

**HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

8th September 2025

Application No:	HPK/2024/0481	
Location	Glossopdale Community College, Lower Site, Talbot Road, Glossop	
Proposal	Outline planning application for the construction of up to 110 dwellings, with all matters reserved (except principal points of access) including all associated ancillary works and engineering operations	
Applicant	Derbyshire County Council	
Agent	Cartar Jonas LLP	
Parish/ward	Glossop	Date registered: 07.01.25
If you have a question about this report please contact: Rachael Simpkin, Tel. 01298 28400 extension 4922, rachael.simpkin@highpeak.gov.uk		

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

1. REASON FOR COMMITTEE DETERMINATION

- 1.1 This application has been brought before the Development Control Committee as the proposal constitutes major development exceeding 1.0 hectare (ha).

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The 4.75 hectare (ha) broadly triangular shaped application site partly comprises previously developed land (excluding the 2.6 ha playing field land) and lies to the north of Glossop Town Centre. Existing vehicular access points are from Talbot Road (x2) and North Road (x1). The site accommodated Glossopdale Community College prior to its relocation to a single site at Newshaw Lane, Hadfield in 2018. Subsequently, the school buildings have been demolished and hard surface areas removed during 2021. The site is now considered to be vacant.
- 2.2 The site generally slopes in a north to south direction, with the former school and sports pitch development accommodated by land terracing. The southern most terrace leads to steeply sloped land along the site's southern and western periphery. Residential streets primarily consisting of two-storey detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings directly adjoin the application site in relation to: North Road (west), Spire Hollins (south) and Fauvel Road (southeast). Larger properties in spacious plots lie opposite on Talbot Road (north).

- 2.3 The Environment Agency's Flood Zone Map confirms the application site to be located within Flood Zone 1 (i.e. the lowest probability of flood risk). The site is bounded by hedgerows interspersed by some trees along the eastern, southern and western boundaries. Furthermore, there are some trees alongside the northern periphery, with a grouping located within the northeast corner of the site.
- 2.4 The Howard Park Conservation Area's southern most boundary opposes part of the application site's northern boundary. Whilst the Norfolk Square Extension Conservation Area's northwest boundary traverses Fauvel Road to the southeast of the site. The closest listed building to the application site is the Grade II listed Victoria Hall and Public Library, which is located approximately 100.0 metres to the south.
- 2.5 The site is unallocated in the Adopted High Peak Local Plan, but lies within the built up area boundary of Glossop. Other local plan designations include the Aerodrome Safeguarding for Manchester Airport and Smoke Zones Glossop 4.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Outline planning permission is sought for a residential development of up to 110 dwellings, with all matters reserved, except for principal points of access. The proposed development would be served via three points of access, with reference to the two new vehicular points off Talbot Road and the existing access from North Road, which would serve both pedestrian and cyclists only and would form the access matters sought for approval at the outline stage.
- 3.2 The applicant's Parameters Plan is further sought for approval as part of the outline application submission. It is intended to set appropriate development parameters for any future reserved matter(s) application.
- 3.3 In addition, the submitted indicative Concept Plan illustrates how a residential development of up to 110 dwellings (at a housing density of c.33 dwellings per ha) could be brought forward for the application site at the reserved matters stage.
- 3.4 In addition to the Planning Statement, the following documents accompany the application submission:
- Completed Application Forms and Ownership Certificates
 - Covering Letter (prepared by Carter Jonas LLP)
 - Site Location Plan (ref. J0053214_CJ_MP_PL_005_V1, prepared by Carter Jonas LLP, dated October 2024)
 - Considerations Plan (ref. J0053214_CJ_MP_PL_001_V2, prepared by Carter Jonas LLP, dated October 2024)
 - Parameter Plan (ref. J0053214_CJ_MP_PL_004_V2, prepared by Carter Jonas LLP, dated October 2024)

- Concept Plan (ref. J0053214_CJ_MP_PL_002_V2, prepared by Carter Jonas LLP, dated October 2024)
- Land Use and Accommodation Schedule (ref. J0053214_CJ_MP_002_V2, prepared by Carter Jonas LLP)
- Drawing Issue Sheet (ref. J0053214, prepared by Carter Jonas LLP)
- Design and Access Statement (ref. J0053214_CJ_MP_102_PL_V1, prepared by Carter Jonas LLP, dated October 2024)
- Heritage Statement (ref. LPA254-CAJ09, prepared by Prospect Archaeology, dated August 2024)
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and BNG Assessment (ref. 15974_R01_NB, prepared by Tyler Grange, dated 12 August 2024)
- Drainage Strategy and Flood Risk Assessment (ref. 00.23181-ACE-ZZ-ZZ-RP-C-0001, prepared by Adept Consulting Engineers Ltd, dated 8 November 2024)
- Transport Assessment (ref. VN232727, prepared by SLR Consulting Ltd, dated 25 October 2024)
- Travel Plan (ref. VN232727, prepared by SLR Consulting Ltd, dated 25 October 2024)
- Landscape and Visual Appraisal (ref. 067-027-R01, prepared by DRaW (UK) Ltd, dated 6 September 2023)
- Phase I Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report (ref. HSP2021-C3678-G-GPI-439, prepared by hsp consulting, dated 10 March 2022)
- Phase II Geo-Environmental Assessment Report (ref. HSP2022-C3678-G-GPII-518, prepared by hsp consulting, dated 10 March 2022)
- Landscape Planning Designations and Constraints (ref. no. 1, prepared by DRaW (UK) Ltd, dated 10 August 2023)
- Landscape Character Areas (ref. no. 2, prepared by DRaW (UK) Ltd, dated 10 August 2023)
- Topography Drawing (ref. no. 3, prepared by DRaW (UK) Ltd, dated 10 August 2023)
- Zone of Theoretical Visibility & Viewpoint Locations (ref. no. 4, prepared by DRaW (UK) Ltd, dated 17 August 2023)
- Tree Constraints Plan (ref. TWC1378-D-001, prepared by The Tree and Woodland Company, dated 16 August 2023)
- Arboricultural Summary (ref. TWC1178, prepared by The Tree and Woodland Company, dated 17 August 2023)
- Tree Survey Schedule (ref. TWC1378-S-001, prepared by The Tree and Woodland Company, dated 16 August 2023)

3.5 The following revised documents and plans have been further submitted by the applicant:

- Illustrative Site Sections A-AA, B-BB AND C-CC dated 19th May 2025
- Applicant Letter of Response dated 19th May 2025
- Applicant Response to Planning Policy Comments dated 19th May 2025

- Glossopdale Post Demolition land Survey received 4th June 2025
- Illustrative Site Sections Drawing received 23rd May 2025
- Applicant Letter of Response (various) dated 25th July 2025
- Updated Highway Drawings received 23rd July 2025
 - Proposed Modal Filter Location Plan ref. 415.065105-D100 Rev A dated 21st July 2025
 - Proposed Modal Filter Access (North Street) ref. 415.065105-D101 Rev A dated 21st July 2025
 - Proposed Modal Filter Access (Talbot Road) ref. 415.065105-D102 Rev A dated 21st July 2025
- Technical Note SLR Highway Response to comments from Derbyshire County Council Highway Department dated 22nd July 2025
- Travel Plan, Talbot Road, Glossop ref. SLR Project No.: VN232727 Revision: 03 dated 8th July 2025
- Air Quality Assessment Talbot Road, Glossop ref. VAL-24-0073 dated July 2025
- Proposed density and quantum of development Letter dated 7th August 2025
- Response to LLFA Objection
- Drainage Strategy & Flood Risk Assessment ref. 00.23181-ACE-ZZ-ZZ-RP-C-0001 (Revision P4) dated 15th August 2025
- Drainage Strategy & Flood Risk Assessment ref. 00.23181-ACE-ZZ-ZZ-RP-C-0001 (Revision P5) dated 21st August 2025
- Considerations Plan (ref. J0053214_CJ_MP_PL_001_V4, prepared by Carter Jonas LLP, dated August 2025)

3.6 The application and details attached to it, including the plans, supporting documents, representations made by residents and the responses from consultees can be found on the Council's website at:-

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=268706XXX>

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| DET/2019/0008 | Demolition of existing building and engineering block at Glossopdale Community College Lower Site Talbot Road Glossop SK13 7DR. Approved 31/07/2020 |
| DOC/2020/0099 | Discharge of condition 3 and 4 in relation to DET/2019/0008 at Glossopdale Community College Lower Site Talbot Road Glossop. Approved 11/03/2021 |

5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Adopted High Peak Local Plan 2016

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

S2 Settlement Hierarchy
 S3 Strategic Housing Development
 S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
 H1 Location of New Housing Development
 H2 Housing Allocations
 H3 New Housing Development
 EQ1 Climate Change
 EQ2 Landscape Character
 EQ5 Biodiversity
 EQ6 Design and Place Making
 EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
 EQ9 Trees, Woodlands and hedgerows
 EQ10 Pollution Control and Unstable Land
 EQ11 Flood Risk Management
 CF3 Local Infrastructure
 CF4 Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities
 CF5 Provision and Retention of Local Community Services and Facilities
 CF6 Accessibility and Transport
Other Evidence Base

High Peak Housing Economic Land Needs Assessment (2022)

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

High Peak Design Guide SPD (2018)
 Residential Guide SPD (2005)
 Planning Obligations SPD (2023)

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Guidance

6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Site notices	Posted: 27 th February 2025 (Expired 20 th March 2025)
Neighbour letters	Consulted: 22 nd January 2025 (Expired 12 th February 2025)
Press Notice	Published: 6 th February 2025 (Expired 6 th February 2025)

NEIGHBOURS

Neither (4):

- More houses in the UK are needed, but enough new houses have been built in Glossop without any serious consideration of infrastructure despite it being under extreme pressure.
- Many local residents cannot get their children into the school and have to seek placements out of the area, the emphasis should be to build an additional school, to accommodate all children in the area. The area should be for a new school rather than housing.

- The site would be better used to build much need additional services for the present residents. A Health Centre or a new Sports Centre would benefit all residents and be welcomed by all.
- The new dwellings will overlook the existing dwellings.
- The Land Use and Accommodation Schedule refers to 70% open market and 30% affordable housing. This would satisfy the Council's Policy H4 (Affordable Housing). However, under open market housing, the schedule sets out that 80% will be affordable rent and 20% will be shared ownership. These both appear to be affordable housing. Therefore, the schedule appears to say that all of the housing in the scheme will be affordable. This is at odds with the Planning Statement, Transport Assessment and the application form.
- The Transport Assessment sets out traffic estimates for the site operating as a school. This is then discounted from the traffic estimates for the residential scheme. The report concludes that there will be no impact on the surrounding roads. The use of the school as a base situation is very misleading as the school has been demolished for some time. The report should be revised to consider the residential traffic as new. Residential traffic will pass through the North Road/Dinting Road/Talbot Road, Woodhead Road/Hall Meadow Road/Norfolk Street/Talbot Road and Fauvel Road/Talbot Road junctions. In the case of the latter, Fauvel Road meets Talbot Road in close proximity to the Woodhead Road/Norfolk Street junction and is regularly blocked by queuing traffic. There is also very limited visibility to the left for a vehicle emerging from Fauvel Road. These junctions should be properly assessed to confirm that the new traffic can be accommodated or if mitigation is required.
- A residential scheme (Seddon Homes) is currently under construction on Dinting Road. There is also planning consent for a residential scheme at the former Shire Hill hospital. Both of these schemes will add traffic to the junctions listed above and this adds weight to completing detailed junction assessments
- The scheme includes a new footpath / cycle connection with North Road. However, there are no details of how cyclists will enter or leave North Road. The TA report does not include any traffic flow or speed information for North Road, which is well used as a link between Glossop and Hadfield.
- The scheme does not include any sustainable travel enhancements on the surrounding roads. There are existing bus stops near the stop which are basic in nature. There is an opportunity to upgrade some stops, particularly along the site frontage, to offer a shelter and real time information.

Objections (17):

- The area local / accessible NHS unit that can address the needs of people in the area. This would be a valuable asset to the local communities. The area has experienced the closure of 2 older existing

units and badly need, in line with the Labour Governments aims, of local NHS needs.

