches;*
- *Public realm, hard/soft landscaping, and boundary treatments, including buffers to surrounding dwellings;*
- *Parking strategies, refuse storage, and cycle integration;*
- *Sustainable urban drainage (SuDS) integration.*

*All subsequent Reserved Matters applications shall be in accordance with the approved Design Code."*

*Reason: To ensure a high quality of design and a cohesive approach to the development across the site in accordance with High Peak Local Plan Policy and the National Planning Policy Framework."*

These design principles should be set as part of a Design Code to ensure that future Reserved Matters applications adhere to these principles which are completely lacking from the current outline scheme. Attaching such a condition would render the outline proposal acceptable.

### **Drainage**

In addition to the above, we remain concerned regarding drainage. The topography of the site varies significantly with an overall drop in gradient north to south, much like the rest of the area surrounding. As such, Spire Hollin sits at a lower level, during periods of heavy rainfall (of which there are ever increasing occurrences) both North Road and Fauvel Road, which sit on slopes, act as channels for the flow of water, this water then collects and pools naturally at the lowest points. Properties and gardens on Spire Hollin are already affected by flooding due to run off from the old school grounds as well as the downhill flow previously mentioned. This will only be exacerbated by increased hard standing areas.

This is picked up on the Constraints Plan (albeit it is difficult to see as the yellow annotation sits directly on top of the blue surface water flooding annotation). And indeed, the submitted FRA notes that Surface Water flooding risk is medium to high. It is respectfully requested that a condition is included to ensure that appropriate land drains are installed along the full extent of the eastern and western boundaries of the site with Fauvel Road and North Road (these could connect into the existing culvert) to ensure that surface water can appropriately drain and avoid pooling at the bottom of gardens.

Pooling of water at low points where rear gardens meet back to back is commonplace in new build developments and this will be exacerbated on this site as a result of the topography and the channel like nature of both North and Fauvel Road mentioned above. Again, it is

appreciated that this is only an outline scheme, however setting these principles and parameters at this stage is good practice and ensures the Reserved matters application addresses these issues.

### **Sports Fields**

We support the LPA in the Reason for Refusal 1 and remain of the opinion that the appellant has not demonstrated that the loss of playing field land has been addressed via re-provision elsewhere with an alternative facility of equal or better quality. Insufficient information has been submitted with the proposal to clearly demonstrate how the development would accord with policy exception 4 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy in relation to the provision of specific details of the replacement playing field.

The appellant has failed to address this reason for refusal and has not undertaken an open space or playing field assessment to justify this outright loss. The submission of an Agronomy Report as an attempt to demonstrate how difficult it would be to provide playing pitches does not equate to a playing pitch or open space assessment. The appellant has failed to consider the playing pitch needs of the Local Authority and has not justified the loss of this playfield field land.

Accordingly, the proposal would not accord with policies S1, S5, H1 and CF4 of the Adopted Local Plan, the exceptions of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy or paragraph 104 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

### **Summary**

It is respectfully requested that the Inspector dismiss the appeal for the same reasons as the LPA refused the outline planning application. There has been no material change to circumstances and the appellant has not provided any further justification for the scheme.

However, in the event that the Inspector is minded to allow the appeal, we respectfully request that the Parameters Plan is amended to provide a green buffer between the proposed Residential Area and the rear of properties on Fauvel Road, of equal proportion to that shown on the western boundary with North Road. In addition, to a condition requiring a Design Code, as set out within this submission to ensure the proposal is in accordance with Local Plan Policies S1, S5 and EQ6, the High Peak Design Guidance 2018 and Residential Guidance 2005 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

We reserve the right as residents to attend the Planning Inquiry in due course and speak in objection to the appeal and ensure our comments are heard.