- Traffic is already a problem in Glossop and the increase in traffic from the development will only lead to more congestion on the already busy roads.
- The area needs a new school, a new dentist, a new doctors, new green space, new opportunities for young people, not 110 houses.
- There have been a large number of houses and new housing developments in Glossop over the last few years there has been no increase in infrastructure to support these.
- The site should be used for "Kings Woodland Plan" which focusses on biodiversity, community engagement and the creation of sustainable, accessible and valuable woodland spaces.
- The development will increase the risk of floods in the area.
- The development would have an overbearing impact, loss of privacy and harm to residential amenity.
- The proposed dwellings and development are not in keeping with the area and the height of the dwellings make them stand at odds with the neighbouring properties and appears at odds with the character of the area.
- From review of the Statement of Community Involvement the applicant asserts that requests from residents for increased buffers along the site boundaries have been addressed and widened buffers have been provided. Yet the residents fail to see this change in the submission in respect of the eastern boundary with the rear of properties on Fauvel Road.
- A 6-metre buffer is apparent between the rear of North Road properties and the edge of the Net Developable Area boundary (NDA hereafter), but no such buffer is provided to Fauvel Road properties. The orange dashed line that represents the NDA sits tight to the red edge boundary with Fauvel Road properties. There is no justification for this disproportionate provision and the Concept Masterplan should be updated to provide equal protection for residents' amenity on both sides of the development. 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.
- There is not enough infrastructure in the area to support the development.

CONSULTEES

CONSULTEE	COMMENT	OFFICER RESPONSE
Active Travel England	-	-

Active Travel England are not a statutory consultee for this planning application and therefore have not been consulted.

Alliance Waste

-

Refer to Updates Report

04.02.25:

Properties should be planned so bins can be stored within the property boundary and be moved to the presentation point without the need to go up or down steps or through the property. Garden gates need to be wide enough to accommodate a standard 240l wheeled bin.

Collection vehicles are unable to access the unadopted highway unless an indemnity form has been completed by the developer. In instances where there is no indemnity for properties, occupiers will have to present their bins at a point next to the nearest adopted highway.

All roads that are intended to be used for the purposes of waste collection must be suitable for a full size 32 tonne waste collection vehicle with a turning circle of 22.5m. It is advisable to design out the need for collection vehicles to reverse where possible. If reversing is unavoidable the following must be applied:

- waste collection vehicles should not reverse more than 12 meters
- the reverse should be straight and free from obstacles and visual obstructions.

Please provide a tracked plan to show waste collection vehicle access and turning and indicate waste collection points for each property on the plan.

Please provide as part of the planning application a tracked plan to show waste collection vehicle access and turning.

For multi-occupancy buildings / flats there must be an area on the site to store the bins; this can be a hard-standing or a bin store structure. There must be sufficient space within the storage area to accommodate the correct number of bins to prevent waste being dumped on the floor.

The bins storage areas must be designed so they are easily accessible for all residents, including those with mobility problems. Bin stores must have adequate lighting and ventilation.

Bin store doors must open outwards and be wide enough to accommodate an 1100l wheeled bin.

Doors must be fitted with a catch or similar device, to lock the door back into position to allow the crew to move bins safely in and out of the store with both hands, without having to hold/open the doors.

There must not be steps or raised door surrounds on the floor at the entrance to

the bin store, these prevent bins being wheeled safely and can be easily damaged.

Waste collection vehicles should be able to get within a minimum of 25m of the storage point and the gradient between the two should not exceed 1:12. However, BS 5906:2005 recommends shorter distances of 15m for two wheeled containers, and 10m for four wheeled contained. These recommendations should be followed where possible.

The access from the bin storage point to the collection vehicle should be concrete/paving/tarmac, not gravel or gravel. There must be dropped kerbs where necessary, no steps.

Pathways must be wide enough for an 1100l bin and must not be obstructed by planting, parked, cars or bollards.

If the bin structure has a roof it should be high enough for bin lids to open fully.

Do not provide combined bike and bin stores.

Derbyshire County Council Archaeology	Conditional Response	Refer to Heritage Section
--	-----------------------------	----------------------------------

28.03.25:

The former school site has no known heritage assets either on site or in the immediate vicinity. Although there is a background potential for previously undiscovered archaeological remains there would have been a very substantial impact to any below-ground survival from the school buildings, hard standings and pitches that covered the majority of the site from the later 20th century.

I therefore recommend on balance that there is no need for any archaeological input to these proposals.

Derbyshire County Council Authority	Outstanding	Refer to Drainage & Local Flood Risk Section
--	--------------------	---

A formal response is awaited from the LLFA regarding the recently submitted revised information.

17.01.25:

We are recommending an objection on the proposed development as it is not possible to provide an informed comment until such a time that the applicant has submitted further information to address the below points:

Properties around the boundary are modelled to be at flood risk, in particular to the southwest, this should be acknowledged in the FRA, i.e. the current risk.

Proposals have been put forward to capture flow from a spring and from outside the boundary and channel this around the site around the western boundary to the area at a high risk of flooding. No explanation of how these flows will be diverted safely off site without increasing the risk to adjacent properties has been provided. This would be described as an engineered point of discharge and as such needs to be addressed.

The culvert within the site is a proposed discharge point, however its condition and connectivity is currently unknown beyond that something is causing water levels to increase in the culvert. This prevented a survey of the culvert to confirm its condition and onward connectivity, this needs to be addressed before the LLFA can comment further. In addition, the proposed basin is at a lower elevation than the pond, how the basin will drain should be addressed.

UU have indicated they may accept a discharge to the Talbot Road surface water sewer but given the site topography this will require a pumped solution. A pumped solution has not been discussed in the event the culvert can't be utilised. As a statutory consultee for surface water the minimum details required on all major planning applications are as follows. The applicant has addressed most of these points, however, point 3 remains outstanding.

1. Site plan and impermeable area
2. Topographic survey of the site
3. Appropriate evidence to support how the site will drain, including confirmation of where the surface water will outfall to (photographs / maps / a confirmation letter from a water company)
4. Basic calculations of the greenfield/brownfield runoff and discharge rates
5. A quick storage estimate to show the required storage volume of surface water on site and an indication of the likely location
6. Calculations should include allowances for the current Environment Agency guidance for climate change and urban creep
7. Basic ground investigation (desktop survey as a minimum)
8. Major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which should provide multifunctional benefits wherever possible (as per National Planning Policy Framework 182). A range of sustainable drainage techniques must be considered prior to or in conjunction with the planning layout.
9. How the sustainable drainage systems integrate with the open space and green infrastructure should be described and what multifunctional benefits they provide should be stated, as per paragraph 59 of planning practice guidance (Aug 2022).

These details are required at the early planning stage to demonstrate that the proposed site is able to drain and that due consideration has been given to the space required on site for surface water storage.

Please note the level of detail submitted should be proportionate to the size and scale of the development.

Derbyshire County Council Place	Financial contribution sought	Refer to Planning Obligations Section
--	--------------------------------------	--

	towards SEND places @ £89,441.97 and Glossop Library (stock only) @ £7,751.92	
26.02.25: Education <u>SEND</u> A contribution towards SEND infrastructure will be requested for developments of 100 dwellings or more. The request for a contribution towards Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) provision is not subject to an analysis of capacity within a given geographical area, i.e. the locality within which the development is located. Rates of all types of SEND are increasing and special schools and Enhanced Resource School (ERS) units generally operate at or above capacity to avoid pupils being placed out of County. The pattern of provision across the County often involves pupils travelling a significant distance in order to access the most appropriate place to suit their needs. It is therefore not appropriate or possible to assess capacity against the need for places generated by any given development within any specific locality. The proposed development for 110 dwellings $\times 0.7/100 = 0.77$ pupil places. <u>Mitigation</u> The above analysis indicates that there would be a need to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on SEND infrastructure in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The County Council therefore requests financial contributions as follows: • £89,441.97 towards SEND places Libraries In this instance a stock only contribution of £7,751.92 is sought and is calculated as follows: 110 dwellings $\times 2.3$ (average household size) = 253 people 253 people $\times 1.532$ (stock level per person) = 388 stock items 388 (stock items) $\times$ £20 (cost per stock item) = £7,751.92 (i.e. £70.47 per dwelling). <i>Refer to the public file for the full response.</i>		
Derbyshire	County	Conditional Response Refer to Highway Safety &

Council Highways		Sustainable Transport Section
27.08.25: The details of the pedestrian/cycle access, as attached, are considered to be suitable. I refer you to the original LHA comments and recommended conditions; in light of the additional details of the pedestrian and cycle accesses now being submitted it is recommended that the 2nd condition is replaced with the following and the Travel Plan condition is revised as below: The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the cycle and pedestrian accesses to Talbot Road and North Road have been laid and constructed in accordance with the submitted drawings 415.0065105.00001 – D101 and D102. Reason: In the interest of highway safety. The Residential Travel Plan hereby approved, shall be implemented and monitored in accordance with the regime contained within the Plan. In the event of failing to meet the targets within the Plan a revised Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to address any shortfalls, and where necessary make provision for and promote improved sustainable forms of access to and from the site. The Plan thereafter shall be implemented and updated in agreement with the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented as amended. Reason: To reduce vehicle movements and promote sustainable access. 17.02.25: Derbyshire County Council, the Highway Authority acting in its role as Statutory Consultee has undertaken a full assessment of this planning application. Based on the appraisal of the development proposals, the Highways Development Management Manager on behalf of the County Council, under Article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order, 2015 has no objection subject to conditions and financial obligations. <u>Background</u> The application is for outline consent for up to 110 residential dwellings including access with all other matters reserved. The application site formerly accommodated a secondary school until it was disused and demolished circa 2018. The site has been left vacant since the school was demolished. <u>Site Access</u> The site is served by three existing accesses to Talbot Road consisting of two		

which serve as vehicle and pedestrian access and one which serves vehicles only. There is also a pedestrian only access off North Road which serves the western edge of the site.

The application proposes one new 'priority' access off Talbot Road with a width of 5.5m and 2m wide footways. The access is proposed to be provided with visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m in both directions. The Y distance of 43m is considered to be appropriate for the expected vehicle approach speeds on Talbot Road and is commensurate with the speed survey results included in the TA. It is also noted that there are two raised pedestrian crossing points / plateaus on Talbot Road which would assist in reducing vehicle speeds. It is considered that the proposed 'priority' access is acceptable to serve development on the site.

A new pedestrian / emergency access further east on Talbot Road is also proposed. This access appears to have a width of approximately 4.5m and has a 2m wide footway on the western side. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m are also considered achievable in both directions from the access along Talbot Road, although no reference is made to visibility splays in the TA or submitted plans.

However, it is not clear how this access is to be controlled for use by pedestrians / cyclists and / or emergency vehicles only. The TA comments that "There will also be opportunities to create new pedestrian and cycle accesses around the site onto Talbot Road and North Road, with the one off Talbot Road being also designed for emergency vehicle access". It is noted that the description of the application includes 'principle points of access', therefore, it may be that the applicants intention is for the pedestrian / emergency access not to be addressed at this stage and for details to be submitted at reserved matters stage, but this is not clear. This needs to be clarified by the applicant before further assessment and potential conditions are recommended on the layout and suitability of this access.

The application references an existing pedestrian access onto North Road is to be retained to serve the application site; however, similar to the aforementioned comments, no details are provided of this access and it is assumed that this access point is intended to be considered at reserved matters stage. NB it is considered appropriate for this access point to be a shared pedestrian/cycle access and this should be assessed by the applicant when details are submitted and applied for.

All disused accesses to Talbot Road will require closure and reinstating as footway and this should be conditioned accordingly.

Highway Safety

The submitted TA includes an assessment of collision data in the vicinity of the application site. There are objections regarding the data submitted and analysis undertaken it is accepted that there is no evidence that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Trip Generation / Sustainable Travel

With regards to the potential vehicular impact of the proposed development on the highway network, the LHA generally accepts the analysis undertaken and the conclusions reached in the submitted TA. It is considered that the application will not have severe residual cumulative impact on the highway network.

The application includes the submission of a Travel Plan and at the time of submitting these comments the analysis of the Travel Plan and corresponding comments have yet to be received from DCC's Sustainable Travel officer. However, these will be forwarded as soon as possible when they have been received.

Conclusion

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.

Conditions

Planning Obligations

Travel Plan monitoring fee of £6,325 is required to be included in a S106 agreement.

Refer to the public file for the full response.

**Derbyshire
Constabulary Force
Designing Out Crime
Officer**

No Objection

**Refer to Design and Layout
Section of the Report**

06.02.25:

There are no reasons in principle which would lead to an objection to the redevelopment of this former school site for residential occupancy from a community safety perspective.

It is noted that all matters except access are reserved. The former school footpath entrance from North Road is proposed to be retained. In this instance a defensive planting buffer between the route and side boundary of adjacent housing would be sensible to separate public and private space, to be included as part of any future agreed landscaping plans, and subject to a continuing land management agreement to ensure the provision thickens on maturing but does not encroach upon the visual openness of the path.

Some enclosure of a landscape buffer between the development and existing housing on North Road is shown on concept plans, which is sensible in context. The same provision may be required for some sections of back to back housing

on the Fauvel Road boundary also, on the assumption that the same form of buffer would be needed.

Considering the scale of the proposal, if approved in outline form, we would expect to be consulted by applicants in the process of drawing up detailed proposals, prior to any reserved matters submission.

Derbyshire Fire & Rescue Authority	Awaited	Refer to Other Matters Section
---	----------------	---------------------------------------

-

Derbyshire Swift Conservation Project	Conditional Response	Refer to Ecology Section
--	-----------------------------	---------------------------------

Awaited.

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust	Conditional Response	Refer to Ecology Section
----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------

06.03.25:

Response

We have reviewed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) (Tyler Grange, August 2024) and metric dated 12th August 2024. The application area currently comprises the site of a former school (now demolished), with areas of hardstanding, unmanaged modified grassland and scattered trees.

Proposals comprise a high-level parameters plan rather than an outline layout. Likely impacts will include loss of modified grassland and some scattered trees. Existing hedgerow is predicted for retention. Protected species constraints are largely restricted to nesting birds and hedgehogs. All trees with bat roost potential (BRP) are predicted to be retained. *If removal of any of the 11No. trees with BRP identified in the PEA becomes necessary, additional survey and/or precautionary felling methods will be necessary.*

Whilst the BNG calculations will be subject to change once a detailed layout is available, the parameters plan enables a broad outline prediction of losses and gains. Based on the assumptions set out in the PEA, a net gain of +6.91 habitat units (144%) and +2.01 hedgerow units (167.37%) is predicted through habitat creation and enhancement on site. The area of proposed green space is considered sufficiently large enough to ensure that trading rules are satisfied, given the scope for tree planting and other habitat creation. *We advise that an updated metric should be submitted as part of any reserved matters application.* Full details of biodiversity gains must be provided in a statutory Gain Plan, prior to commencement of development. A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will be required to secure management and monitoring for onsite habitats for the 30 year period, as onsite gains are expected to be significant.

The PEA identifies the presence of internationally designated sites approximately 2.3 m from the application area. Whilst the type of development does not trigger consultation with Natural England, we would draw the attention of the LPA to Table 2.1 and Section 4.1 and advise that consideration should be given as to whether a Habitats Regulations Assessment is required.

We advise that the following conditions are attached to any permission:

Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity)

No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance and movement of plant, machinery and materials) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall be produced by an ecologist and shall include the following. a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities. b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones". c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction, based on Tables 2.2 and 2.3 in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Tyler Grange, August 2024). d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features. e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works. f) Responsible persons and lines of communication. g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECOW) or similarly competent person. h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs. The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP)

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. This 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. Guidance on producing a HMMP can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/creating-a-habitat-management-and-monitoring-plan-for-biodiversity-net-gain>

Lighting

Prior to the installation of 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 lightspill to any sensitive ecological zones/features. Guidelines can be found in Guidance Note 08/23 - Bats and

Artificial Lighting at Night (BCT and ILP, 2023). Such approved measures will be implemented in full. Species Enhancement Plan 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: • universal nest boxes at ratio of 1:1, in line with British Standard 42021:2022. • integrated bat boxes in 30% of dwellings. • insect bricks in 30% dwellings and / or towers in public open space. • fencing gaps 130 mm x 130 mm to maintain connectivity for hedgehogs in all gardens. 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.

Refer to the public file for the previous responses.

HPBC Officer	Arboricultural	Conditional Response	Refer to Landscape Section
---------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

03.06.25:

Trees on Site:

- 78 individual trees, 9 Groups of trees and hedging on site and affected by the proposal
- No current TPOs or conservation areas protecting the trees.
- Tree Survey suggests there are trees worthy of protection.
- 36 proposed trees.

Tree Concerns:

- Only a tree survey provided – no other detailed information has been provided.
- New streets created that are not proposed to be tree-lined.
- Trees proposed for removal (Concept plan) but no confirmation as to which trees.

Discussion:

Whilst there are no objections to the principle of this development, the supplied information, in terms of arboriculture, is very poor and does not help to paint a clear picture about is proposed with regards to the existing and future tree stock. The design appears to largely stay away from healthy, safe trees and seemingly proposes to only remove trees that are dead / dying / dangerous, however this is based on assumptions.

Poor level of detail:

The British Standard 5837 provides guidance on what is regarded as reasonable levels of information that an applicant should provide at each stage of planning so

that an accurate decision can be made by the planning department. At this stage it is not unreasonable to expect the following to be supplied:

1. Tree Survey PROVIDED
2. Tree retention/removal plan NOT PROVIDED
3. Retained trees and RPAs shown on a plan NOT PROVIDED
4. Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) NOT PROVIDED

Partial details of 2 & 3 have been provided in the Design and Access statement, but the trees have not been marked with the tree numbers in the supplied Tree Survey, so it is impossible to fully judge which trees are being impacted and if the proposals are appropriate.

The applicant has also not provided their own assessment, as would be expected in an AIA report, which would help to answer the majority of those questions. If consent is granted then the following information will be required:

- Detailed hard and soft landscaping design, including details on tree species and planting specifications
- Tree Protection Plan
- Method Statement detailing how the tree protection plan will be implemented.
- Schedule of works to retained trees.
- Arboriculture site monitoring scheme
- Post construction remedial works

Trees proposed for removal

The only details about tree removals are supplied on the 'Concept Plan', which states "Existing CAT U trees to be removed". As stated above it is not possible to assess which trees these are and if they really class as U category trees.

There also appears to be root protection areas on the concept plan that don't relate to trees. Are these other trees that are proposed for removal?

Generally there is no confirmation about how many trees are to be removed, so an assessment of the impact on the tree stock and the appropriateness of planting proposals can't be assessed.

Tree-lined Streets

Updates to the NPPF have confirmed the government's desire for newly formed streets to be tree-lined. The current proposal will only see one of the proposed streets be tree-lined. The NPPF states the following:

136. Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined.

The scheme must be re-designed to include trees in street. Confirmation will also

be needed to confirm if the maintenance of any street trees will be the responsibility of the local authority, so that appropriate management costs can be sought.

Decision:

I have been informed that the application is to confirm the principle of the size of the development and the access points into the site, therefore the concerns stated above can be resolved at the Reserved Matters stage and there is no objection to this application.

The following tree protection conditions should be applied:

Conditions:

Refer to the public file for the previous responses.

HPBC Conservation Officer	No objection	Refer to Heritage Section
----------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------

04.06.25:

Heritage assets affected:

Designated Heritage Asset(s):

- Glossop Norfolk Square Conservation Area
- Glossop Howard Park Conservation Area
- Victoria Hall and Public Library – Grade II (listing ref: 1384300)

Non-Designated Heritage Asset(s):

None.

Conservation Advice

Summary of Significance

The proposal would be situated in the wider setting of two Conservation Areas – Norfolk Square and Howard Park – as well as the wider setting of Glossop library, which is a Grade II Listed Building. Howard Park Conservation Area incorporates the park which opened 1888 and the villa style buildings along Talbot and North Road. The land was gifted by Lord Howard and the baths and hospital gifted by the Wood family. The significance derives from the verdant leafy character, spacious development of buildings and association with the development of public parks and focus on health and wellbeing in the late-Victorian period.

Norfolk Square Conservation Area forms part of the civic and commercial core of Glossop as well as some residential development to the north. Norfolk square was laid out c.1837 with a mixture of Gothic and Tudor revival styles with the

landmark buildings. Typically buildings are constructed in gritstone with slate roofs and the buildings are laid out in linear formation and tightly knit grain.

Victoria Hall was built as a concert hall and public library c.1887-8 designed by Darbyshire & Smith in free Gothic revival style. The building is cruciform plan with a square bell tower. The significance derives from its association with the development of public buildings in the late-Victorian period, highly decorative Gothic revival style and designed prominence of the tower in the town.



Fig.1 c.1920 OS map [online] (National Library of Scotland)

Assessment and Impact

The application seeks permission for outline consent for 110 dwellings, with all matters but access reserved.

With limited details on the design and layout it is difficult to fully assess the impact on the surrounding designated heritage assets. Nevertheless, it is likely that the proposed built aspect of the development would be relatively low-rise (e.g. 2 and 2 ½ storeys) and would not dominate or overbear the wider setting of the Conservation Areas.

With any forthcoming reserved matters application, it would be recommended that a sympathetic palette of external facing materials and domestic boundary treatments is utilised in closer proximity to heritage assets. For example, along Talbot Road as part of this road forms the boundary to Howard Park Conservation Area. In addition, it would be recommended that careful consideration is given to soft landscaping along the northern edge of the development to maintain the verdant character and appearance of Howard Park Conservation Area which abuts this part of the development. It is likely that the proposal would have negligible impact on the setting of the Norfolk Square Conservation Area due to

the intervening modern housing to the south and east.

With the demolition of the college, this has inadvertently better revealed some wider views of the bell tower of the library (Grade II) to the south with a pleasing backdrop of the Peak District. Whilst it is recognised that there was previously a modern college building blocking this view, it would be suggested that consideration is given to creating a view of this looking south when designing the proposed layout as this would better reveal and enhance the designed prominence of this Listed Building (para.210 of NPPF).

Legislation and Policy

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

The local planning authority should have a desirability of preserving the setting of the Listed Building (s.66).

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024

In determining applications, local authorities should take account of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation, the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality, the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (para 210).

Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within the setting), should require clear and convincing justification (para 213).

The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining applications and a balanced judgement will be required in regard to the scale of harm or loss of significance of the non-designated heritage asset (para 216).

Local Development Framework

Consideration should also be given to the following documents and local development framework policies:

- High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016)
- EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
- Glossop Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)

Conclusions and Recommendations

In summary, the proposed development has the potential to have a neutral impact on the setting of the Conservation Areas and Listed Building which would comply with s.66 of the Act, Section 16 of the NPPF and policy EQ7 of the local development framework. There are no objections to the principle of the

development from a conservation perspective. However, as outlined above, it would recommended that consideration is given to possibly enhancing the setting and appreciation of the listed library (Grade II) in the proposed layout design. In addition, it would recommended that careful consideration be given to soft landscaping and palette of materials to the northern part of the development as this is in close proximity to Howard Park Conservation Area.

For any consent granted, we would suggest the following details are agreed via reserved matters:

- Details of the layout and elevational design of dwellings
- Details of all external facing materials for the dwellings, including samples upon request
- Details of boundary treatments
- Details of hard and soft landscaping

HPBC Environmental Health Officer

Awaited

Refer to the Contamination & Land Instability Section

28.08.25:

Further to our previous comments, an updated air quality screening assessment has been submitted in support of the above application (Ref: VAL-24-0073 – Air Quality Assessment Talbot Road, Glossop Derbyshire County Council July 2025).

In response to the queries previously raised, the applicant has now included the following (abridged) response.

- With Regards to traffic in the AQMA the consultant's state:

"It has also been confirmed by SLR Consulting Ltd that while the daily traffic generated by the development would be 454 two-way vehicular trips (not netted off), it is expected that only a reduced proportion of them (10% or less) will travel through the AQMA" *(therefore below the 100 daily traffic increase that would trigger an assessment)*

Although further, reasonable logical arguments have been supplied to support this statement no actual no data (modelling) has been supplied. However, highways do appear to have accepted this argument therefore we would not be in a position to dispute this statement.

- With regards to traffic on Dinting Road:

"A review of the Air Quality Assessment provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement for the A57 Link Road project has been undertaken. As such it is not expected that the already committed development of the A57 link road will have any significant impact on the proposed human health receptors at the Development or in the vicinity. Based on professional judgement and taking into account local monitoring and background data showing pollutant concentrations considerably below the relevant UK AQO's, the operational impact

of the Development is deemed to be negligible”

It is not clear if the applicant misunderstood this comment. This comment was raised regarding the traffic numbers used in transport assessment. In the proposed A57 development, the traffic modelling in this study indicated that a significant portion of the “new” vehicle movements moving between the new A57 and Glossop town Centre would utilise Shaw Lane and Dinting Road (and then possibly Talbot Road) rather than the existing A57, which may mean that the existing transport statement underestimated the likely number of vehicles utilising this route at the time of opening.

The above noted it is conceded that the highways have accepted the traffic numbers utilised in the transport statement and that the proposed layout of the development indicates that the houses will probably be set back from Talbot Road therefore, we would agree that it is unlikely that the site itself would be significantly affected by emissions from an underestimation of potential traffic numbers (and thus pollution sources). A condition requiring / ensuring properties are set back is recommended.

With regard to general AQ impacts, although it is conceded that the application will not significantly deteriorate the existing air quality in the area, it does inevitably introduce some new sources of pollution (traffic, boilers etc). To minimise the impacts of this it is recommended that the developer produce a low emission strategy outlining the measures implemented to minimise this increase. Many of these measures have already been produced, and are contained in the travel plan but should include other potential source (e.g. boilers)

With regards to the construction dust. The applicant has now noted that the recommendations made within the assessment to mitigate these impacts will be included in any future construction management plan. This is noted in the condition below:

Air Quality

1. No door or window opening to any room of the dwelling(s) shall be situated within 5 metres of the kerbside of Talbot Road.
2. Development shall not commence, excluding demolition, until a low-emissions strategy for mitigating the air-quality impacts of the development is submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. All works that form part of the approved scheme shall be completed before occupation of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA. The measures in the agreed scheme shall be maintained throughout the life of the development.

Reason (Both): In order to safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of the proposed dwelling[s] in respect of atmospheric pollution in compliance with policy. [EQ 10.]

Construction and Environmental Management Plan:

3. No phase of the development hereby permitted shall take place except for works of site clearance and demolition until a Construction and Environmental Management Plan for that phase of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which shall include the following details:-

I. the hours of work, which shall not exceed the following: Construction and associated deliveries to the site shall not take place outside 08:00 to 18:00 hours Mondays to Fridays, and 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holiday;

II. the method and duration of any pile driving operations (including expected starting date and completion date);

III. pile driving shall not take place outside 09:00 to 16:00 hours Mondays to Fridays, nor at any time on Saturdays, Sundays or Bank Holidays;

IV. the arrangements for prior notification to the occupiers of potentially affected properties;

V. the responsible person (e.g. site manager / office) who could be contacted in the event of complaint;

VI. a scheme to minimise dust emissions arising from construction activities on the site, which should include all the dust mitigation measures in the air quality assessment (Ref: VAL-24-0073 – Air Quality Assessment Talbot Road, Glossop Derbyshire County Council July 2025) submitted in support of the above application

VII. a scheme for recycling/disposal of waste resulting from the construction works;

VIII. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;

IX. the loading and unloading of plant and materials;

X. the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;

XI. details of measures to protect the public footpaths and amenity of users of the public footpaths crossing the site during the construction works,

XII. any waste material associated with the demolition or construction shall not be burnt on site but shall be kept securely for removal to prevent escape into the environment,

XIII. details of any generator/s to be used on site. They should be sufficiently attenuated so that any noise generated shall be inaudible inside any nearby noise sensitive premise,

XIV. during construction/demolition phases amplified music and/or radios shall

not be audible beyond the site boundary.

All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Any alteration to this Plan shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the alteration.

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents and that of the surrounding area from unreasonable disturbance and ensure that the development does not result in adverse effects as set out in Policy EQ 10.

11.06.25:

In respect of air quality, further information is required prior to determination.

An air quality assessment has been submitted with the application, although this was not made clear as listed on the consultation page under the name "VAL-24-0073_Talbot Road, Glossop_AR1_20241220_FINAL" The air quality assessment, reference VAL-24-0073 and dated December 2024 has been undertaken as a screening assessment concluding that effects are deemed to be not significant, however, clarification is required on the following:

- The transport assessment submitted as part of the proposed A57 link road identifies Shaw Lane, Dinting Road as a route around traffic on High Street West. The assessment appears focused on change in traffic numbers as a result of the proposal only and not taking into account potential change and exposure as a result of already committed development and therefore this must be clarified as could impact on future residents of the development and those in the vicinity.
- Additionally, the impact on the wider transport network requires clarification in terms of the increase in vehicle movements specifically within the AQMA at Dinting Vale. While the former use of the site and transport associated with this is acknowledged, the site has been closed since circa 2018 and the impact needs to be considered against current levels.
- In terms of the Construction Phase air quality impacts, this has been identified as a low to negligible risk, however, this is dependent on the controls specified in Table 5.2 being fully implemented and it is therefore a requirement for the measures to be incorporated into a construction management plan to be approved prior to development commencing and a requirement for a condition relating to boundary visible dust emissions.

A full set of conditions will be provided subject to satisfactory provision of the further information identified above to ensure that the development does not result in adverse effects as set out in Policy EQ10.

13.03.25:

The Environmental Health Department has no objection to the proposed development subject to the conditions set out below being applied to any permission granted. This statement is contingent on all recommended conditions being adopted in any approval. Should the planning officer wish to disregard any

recommended conditions they should speak to the Environmental Health Team, to determine if this changes the consultation advice.

CONDITIONS:

SENSITIVE USE The contaminated land assessments submitted in support of this development may be accepted.

- HSP Consulting, "Phase I Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report" (ref: HSP2021- C3678-G-GPi-439), dated 10 March 2022
- HSP Consulting, "Phase II Geo-Environmental Assessment Report" (ref: HSP2022- C3678-G-GPii-518), dated 10 March 2022

The reports identify limited contamination and conclude that remediation may be required to render the site suitable for residential use. The proposed end use of the development is particularly sensitive to the presence of land contamination, for this reason the following conditions 1 is recommended. This is a full contamination condition because developers often like to submit their own contamination assessments, and the LPA need to maintain a degree oversight.

CONSTRUCTION

The construction/demolition stage of the development could lead to an increase of noise and dust etc. experienced at sensitive premises and subsequent loss of amenity, for this reason conditions 2 to 7 are suggested.

Refer to the public file for the full response.

HPBC Commissioning Leisure Environmental Services	Service &	Objection	Refer to Planning Obligations Section
--	--------------------------	------------------	--

29.08.25:

A Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) would not be required at the application site owing to the proximity of play provision in Howard Park and Manor Park and instead an off-site financial contribution would be required towards improvements at these sites.

27.08.25:

We have read the latest communication from Sport England and the response from the applicant and would also agree with Sport England's position that whilst the school buildings, car parks and hard standing were removed, this does not relate to the playing field which continued to be present on the basis it was included as part of the original planning permission for the former school development, regardless of that fact it had not been used for some time.

Policy CF4 of the Local Plan states that the Council will seek to protect, maintain and where possible enhance existing open spaces, sport and recreational

buildings and land including playing fields in order to ensure their continued contribution to the health and well-being of local communities.

This will be achieved by:

Resisting any development that involves the loss of a sport, recreation, play facility or amenity green-space except where it can be demonstrated that alternative facilities of equal or better quality will be provided in an equally accessible location as part of the development or the loss is associated with an alternative sports provision that would deliver benefits that would clearly outweigh the loss, or an assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate the facility is surplus to requirements

The applicant has neither demonstrated that alternative facilities of equal or better quality will be provided, nor that the playing field is surplus to requirements.

24.06.25:

We would be requesting off site contributions as part of this application to existing open spaces and leisure facilities within a 2-mile radius of the site:-

- Play - £249.30 x 110 = £27,423
- Parks & Gardens - £620.40 x 110 = £68,244
- Allotments - £91.30 x 110 = £10,043 Built Sports Facility towards the provision of a new leisure centre in Glossop, including combined wet and dry facility:-
 - Swimming pool - £59,941
 - Sports hall - £50,361
- Grass playing pitches towards enhancing, developing and maintaining grass pitches within a 2-mile radius of the site:-
 - £26,253 – contribution towards a new grass pitch
 - £52,670 maintenance costs over 10 years towards Cemetery Road (£5,267 x 10 years).

The issue of loss of on-site recreational facilities also needs to be addressed by the applicant which includes playing field land and an old redgra surface, as stated in the current Playing Pitch Strategy. The Strategy also states that the recommended actions for the site are to ensure that any developments on the site adhere to NPPF 74 (now paragraph 104) and local planning policy.

We would therefore refer to and support the formal comments of Sport England in that the applicant needs to provide information that clearly demonstrates how the proposal will accord with policy exception 4 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy, and we would request that the applicant work with a suitably qualified and experienced sports turf consultant to provide the necessary details of the replacement playing field.

The High Peak Playing Pitch Strategy is currently being updated so more relevant football data usage and demand will be available towards the end of the year, however, the existing PPS (2017) states that whilst overall spare capacity exists

on adult pitches, a shortfall is evident in the Central and Glossopdale Analysis Area and there is a current shortfall of youth 11v11 pitches, attributed to the Central and Glossopdale analysis areas.

Manchester Airport Group (MAG) Aerodrome Safeguarding Officer	No objection	Refer to Other Matters Section
--	---------------------	---------------------------------------

-

NHS (National Health Service)	Awaited	Refer to Planning Obligations Section
--------------------------------------	----------------	--

-

Sport England	Objection	Refer to Open Space, Sports and recreational Facilities Section
----------------------	------------------	--

15.08.25:

I do not propose to re-state Sport England's views on the application which already are fully set out in our letter response on 20th June 2025 to this application. Rather, this email briefly responds to the applicant's rebuttal letter dated 25th July 2025.

The applicant is seeking to make the following points:

- That the lawful use is for education (use Class F1) and not playing fields (which fall within Use Class F2)
- That the former school facilities (including its sports facilities) were previously replaced, and
- It is not necessary to replace playing fields/pitches which do not exist following the demolition and clearance of the site

We do not dispute that the existing use relates to an education use, where part and parcel of that use is an existing (disused) playing field.

We have previously commented on why we do not consider the playing field to have already been suitably replaced, so I don't repeat our views on that point here.

On the final point, we would draw to the Council's attention the principle considered in Pioneer Aggregates case (Pioneer Aggregates (UK) Limited v SSE [1985]) where the House of Lords held that where a planning permission had authorised a use of land, in the absence of an intervening use or an act of Parliament one cannot abandon said use. The clearance of the former school buildings may have removed certain facilities associated with the use of the playing field, such as car parking, changing rooms and so on, but this does not

mean that the use as playing field has been lost, even where the site may not have been in active use for some years. On the basis that the use of the site as playing field, as part and parcel of the former school were established via a planning permission, and given there has been no intervening use it is not possible to abandon the use as playing field.

We have previously explained that policy, in both the Framework and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy, does not distinguish between privately and publicly owned playing field sites, nor does policy distinguish between playing field sites that are in active use and those that are currently disused. There are many appeal decisions that support this position. As such, Sport England remains of the view that relevant policies in respect of the loss of playing fields should be applied and given appropriate weight when determining this application. We have previously set out our views to explain why we consider that the applicant has not demonstrated, to date, how these relevant policies would be met.

20.06.25:

Sport England – Non-Statutory consultee role and policy

It is considered that the proposal would affect playing field as defined in The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (Statutory Instrument 2015 No. 595). As the playing field appears not to have been used for at least five years, the consultation with Sport England has been considered as non-statutory.

Notwithstanding the non-statutory status of the consultation, we have assessed the proposal in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular paragraph 104, and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy, which is presented within our 'Playing Fields Policy and Guidance Document': www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy

Sport England applies its policy to any land in use as playing field or last used as playing field and which remains undeveloped, irrespective of whether that use ceased more than five years ago.

A lack of use of a playing field, or part of, should not be taken as necessarily indicating an absence of need in an area. The lawful planning use of a disused playing field site is still that of a playing field until such time as there is a formal change of use or development occurs. Such land can retain the potential to provide playing pitches to meet current or future needs. It should also be noted that a playing field does not have to be available for community use to fall within the definition of playing field. *Neither the DMPO, NPPF or Sport England Policy make any distinction between private and publicly owned or used nor is there a positive obligation (under planning law) for any playing field to be actively used as such. Both policies are applied equally, irrespective of the ownership.*

The above stance has been confirmed by Planning Inspectors and I have attached an appeal decision (ref: APP/Q3115/W/22/3292619) which considered evidence on the existing lawful use of an inactive playing field site for your

attention. It is considered that the Inspector's findings in paragraphs 20 and 21 are similar to this development proposal.

Furthermore, Sport England note paragraphs 5.35 – 5.38 of the Planning Statement regarding whether or not we should be consulted. There is often debate as to the implication of the 5 year period mentioned within the Order and its implications for the weight that should be afforded to the response that Sport England makes on planning applications.

The duty to consult with Sport England on proposals affecting playing field was first established in 1996. The letter to Chief Planning Officers advising them of the impending change notes that the Order that was going before Parliament replaced the phrase 'development on land last used as a playing field' with 'development which...is on land which has been used as playing field at any time in the 5 years before the relevant application and which remains undeveloped'. The letter explains that the change was in response to concerns that 'land last used as a playing field' might not cover land which was being used for temporary purposes, such as grazing.

It is clear from the above that the government intended to afford Sport England a strong role in the protection of playing field and it introduced the 5 year rule to close what might have been a 'loophole' to that protective role. Unfortunately experience suggests to Sport England that the 5 year rule is being used as 'loophole' in its own right. Land owners who wish to see their playing field developed for alternative uses will stop maintaining the site so that it becomes unusable to sports teams and then wait for 5 years to elapse in anticipation that Sport England will not be a statutory consultee when their proposals are considered.

Sport England's advice to Local Planning Authorities on this matter is that the 5 year rule is not intended to act as guillotine to statutory consultation with Sport England. In instances where the use of a site has ceased due to the actions of its owners (rather than through lack of demand for playing pitches) then we encourage Local Authorities to still attach great and considerable weight to Sport England comments.

The proposal and impact on playing field

The proposal consists of a residential proposal that would result in the loss of the whole of the playing field land as shown in the below 2018 and 2020 Google Earth aerial images. However, it should be noted that the Google Earth evidence provides only snapshots in time and the playing field may have been used after that time. This playing field land exceeds some 2.6 hectares of land.

The High Peak Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) explains that the site is due to close in 2017/2018 and that whilst the site does not have any formal playing pitches it does have playing field land and an old redgra surface. The recommended actions for the site in the PPS are to ensure that any developments on the site adhere to NPPF 74 (now paragraph 104) and local planning policy.



2018 Google Aerial Image clearly showing pitch markings



2020 Google Aerial Image showing feint pitch markings

Assessment against Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and NPPF

Playing field policy is a restrictive policy based on a presumption against any development which results in the loss of playing field (in whole or part) or prejudices its use. As such, for development not to encounter an objection from Sport England it must be shown to be of a form covered by one of the exceptions (to the presumption against) set out in the Annex.

Sport England note the matters raised to justify the loss of playing field in paragraphs 5.26 – 5.45 of the applicant's Planning Statement. According to our records, Sport England have provided numerous pre application responses in email correspondence dated 9/2/2023, 8/9/2023, 20/12/2023 to similar development proposals on this site, where it appears that the agent put forward the same reasons to justify the loss of playing field.

The loss of this playing field needs to be considered against the exceptions in Sport England's policy which accord with the specified justifications included in

paragraph 104 of the NPPF and Development Plan Policy CF 4 which all seek to protect playing fields from development.

Of Sport England's Playing fields policy's five exceptions, policy exception 1 and policy exception 4 are considered the most relevant to this development proposal.

Policy Exception 1:

Policy exception 1 allows the loss of playing field where a robust and up-to-date assessment has demonstrated, to the satisfaction of Sport England, that there is an excess of playing field provision in the catchment, which would remain the case should the development be permitted.

The PPS confirms that there is little spare capacity for existing and the growth of football in the area and that there is an identified shortfall of youth grass pitches and full size 3G pitches across the High Peak area. A shortfall in rugby union pitches is also identified.

Additionally, paragraph 46 of our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document explains that School plans and assessments showing an excess of playing field provision for the purposes of Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 or Schedule 1 of the Academies Act 2010 (or their replacements), and with regard to the Department for Education's advice on the disposal or change of use of playing field and school land, do not meet the requirements of this exception. These assessments focus on the needs of the school, nearby schools and any existing community users of the site. They do not assess the wider sporting and community need for playing fields. Furthermore, it should be noted that consent under Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act does not necessarily mean subsequent planning approval will be granted.

The PPS does not show a surplus of playing field provision in the area. No robust assessment to the satisfaction of Sport England has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would meet policy exception 1 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy or paragraph 104 a) of the NPPF.

Policy Exception 4

To meet policy exception 4, a minimum of 2.6ha of playing field land of equivalent or better quality needs to be replaced within the locality. The new area of playing field should be delivered prior to the commencement of the housing development and subject to equivalent or better accessibility and management arrangements.

Replacement must represent a genuine replacement i.e. creation of a new playing field. Improvements to existing playing field do not represent a genuine replacement because the quantity element of the exception has not been addressed only the quality element.

Sport England note that the Planning Statement makes reference to planning permission granted under ref: CD1/0216/137 for the construction of a replacement community college and sports facilities and the demolition of existing

school buildings at Glossopdale Community College, Newshaw Lane, Glossop. The Google Earth aerial images from 2009 (to the left) and 2022 (right) demonstrate that the new school buildings were constructed on existing playing field land. It is understood that the quantum of playing field land lost was subsequently replaced on the site of the existing school buildings. Therefore, the proposal did not involve the creation of additional playing field land to compensate for any future loss of the Talbot Road site.



Google Aerial Images showing no creation of additional playing field land

Furthermore, Sport England's Playing Fields Policy at paragraph 69 provides the explanation as to why providing replacement provision on an existing playing field cannot meet this exception. This is because it would not provide a new area of playing field (quantity) and may also cause deterioration in the quality of existing playing fields.

Therefore, from the information submitted with the planning application there is no reference to the playing field being replaced that would accord with policy exception 4 of the Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and paragraph 104 b) of the NPPF.

Sport England's position

Given the above, Sport England raises an objection to the application because it is not considered to accord with any of the exceptions to our Playing Fields Policy or paragraph 104 of the NPPF.

Potential to overcome the objection Sport England would be pleased to review the objection with a view to considering potentially withdrawing it if the applicant can provide the following:

- Information that clearly demonstrates how the proposal will accord with policy exception 4 of our Playing Fields Policy. The applicant should refer to *Section 6.4 and Annex B*, as well as the *Equivalent Quality Assessment of Natural Turf Playing Field briefing note* as to what is required. The applicant should work with a suitably qualified and experienced sports turf

consultant to provide the necessary details of the replacement playing field.

Determining the application

If this application is to be presented to a Planning Committee, we would like to be notified in advance of the publication of any committee agendas, report(s) and committee date(s). Please note that this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site. Sport England would be pleased to comment on further details that address the above comments.

United Utilities

Conditional Response

Refer to Drainage & Flood Risk Section

05.02.25:

United Utilities provides the following comments to support the Local Planning Authority in their determination of the planning application detailed above, and to direct the applicant to further sources of support and guidance on matters that might impact their proposal.

The letter and Appendix should be read in their entirety to support the determination, the design, and should the scheme be approved, the subsequent delivery of the proposal.

DRAINAGE

Drainage design can be a key determining factor of site levels and layout. In the absence of a detailed plan outlining the proposed levels (including finished floor levels and ground levels) shown in metres above Ordnance Datum and an indicative foul and surface water drainage strategy (including cover and invert levels), we are unable to assess any risk of sewer surcharge. In the absence of this information, we request a pre-commencement condition relating to drainage to ensure that an appropriate, robust drainage solution is proposed and delivered. If the applicant provides the required information (above) prior to determination, we will review any new plans at the request of the Local Authority.

We request the following drainage condition is attached to any subsequent approval:

CONDITION

Refer to the public file for the full response.

7. POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS AND PLANNING BALANCE

Decision Making Framework

- 7.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which is to be read in conjunction with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires the Local Planning Authority to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material considerations which 'indicate otherwise'. Section 70(2) provides that in determining applications the Adopted Local Planning Authority "shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application and to any other material considerations". The Development Plan for the borough consists of the Adopted High Peak Local Plan dated April 2016.
- 7.2 Achieving sustainable development sits at the heart of the NPPF. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF outlines that achieving sustainable development requires the consideration of three overarching and mutually dependant objectives being: economic, social and environmental where they are to be applied to local circumstances of character, need and opportunity of each area. These objectives are interdependent and should be pursued in mutually supportive ways and comprise;
- a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
 - b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of the present and future generations; and by fostering well designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well being; and,
 - c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making the effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.
- 7.3 NPPF paragraph 11 (as amended) for decision taking states:

"Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. ...

For decision-taking this means:

- c) *approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or*
- d) *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”.*

- 7.4 The Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on the 12th December 2024.
- 7.5 In delivering a sufficient supply of homes, the standard method (first introduced in 2018) identifies the minimum number of homes that a local planning authority should plan for in its area. The standard method is now updated in the practical guidance published on 12 December 2024 [13] (“the Standard Method”) and is the delivery mechanism to enable the Government to deliver on the envisioned 1,500,000[14] new homes during its parliament.
- 7.6 Importantly, the Standard Method in Planning Practice Guidance is no longer an advisory starting point, but mandatory [15]. As explained in the PPG, it uses “a formula that incorporates a baseline of local housing stock which is then adjusted upwards to reflect local affordability pressures to identify the minimum number of homes expected to be planned for” [16].
- 7.7 The 2023 Housing delivery Test showed delivery against the prevailing standard method figures of 153% meaning the buffer to be applied to the assessment is 5%. As High Peak’s adopted plan is more than 5 years old, supply is assessed against the new Standard Method figure at 553 dwellings per annum.
- 7.8 The Council’s Local Plan’s Team have calculated the new 5-year housing land supply figures for the High Peak Borough at 2.85 years.
- 7.9 The following Local Plan (LP) policies of relevance to the scheme, are deemed to be out-of-date as a result of the newly calculated Local Housing Need (LHN) amended by the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in December 2024. This means they are

given less weight in the determination of planning applications for residential development, with weight to be applied as follows:

- S2 'Settlement Hierarchy' attracts moderate weight. This policy seeks to restrict the scale of development in Larger Villages, Smaller Villages and Other Rural Areas and appears to be generally consistent with NPPF.
- S3 'Strategic Housing Development' attracts limited weight. This policy does not reflect the latest Local Housing Need (LHN) as per the NPPF.
- H1 'Location of Housing Development' attracts moderate weight. This policy seeks to restrict the location of residential development, however, appears to be generally consistent with the NPPF.

7.10 In relation to LP Policy H4 "Affordable Housing", the Council has effectively already been applying less weight to this policy for some time due to conflict with the NPPF. LP H4 calls for affordable housing contribution on sites of 5 units or above (or 0.16ha+). In accordance with the NPPF, contributions are now only sought for major developments.

7.11 The following local plan policies, (all of which are considered to be up-to-date) are considered to be particularly relevant to this proposal:

- S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
- EQ6 Design and Place Making
- Facilities
- H1 Location of Housing Development
- H3 New Housing Development
- H4 Affordable Housing
- EQ10 Pollution Control and Unstable Land
- CF4 Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities
- CF6 Accessibility and Transport
- CF5 Provision and Retention of Local Community Services and
- CF7 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy

Principle of Development

7.12 The application site is located within the built up area boundary of Glossop, within a predominantly residential area and is located within walking distance of Glossop town centre to the south.

7.13 LP Policy S1 'Sustainable Development Principles states: "*The Borough Council will expect that all new development makes a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protecting, and where possible enhancing, the environment; and mitigating the process of climate change, within the Plan Area.*"

This will be achieved by:

- *Meeting most development needs within or adjacent to existing communities;*
- *Making effective use of land (including the remediation of contaminated land and reuse of brownfield land), buildings and existing infrastructure;*
- *Making efficient use of land by ensuring that the density of proposals is appropriate (and informed by the surrounding built environment);*
- *Taking account of the distinct Peak District character, landscape, townscape, roles and setting of different areas and settlements in the High Peak;*
- *Protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment of the High Peak and its surrounding areas including the Peak District National Park;*
- *Providing for a mix of types and tenures of quality homes to meet the needs and aspirations of existing and future residents in sustainable locations;*
- *Supporting the local economy and businesses by providing for a range of economic development that provide employment opportunities suitable for local people in sustainable locations, and generally encourage larger developments to incorporate mixed uses where possible so as to reduce the need to travel;*
- *Minimising the need to travel by promoting development in locations where there is access to a broad range of jobs, services and facilities which are accessible by foot, cycle or public transport with minimal reliance on the private car;*
- *Minimising the risk of damage to areas of importance for nature conservation and/or landscape value, both directly and indirectly and ensuring that there is suitable mitigation for a net gain in biodiversity and the creation of ecological networks;*
- *Minimising carbon or energy impacts associated with development according to the principles of the 'energy hierarchy' by minimising the need for energy through the appropriate siting, orientation and design of new buildings; the use of renewable energy sources and ensuring building construction and other forms of development address the challenge of climate change by meeting high environmental standards with particular regard to energy efficiency, water efficiency, use of sustainable materials, encouraging waste reduction, recycling, including where appropriate the local- or on site-sourcing of building materials;*
- *Further mitigating the impacts of climate change by seeking reductions in greenhouse gas emissions across the High Peak; in particular through supporting the delivery of renewable and low-carbon forms of energy (either via stand-alone installations, or installations integrated within new/existing developments), where this is considered acceptable against all other Development Plan Policies as a whole;*
- *Requiring that all new development addresses flood risk mitigation/adaptation, ensuring for example that sustainable drainage systems are considered at the outset within proposals (and to comply with legislative requirements);*

- *Seeking to secure high quality, locally distinctive and inclusive design in all development that can be accessed and used by everyone including disabled people;*
- *Seeking to secure developments provide a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, ensuring communities have a healthy, safe and attractive living and working environment and the risks from potential hazards are minimised, and,*
- *Maintaining and where possible enhancing accessibility to a good range of services and facilities, and ensuring existing infrastructure and services have the capacity to support development when required.*

In order to enable required development to take place, in some cases mitigation measures will be needed to address the impacts of new development on existing infrastructure and on nearby sensitive areas.

In all cases development should not conflict with the relevant policies in this Local Plan. Development should be designed to be sustainable; seek to enhance the environment; have regard to both its direct and indirect cumulative impact over the longer term; and should provide any necessary mitigating or compensatory measures to address harmful implications.

New development should make effective use of land and buildings and be located in sustainable locations in line with the Settlement Hierarchy in Policy S2”.

- 7.14 LP Policy S2 ‘Settlement Hierarchy’ promotes a sustainable pattern of development by focusing development to the market towns and larger villages with limited development in the smaller villages and a more restrictive approach to development in countryside and Green Belt. Consideration therefore needs to be given to the scale of residential development proposed and whether this would be in accordance with the settlement hierarchy in this location. Settlement boundaries for the settlements referred to in Policy S2 are defined on the Adopted LP Policies Map.
- 7.15 Area based LP Policy S5 ‘Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy’ states: *“The Council will seek to promote the sustainable growth of Glossopdale whilst promoting and maintaining the distinct identity of its settlements, provide an increasing range of employment opportunities, promote the growth of a sustainable tourist economy and meet the housing needs of the local community. This will be achieved by:” ... “2. Providing for the housing needs of the community by planning for sustainable housing and mixed use developments by: ... (2nd Bullet point) “Supporting the development of new housing on sustainable sites within the built-up area boundary ...”.*
- 7.16 Of relevance, LP Policy H1 ‘Location of New Development’ states: *“The Council will ensure provision is made for housing taking into account all other policies in this Local Plan by:” ... (2nd bullet point) “Promoting the effective reuse of land by encouraging housing development including redevelopment, infill, conversion of existing dwellings and the change of*

use of existing buildings to housing, on all sites suitable for that purpose” ... (3rd bullet point) “The Council will ensure provision is made for housing taking into account all other policies in this Local Plan by:” (2) “Supporting housing development on unallocated sites within defined built up area boundaries of the towns and larger villages”.

- 7.17 The proposal for up to 110 dwellings would be sustainably located within the built settlement of Glossop and would make a significant contribution towards housing delivery. Whilst part of the application site is acknowledged as previously developed land (2.15 ha), the playing field land (2.6 ha) element clearly falls outside of this definition requiring further discussion, together with any other relevant policy consideration as raised within the relevant report sections below.

Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities

- 7.18 LP Policy CF4 ‘Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities’ states: *“The Council will seek to protect, maintain and where possible enhance existing open spaces, sport and recreational buildings and land including playing fields in order to ensure their continued contribution to the health and well being of local communities. This will be achieved by: (first bullet) Resisting any development that involves the loss of a sport, recreation, play facility or development or the loss is associated with an alternative sports provision that would deliver benefits that would clearly outweigh the loss, or an assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate the facility is surplus to requirements”.*
- 7.19 Of relevance LP Policy S5 ‘Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy’ further states in relation to *“(2) promoting and maintaining identity of the settlements which make up Glossopdale by: (first bullet) Protecting and enhancing sites designated for Environmental Value, including Manor Park, Howard Park and Bankswood Park, public open spaces, playing fields and outdoor sports facilities, local and European wildlife sites, recreation areas and allotments”.*
- 7.20 The presence of playing field land associated with the former school use is a key issue to be considered as part of any future redevelopment of the site. Accordingly, any development should adhere to the requirements of this policy.
- 7.21 In addition, developer contributions towards the delivery, improvement and management of off-site provision of open space and recreation facilities would be expected along with a contribution towards off-site allotment provision if growing areas for residents are not required as part of the scheme. Excepting the matter pertaining to the loss of the playing field land, financial contributions rather than onsite provision would be required towards such facilities as set out in the Planning Obligations section below.

- 7.22 A Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) as identified on the application site would not be required owing to the proximity of play provision in Howard Park and Manor Park and instead an off-site financial contribution would be required towards improvements at these sites as set out.
- 7.23 Furthermore, LP Policy CF5 'Provision and Retention of Local Community Services and Facilities' would be applicable to the former school site. Accordingly, for a change of use to be acceptable, it would need to be demonstrated that the existing use is no longer financially or commercially viable and there are no other means of maintaining the facility.
- 7.24 The former school buildings were demolished and site cleared in accordance with the prior approval ref. DET/2019/0008 during 2021. It followed the school's relocation to the Newshaw Lane site as part of a consolidation of the school estate, which was previously distributed across three separate sites in accordance with Derbyshire County Council's planning permission ref. CD1/0216/137 'Proposed construction of replacement community college and sports facilities along with the provision of additional areas of car parking and landscaping along with demolition of existing school buildings' at Glossopdale Community College, Newshaw Lane, Hadfield Approved 7th July 2016. The applicant considers such evidence would provide suitable alternative school provision locally to accord with policy CF5.
- 7.25 In addition, the consolidated school proposes the replacement, upgrade and installation of new outdoor and indoor sports provision as associated with the previous three school sites. The proceeds from the sale of the application site would be utilised to fund the replacement of Glossopdale school.
- 7.26 The Secretary of State has granted consent for the disposal of land comprising school playing fields stating: "The school operates from 3 sites all of which are in poor condition and the school is to be consolidated onto the main Hadfield Site due to a significant reduction in the numbers of pupils on roll. The capital receipt raised from the sale of the redundant Talbot Road and Talbot House sites will fund the school's redevelopment to include the provision of a 4 court sports hall, activity studio and changing facilities. Externally there will be new and improved hard court multi-use games areas provided" as highlighted by the applicant.
- 7.27 It should be noted that consent under Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act does not necessarily mean subsequent planning approval would be granted. Consequently, any application for planning permission must meet the requirements of the relevant policy, in this case paragraph 104 of the NPPF, as well as relevant Local Plan and Sport England policy.
- 7.28 Clearly, the proposed development scheme would lead to the loss of the whole of the playing field land exceeding c.2.6 hectares at the application site. The Council's High Peak Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) confirms both

playing field land and an old redgra surface exist at the site. It states any developments on the site should adhere to NPPF paragraph 74 (now paragraph 104) and local planning policy.

7.29 NPPF paragraph 104 states: *“Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields and formal play spaces, should not be built on unless:*

- a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or*
- b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or*
- c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use”.*

7.30 In relation to the loss of the playing field land at the application site, the applicant does not consider that Sport England should be a statutory consultee to the scheme both in relation to the Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and planning policy guidance. This viewpoint is justified on the basis of the playing field land being unavailable for use since September 2018 i.e. > 5 years and its physical removal in early 2021. Consequently, the proposals are not considered by the applicant to prejudice the use or lead to the loss of use of playing fields.

7.31 Notwithstanding the applicant's viewpoint, Sport England have been consulted and raised objections to the scheme. These concerns are supported by the Council's Leisure and Environmental Services, Senior Strategy & Partnerships Lead Officer and all comments are fully detailed within the consultation section above. Of note, the officer identifies an evident shortfall of playing pitches in the Central and Glossopdale Analysis Area and a current shortfall of youth 11v11 pitches, attributed to these analysis areas.

7.32 Of particular note, Sport England's consultation response dated 20th June 2025 states:

“Sport England note the matters raised to justify the loss of playing field in paragraphs 5.26 – 5.45 of the applicant's Planning Statement. According to our records, Sport England have provided numerous pre application responses in email correspondence dated 9/2/2023, 8/9/2023, 20/12/2023 to similar development proposals on this site, where it appears that the agent put forward the same reasons to justify the loss of playing field.

The loss of this playing field needs to be considered against the exceptions in Sport England's policy which accord with the specified justifications included in paragraph 104 of the NPPF and Development Plan Policy CF 4 which all seek to protect playing fields from development.

Of Sport England's Playing fields policy's five exceptions, policy exception 1 and policy exception 4 are considered the most relevant to this development proposal.

Policy Exception 1:

Policy exception 1 allows the loss of playing field where a robust and up-to-date assessment has demonstrated, to the satisfaction of Sport England, that there is an excess of playing field provision in the catchment, which would remain the case should the development be permitted.

The PPS confirms that there is little spare capacity for existing and the growth of football in the area and that there is an identified shortfall of youth grass pitches and full size 3G pitches across the High Peak area. A shortfall in rugby union pitches is also identified.

Additionally, paragraph 46 of our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document explains that School plans and assessments showing an excess of playing field provision for the purposes of Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 or Schedule 1 of the Academies Act 2010 (or their replacements), and with regard to the Department for Education's advice on the disposal or change of use of playing field and school land, do not meet the requirements of this exception. These assessments focus on the needs of the school, nearby schools and any existing community users of the site. They do not assess the wider sporting and community need for playing fields. Furthermore, it should be noted that consent under Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act does not necessarily mean subsequent planning approval will be granted.

The PPS does not show a surplus of playing field provision in the area. No robust assessment to the satisfaction of Sport England has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would meet policy exception 1 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy or paragraph 104 a) of the NPPF.

Policy Exception 4

To meet policy exception 4, a minimum of 2.6ha of playing field land of equivalent or better quality needs to be replaced within the locality. The new area of playing field should be delivered prior to the commencement of the housing development and subject to equivalent or better accessibility and management arrangements.

Replacement must represent a genuine replacement i.e. creation of a new playing field. Improvements to existing playing field do not represent a genuine replacement because the quantity element of the exception has not been addressed only the quality element.

Sport England note that the Planning Statement makes reference to planning permission granted under ref: CD1/0216/137 for the construction of a replacement community college and sports facilities and the demolition of existing school buildings at Glossopdale Community College, Newshaw Lane, Glossop. The Google Earth aerial images from 2009 (to the left) and 2022 (right) demonstrate that the new school buildings were constructed on existing playing field land. It is understood that the quantum of playing field land lost was subsequently replaced on the site of the existing school buildings. Therefore, the proposal did not involve the creation of additional playing field land to compensate for any future loss of the Talbot Road site” ...

Furthermore, Sport England’s Playing Fields Policy at paragraph 69 provides the explanation as to why providing replacement provision on an existing playing field cannot meet this exception. This is because it would not provide a new area of playing field (quantity) and may also cause deterioration in the quality of existing playing fields.

Therefore, from the information submitted with the planning application there is no reference to the playing field being replaced that would accord with policy exception 4 of the Sport England’s Playing Fields Policy and paragraph 104 b) of the NPPF”.

- 7.33 In response to concerns raised, the applicant’s agent has sought to clarify the lawful use of the application site as follows: *“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”.*
- 7.34 With regard to the Council’s approved prior approval for demolition ref. DET/2019/0008, the applicant states: *“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”.*
- 7.35 Furthermore, *“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”.*
- 7.36 In response to the applicant’s latest submissions as summarised above, Sport England has responded to specific points raised as follows:

7.37 *“The applicant is seeking to make the following points:*

- That the lawful use is for education (use Class F1) and not playing fields (which fall within Use Class F2)*
- That the former school facilities (including its sports facilities) were previously replaced, and*
- It is not necessary to replace playing fields / pitches which do not exist following the demolition and clearance of the site*

We do not dispute that the existing use relates to an education use, where part and parcel of that use is an existing (disused) playing field.

We have previously commented on why we do not consider the playing field to have already been suitably replaced, so I don't repeat our views on that point here.

On the final point, we would draw to the Council's attention the principle considered in Pioneer Aggregates case (Pioneer Aggregates (UK) Limited v SSE [1985]) where the House of Lords held that where a planning permission had authorised a use of land, in the absence of an intervening use or an act of Parliament one cannot abandon said use. The clearance of the former school buildings may have removed certain facilities associated with the use of the playing field, such as car parking, changing rooms and so on, but this does not mean that the use as playing field has been lost, even where the site may not have been in active use for some years. On the basis that the use of the site as playing field, as part and parcel of the former school were established via a planning permission, and given there has been no intervening use it is not possible to abandon the use as playing field.

We have previously explained that policy, in both the Framework and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy, does not distinguish between privately and publicly owned playing field sites, nor does policy distinguish between playing field sites that are in active use and those that are currently disused. There are many appeal decisions that support this position. As such, Sport England remains of the view that relevant policies in respect of the loss of playing fields should be applied and given appropriate weight when determining this application. We have previously set out our views to explain why we consider that the applicant has not demonstrated, to date, how these relevant policies would be met”.

7.38 Officers strongly agree with Sport England's position that whilst the school buildings, car parks and hard standing have been more recently removed, this does not relate to the playing field land, which continues to be in existence on the basis that it was included as part of the original planning permission for the former school development regardless of not been in active use more recently. In addition, the Council's approved prior approval for demolition ref. DET/2019/0008 has not prejudiced this position, given the method of demolition and site restoration has been

specific to the school buildings and hardstanding whilst the determination would not have been judged on matters of planning policy.

- 7.39 Consequently, there would be clear conflict with LP Policies S1, S5, H1 and CF4, which amongst other things seek the protection of open space, sports and recreation facilities, which include playing field land.
- 7.40 These matters are addressed in the conclusion and planning balance section below.

Character and Appearance of the Area

- 7.41 LP Policy S1 'Sustainable Development Principles' also requires development to consider *"the distinct Peak District character, landscape, townscape, roles and setting of different areas and settlements in the High Peak" whilst "protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment of the High Peak and its surrounding areas including the Peak District National Park ..."*.
- 7.42 NPPF paragraph 187 states: *"Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan) ..."*.
- 7.43 LP Policy EQ2 'Landscape Character' states: *"The Council will seek to protect, enhance and restore the landscape character of the Plan Area for its own intrinsic beauty and for its benefit to the economic, environmental and social well-being of the Plan Area. This will be achieved by:*
- *Requiring that development has particular regard to maintaining the aesthetic and biodiversity qualities of natural and man-made features within the landscape, such as trees and woodlands, hedgerows, walls, streams, ponds, rivers, ecological networks or other topographical features*
 - *Requiring that development proposals are informed by, and are sympathetic to the distinctive landscape character areas as identified in the Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document and also take into account other evidence of historic landscape characterisation, landscape sensitivity, landscape impact and the setting of the Peak District National Park and where appropriate incorporate landscape mitigation measures.*
 - *Requiring that development proposals protect and/or enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape and landscape setting of the Peak District National Park.*
 - *Resisting development which would harm or be detrimental to the character of the local and wider landscape or the setting of a settlement as identified in the Landscape Impact Assessment"*.

- 7.44 The Landscape Character Assessment SPD (2006) identifies that the site is located within the 'Urban' Landscape Character Area.
- 7.45 HPBC Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2018 on landscape matters states: *"The High Peak landscapes provide some of the defining characteristics of the area and have been instrumental in shaping local settlement patterns. In order to protect, and where possible enhance, the landscape character, development should assimilate itself into the landscape and avoid adverse impact on landscape quality"* (paras 2.4).
- 7.46 In terms of integration of development with the landscape, the SPD states: *"A careful analysis of the site and its context, including its wider landscape setting, is essential. Further guidance on the character areas of High Peak is contained in the Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This identifies key landscape characteristics and their implications for the siting, design and appearance of new development"* (paras 4.15).
- 7.47 In addition, LP Policy EQ6 'Design and Place Making' 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. Furthermore, it stipulates that *"public and private spaces are well-designed, safe, attractive, complement the built form and provide for the retention of significant landscape features such as mature trees"*.
- 7.48 For amenity matters, LP Policy EQ6 'Design and Place Making' stipulates that development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and should not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity. Similarly NPPF para 135(f) requires a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
- 7.49 In addition, LP Policy EQ9 states that: *"The Council will protect existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows, in particular, ancient woodland, veteran trees and ancient or species-rich hedgerows from loss or deterioration. This will be achieved by:*
- *Requiring that existing woodlands, healthy, mature trees and hedgerows are retained and integrated within a proposed development unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh their loss*
 - *Requiring new developments where appropriate to provide tree planting and soft landscaping, including where possible the replacement of any trees that are removed at a ratio of 2:1*
 - *Resisting development that would directly or indirectly damage existing ancient woodland, veteran trees and ancient or species-rich hedgerows"*.

- 7.50 Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states: *“Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined⁵², that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users”. Footnote 52 states: “Unless, in specific cases, there are clear, justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate”.*
- 7.51 The applicant’s Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) dated September 2023 assesses the potential landscape and visual effects and sensitivities of the application site. The references to the site wholly forming brownfield land, however, are strongly disagreed with as discussed above.
- 7.52 Notwithstanding this matter, the following summary of landscape and visual effects and conclusions are drawn from the submitted LVA:

“Summary of Landscape Effects

The site is defined as urban land and is not subject to statutory protection, or local planning designations. It is not recreational land and is not publicly accessible, neither is it of the highest aesthetic quality due to its current brownfield status.

Summary of direct landscape impacts

During the construction phase site clearance will require the selective removal of trees and other planting. These effects are not considered to be significant in context of the abundance of trees and other vegetation within the locality. Proposed mitigation and planting measures will more than compensate for initial minor losses of vegetation.

Site regrading works will remove artificial steep embankments that formed level platforms to former sports pitch and playgrounds. Proposed site levels will be more in keeping with existing, natural topography, avoiding sharp changes in level.

Overall, direct landscape impacts would not be significant and in the long term would be fully mitigated.

Summary of effects upon landscape and townscape character

Whilst the proposal clearly introduces an increase in built form, to that currently existing, the development of a brownfield site to residential use would be entirely appropriate to the setting of the site amongst

comparable, residential development. High quality building design set within a strong framework of green infrastructure will enhance both the existing site and local townscape character.

Summary of Visual Effects

The site is visually well contained within an existing residential area that includes a strong green infrastructure of mature trees and garden boundary vegetation. The ZTV study is considered a worst case assessment of potential visibility towards the site. This is confirmed by site assessment, identifying areas within the ZTV that do not, on the ground, actually obtain views towards the site.

Various representative viewpoints across the study area have been selected to allow the appraisal of effects upon various visual receptors, including those within or in proximity to the highly sensitive Peak District National Park. No significant adverse effects are predicted; the site is generally well concealed and in distant, elevated views proposed development would typically be barely perceptible and not present a notable feature in the wider scene.

Notable visual effects will be limited to residential receptors neighbouring the site; on North Road, Spire Hollin and Fauvel Road. Existing views will be changed, although not necessarily adversely altered. Introduction of buffer planting, street trees and grassland / wildflower margins will introduce visual diversity, filtering, screening and 'softening' views to proposed built development.

No significant adverse visual effects to residential receptors are predicted and there will be no 'unacceptable' Residential Visual Amenity effects. Summary of effects upon views from, and setting of cultural heritage assets

Summary of effects upon views from, and setting of cultural heritage assets

ZTV mapping indicates that there is limited theoretical visibility to the site from cultural heritage assets within the study area. No or negligible effects have been identified from Conservation Areas, Howard Park (Registered Park & Garden) or Listed Buildings.

The redevelopment of the site and introduction of planting and other appropriate streetscape features along Talbot Road is predicted to have slight beneficial effect to the setting of Glossop Howard Park CA".

Conclusion

"The Landscape and Visual Appraisal has been undertaken by a Chartered Landscape Architect to provide a high level appraisal of potential landscape, townscape and visual effects related to the proposed

residential development on land at Talbot Road, Glossop. The appraisal discusses appropriate mitigation measures to remediate or enhance positive aspects of the landscape and visual resource.

The illustrative site layout and design concept includes high quality built development set within a strong green infrastructure, including public open space and pedestrian access across the site.

The appraisal concludes that that the site is not sensitive to the proposed type of development and that overall, the proposals would make a positive contribution to local landscape and townscape character.

No significant adverse visual effects to high sensitivity residential / recreational footpath users are predicted, including those within the Peak District National Park.

The proposals comply with national and local planning policy that relates to landscape and visual issues”.

- 7.53 The proposed Parameters Plan is submitted for approval as part of the residential outline application for up to 110 dwellings. It would provide a development framework for any future reserved matters application. The scheme would be served via three points of access, from two points off Talbot Road located to the north of the site and the existing access from North Road to the west. North Road would provide access to and from the site for pedestrians and cyclists only. These are matters, which are sought for approval at the outline stage. The Parameters Plan also confirms the residential development envelope and peripheral green infrastructure as well as the 6.0 metre drainage pipe easement.
- 7.54 Additionally, the applicant's indicative Concept Plan is intended to illustrate how a residential development could be brought forward for the site at the reserved matter(s) stage. The indicative proposals would provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes, and each property would have associated parking space and private amenity space as stated by the applicant although these matters are not clear from the plan submissions.
- 7.55 Illustrative site sections have been latterly submitted, which show how regrading earthworks would remove the site's artificial steep embankments, however, the submission lacks overall detail regarding proposed levels information.
- 7.56 The Council's Aboricultural Officer raises no overall objections to the principle of development and site access points. However, he considers the supporting aboricultural information to be poor regarding clear proposals for existing and future tree stock, including tree-lined streets.
- 7.57 Overall, the proposed residential development of the application site would not harm or be detrimental to the character of the local and wider

landscape or the setting of a settlement in the terms of LP Policy EQ2 'Landscape Character'.

- 7.58 The indicative layout plan, however, does not clearly demonstrate that up to 110 dwellings can comfortably be accommodated on the site, whilst accommodating design and amenity standards, together with infrastructure and landscaping requirements. Notwithstanding this lack of detail, the proposed indicative housing density of approximately 33 dwellings per hectare is broadly considered appropriate to the local area.
- 7.59 Accordingly, and to overcome the uncertainty regarding the site's ability to accommodate the quantum of development proposed i.e. a maximum of 110 dwellings, the applicant has been requested to remove the quantum of development from the application description. Members are directed to the Updates Report in these regards.
- 7.60 Consequently, there would be some conflict with LP Policies S1 and EQ6 in particular, which amongst other things broadly seek to achieve high quality design and amenity standards.

Heritage Assets

- 7.61 LP Policy EQ7 'Built and Historic Environment' states that the Council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This will consider the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and will ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment. Protection will be given to designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas.
- 7.62 NPPF 'Proposals affecting heritage assets' section paragraph 207 states: *"In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation."*
- 7.63 Section 66(1) & Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:
- Section 66(1): In considering whether to grant planning permission [or permission in principle] for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the*

Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 (1): In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any [functions under or by virtue of] any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

- 7.64 The applicant's submitted Heritage Assessment revised November 2024 concludes with the following discussions at Section 5 of the report:

"The indicative site layout/concept plan (Fig. 8) shows housing in four main blocks with wide margins around all four sides of the Site. Existing trees on the margins will be retained along with additional boundary planting to improve the screening of the site. The existing vehicular access point off Talbot Road will be retained with two additional points of access for pedestrians and cycles, off Talbot Rd and North Rd, again through existing access points. The south end of the site will be used for LEAP (play area with equipment) and SUDS pond.

Designated Heritage Assets

There are no designated heritage assets within the proposed development site and all potential impacts would therefore be indirect. There are views of the bell tower belonging to Victoria Hall south of the Site (Pl. 19). There are also views of the Woods public baths chimney from the east side of the Site looking north-west. In both cases there are no views into the site from these listed assets so the potential impact of development is likely to be negligible.

The three adjacent Conservation Areas extend along all sides of the proposed development although the only clear views into the site are from Talbot Road the north side (Pls 6-11). The Conservation Area Appraisal (High Peak Borough Council 2006a) notes the importance of local building materials and the relationship of the built environment to the surrounding topography in contributing to the significance of the Conservation Areas. Sympathetic design and use of materials in the proposed development will result in a beneficial gain to the immediate setting of the surrounding Conservation Areas.

Undesignated Heritage Assets

The archaeological record within the study area is sparse the school site was never close to medieval centres of population and despite the industrialisation of Glossop in the 19th century and its continued expansion in the 20th century, this area of the city retained its rural character until the Second World War".

- 7.65 NPPF paragraph 208 states: *“Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal”.*
- 7.66 When considering potential impacts on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the NPPF at paragraph 212 advises that “great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance”.
- 7.67 The Council’s Conservation Officer confirms the heritage assets affected as follows: Glossop Norfolk Square Conservation Area, Glossop Howard Park Conservation Area and Victoria Hall and Public Library, Grade II (listing ref: 1384300). For these assets, a summary of significance is included within the consultation section above. No non-designated heritage assets would be impacted by the scheme.
- 7.68 In terms of both scheme assessment and impacts, the Council’s Conservation Officer states:

“The application seeks permission for outline consent for 110 dwellings, with all matters but access reserved.

With limited details on the design and layout it is difficult to fully assess the impact on the surrounding designated heritage assets. Nevertheless, it is likely that the proposed built aspect of the development would be relatively low-rise (e.g. 2 and 2 ½ storeys) and would not dominate or overbear the wider setting of the Conservation Areas.

With any forthcoming reserved matters application, it would be recommended that a sympathetic palette of external facing materials and domestic boundary treatments is utilised in closer proximity to heritage assets. For example, along Talbot Road as part of this road forms the boundary to Howard Park Conservation Area. In addition, it would be recommended that careful consideration is given to soft landscaping along the northern edge of the development to maintain the verdant character and appearance of Howard Park Conservation Area which abuts this part of the development. It is likely that the proposal would have negligible impact on the setting of the Norfolk Square Conservation Area due to the intervening modern housing to the south and east.

With the demolition of the college, this has inadvertently better revealed some wider views of the bell tower of the library (Grade II) to the south with a pleasing backdrop of the Peak District. Whilst it is recognised that

there was previously a modern college building blocking this view, it would be suggested that consideration is given to creating a view of this looking south when designing the proposed layout as this would better reveal and enhance the designed prominence of this Listed Building (par.210 of NPPF)”.

- 7.69 Accordingly, the Council’s Conservation Officer conclusions and recommendations are as follows:

“In summary, the proposed development has the potential to have a neutral impact on the setting of the Conservation Areas and Listed Building which would comply with s.66 of the Act, Section 16 of the NPPF and policy EQ7 of the local development framework. There are no objections to the principle of the development from a conservation perspective. However, as outlined above, it would recommended that consideration is given to possibly enhancing the setting and appreciation of the listed library (Grade II) in the proposed layout design. In addition, it would recommended that careful consideration be given to soft landscaping and palette of materials to the northern part of the development as this is in close proximity to Howard Park Conservation Area”.

- 7.70 In addition, the following details should be secured via the reserved matter(s) scheme: layout and elevational design of dwellings, all external facing materials for the dwellings, including samples upon request, boundary treatments as well as hard and soft landscaping.
- 7.71 In terms of ‘below ground’ heritage matters, the NPPF at paragraph 218 advises that *“Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible”.*
- 7.72 In these regards, the County Archaeologist considers the former school site has no known heritage assets either on the application site or within the immediate vicinity. Despite a background potential for previously undiscovered archaeological remains, there would have been a substantial impact to any below-ground survival from the school buildings, hard standings and pitches on site from the later 20th century. Accordingly and on balance, he considers no requirements for any archaeological input into these proposals.
- 7.73 Consequently, the scheme achieves policy compliance regarding both below ground and built heritage matters to accord with LP Policies S1, EQ6 and EQ7, which amongst other things broadly seek the protection of heritage assets.

Housing Mix & Type

- 7.74 LP Policy S1 sets out the sustainable development principles for the area and includes that new development should provide for a mix of types and tenures of quality homes. LP Policy S5 'Glossopdale Sub Area Strategy' also seeks to provide for the housing needs of the community by allocating a range of suitable, deliverable housing sites sufficient to meet the requirements of the Glossopdale sub-area, including the delivery of appropriate levels of affordable housing.
- 7.75 NPPF paragraph 61 states: *"To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community"*.
- 7.76 In detail, LP Policy H3 'New Housing Development' requires all new residential development to address the housing needs of local people by:
- a) *"Providing a range of market and affordable housing types and sizes that can reasonably meet the requirements and future needs of a wide range of household types including for the elderly and people with specialist housing needs, based on evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment or successor documents.*
 - b) *Providing a mix of housing that contributes positively to the promotion of a sustainable and inclusive community taking into account the characteristics of the existing housing stock in the surrounding locality.*
 - c) *Supporting dwellings designed to provide flexible accommodation which is capable of future adaptation by seeking to achieve adequate internal space for the intended number of occupants in accordance with the Nationally Described Space Standard and delivered to meet accessibility standards set out in the Optional Requirement M4(2) of Part M of the Building Regulations"*.
- 7.77 The Council's Housing and Economic Land Needs Assessment (HELNA) dated September 2022 was commissioned to inform the review of the Local Plan. Accordingly, the HELNA is deemed to be a "successor document" to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 (SHMA) as referenced in LP Policy H3 and should therefore be considered when determining the scheme. The HELNA provides an updated analysis of the housing mix required across the Borough as well as providing a more detailed assessment of the recommended housing mix across each of the Local Plan sub-areas. This includes the Glossopdale area within which the application site is located.
- 7.78 Consequently, developments should seek to bring the housing stock in the vicinity of and closer to the HELNA recommended mix. This allows for the characteristics of the housing stock in the locality to be considered. The recommendations from the 2022 HELNA in relation to the mix of social housing for both High Peak as a whole, as well as Glossopdale are

outlined below alongside the proposed housing mix from the scheme and existing housing stock in Dinting Ward ward.

7.79 Recommendations with a market adjustment are also provided. This results in a 15% reduction in the number of smaller (1-2 bed) dwellings and a commensurate increase in the number of 3- and 4-bedroom properties to reflect “the very pronounced socio-economic shock precipitated by the pandemic and the strong (and what appears to be a permanent) shift towards homeworking and the need for larger properties to accommodate this” (HELNA, para 12.34).

7.80 The HELNA evidence in relation to the Glossopdale sub-area in terms of market and social housing provision is detailed in the table below:

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed or more
2014 SHMA	10%	45%	35%	10%
2022 HELNA High Peak	10%	37%	41%	12%
2022 HELNA High Peak (with market adjustment)	8%	32%	44%	16%
2022 HELNA Glossop	7%	37%	46%	10%
2022 HELNA Glossop (with market adjustment)	6%	31%	49%	13%
% of existing housing stock in Dinting Ward (2021 Census)	5%	21%	40%	34%

7.81 With regard to housing mix, the applicant states how the scheme for a 104 dwellings could be split as follows:

- 1 bed (8%) - 8 dwellings
- 2 bed (31%) - 32 dwellings
- 3 bed (41%) - 43 dwellings
- 4+ bed (21%) - 21 dwellings

7.82 When assessing recent data from the 2021 Census showing the actual percentage of housing stock in the Dinting Ward and to bring the housing stock closer to the HELNA recommendations, a greater proportion of 1-, 2- and 3-bedroom homes are required.

7.83 Whilst the indicative housing mix mostly accords with HELNA recommendations, the 4+ bedroom Dinting Ward housing stock already

exceeds HELNA recommendations, which would be further exacerbated by the applicant's indicative proposal. Accordingly, the scheme should achieve a higher proportion of 3-bedroom homes against a lower proportion of 4+ bedroom homes to achieve a greater consistency with HELNA recommendations whilst balancing ward housing stock.

- 7.84 Parts c) and e) of LP Policy H3 require all new residential development to contribute positively to the promotion of an inclusive community and to be delivered to meet accessibility standards as set out in the Optional Requirement M4(2) of Part M of the Building Regulations. This requirement is further endorsed by the evidence in the HELNA, which recommends c.50% of new housing should meet these accessibility standards.
- 7.85 Notwithstanding such concerns raised at the outline planning application stage, a suitable housing mix, together Part M4 (2) compliance could be achieved at the reserved matters stage subject to an appropriately worded planning condition applied to the outline consent given these matters are reserved for future consideration.
- 7.86 In these circumstances, the scheme could provide a mix of housing which contributes positively to the promotion of a sustainable and inclusive community, including taking into account the characteristics of the existing housing stock in the surrounding locality.

Affordable Housing

- 7.87 LP Policy H3 'New Housing Development' criteria a) requires proposals to meet the LPs requirements for the provision of affordable housing as set out in LP Policy H4 'Affordable Housing' below. LP Policy H4 states all new residential development should meet the requirements of local people by providing affordable housing within the overall provision of new residential development for sites above 25 units whereby the requirement is 30%.
- 7.88 Of note, LP Policy H4 is deemed to be out of date by the local plan review for development management purposes given national planning policy updates in relation to affordable housing. This includes confirmation that the provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential development which are not major developments.
- 7.89 The development proposal for up to 110 dwellings would be required to secure 30% onsite affordable housing provision. The planning application form confirms a total provision of 33 social, affordable or intermediate rent housing units i.e. 30%. Furthermore, the provision of affordable houses should achieve a target of 80% rented accommodation with the balance being provided as intermediate housing for the scheme to comply with LP Policy H4.

- 7.90 Furthermore, the Council's Developer Contributions SPD at paragraph 4.11 provides additional guidance on space standards for affordable housing. To maximise flexibility in the lettings process and improve living conditions for occupants, it seeks to achieve 2-bed 4 person and 3-bed 5 person dwellings to NDSS requirements. In these regards, the scheme provides 8 x two-bedroom '4' person and 4 x three-bedroom '5' person dwellings to such standards.
- 7.91 The applicant's draft Heads of Terms for a s106 Planning Agreement regarding onsite affordable housing states that the breakdown of such provision would be determined following discussions with the Local Planning Authority. Whilst these are matters to be determined through the s106 agreement, the expectation would be a target of 80% rented accommodation with the balance being provided as intermediate housing for the scheme to be compliant LP Policy H4.

Nature Conservation

- 7.92 LP Policy EQ5 'Nature Conservation' states that the biodiversity and geological resources of the Plan Area and its surroundings will be conserved and where possible enhanced by ensuring that development proposals will not result in significant harm to biodiversity or geodiversity interests. The policy then goes on to identify how this will be achieved, specifying several criteria. The wording of Policy EQ5 requires development proposals to conserve biodiversity by ensuring no significant harm to these interests. There would be no requirement under the policy to achieve an overall biodiversity net gain, albeit the supporting text does seek this where possible.
- 7.93 The NPPF 'Habitats and biodiversity' section at paragraph 192 states: "*To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:*
- a) *Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity⁶⁸ wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation⁶⁹*
 - b) *promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity*".
- 7.94 For decision taking, the NPPF at paragraph 193 states the following principles should be applied including:
- 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; ...*

b) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate”.

7.95 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) in England is now mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states that it is an approach to development which “*makes sure that habitats for wildlife are left in a measurably better state than they were before the development*”. In these regards, developers must deliver a BNG of 10% and this “*means a development will result in more or better quality natural habitat than there was before development*”.

7.96 The application was submitted late in 2024 and after the legislation came into force in February 2024 placing a legal requirement on all non-exempt developments to secure 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).

7.97 Furthermore, the NPPF at paragraph 193 (d) states: “*When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: ... (d) while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate*” and is a material consideration in these regards.

7.98 The application site broadly comprises the site of a former school (now demolished), with areas of hardstanding, unmanaged modified grassland and scattered trees. Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (DWT) have reviewed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) (Tyler Grange, August 2024) and metric dated 12th August 2024 and provide commentary as follows:

“Proposals comprise a high-level parameters plan rather than an outline layout. Likely impacts will include loss of modified grassland and some scattered trees. Existing hedgerow is predicted for retention. Protected species constraints are largely restricted to nesting birds and hedgehogs. All trees with bat roost potential (BRP) are predicted to be retained. If removal of any of the 11No. trees with BRP identified in the PEA becomes necessary, additional survey and/or precautionary felling methods will be necessary.

Whilst the BNG calculations will be subject to change once a detailed layout is available, the parameters plan enables a broad outline prediction of losses and gains. Based on the assumptions set out in the PEA, a net gain of +6.91 habitat units (144%) and +2.01 hedgerow units (167.37%) is predicted through habitat creation and enhancement on site. The area of proposed green space is considered sufficiently large enough to ensure that trading rules are satisfied, given the scope for tree planting and other

habitat creation. We advise that an updated metric should be submitted as part of any reserved matters application. Full details of biodiversity gains must be provided in a statutory Gain Plan, prior to commencement of development. A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will be required to secure management and monitoring for onsite habitats for the 30 year period, as onsite gains are expected to be significant.

The PEA identifies the presence of internationally designated sites approximately 2.3 m from the application area. Whilst the type of development does not trigger consultation with Natural England, we would draw the attention of the LPA to Table 2.1 and Section 4.1 and advise that consideration should be given as to whether a Habitats Regulations Assessment is required”.

- 7.99 The Government guidance for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) confirms that the developer should enter into a legal agreement as the landowner for significant onsite BNG. In such circumstances, it would be necessary to secure the proposed onsite habitat creation and enhancements via a s106 agreement. In addition, proposed ecological planning conditions listed in the recommendations section of the report remain applicable to the scheme.
- 7.100 Accordingly, the scheme is considered to comply with LP Policy EQ5 ‘Nature Conservation’ and the NPPF by ensuring no significant harm to biodiversity interests and achieving an overall biodiversity net gain subject to the imposition of suitably worded planning conditions and s106 legal agreement.

Highway Safety & Sustainable Transport

- 7.101 LP Policy CF6 ‘Accessibility and Transport’ seeks to ensure new development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner and minimise the need to travel, particularly by unsustainable modes.
- 7.102 NPPF paragraph 115 states: *“In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:*
- a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location;*
 - b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
 - c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code⁴⁸; and*
 - d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach”.*

- 7.103 In addition, NPPF paragraph 116 states: *“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios”*.
- 7.104 The site is currently served by three existing accesses to Talbot Road consisting of two which serve as vehicle and pedestrian access and one which serves vehicles only. In addition, there is a pedestrian only access off North Road serving the western edge of the site.
- 7.105 The application proposes one new ‘priority’ access off Talbot Road with a width of 5.5m and 2m wide footways. The access is proposed to be provided with visibility splays of 2.4m x 43.0m in both directions. The Y distance of 43m is considered to be appropriate as confirmed by the Local Highway Authority (LHA) for the expected vehicle approach speeds on Talbot Road and is commensurate with the speed survey results included in the Transport Assessment (TA). The LHA note two raised pedestrian crossing points / plateaus on Talbot Road which would assist in reducing vehicle speeds and consider the proposed ‘priority’ access would be acceptable to serve development on the site.
- 7.106 In addition, a new pedestrian / emergency access further east on Talbot Road is proposed. This access appears to have a width of approximately 4.5m and has a 2.0m wide footway on the western side. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 43.0m are also considered achievable in both directions from the access along Talbot Road, although no reference is made to visibility splays in the TA or submitted plans as highlighted by the Local Highway Authority.
- 7.107 The Transport Assessment (TA) (reference VN232727, prepared by SLR Consulting Ltd, dated 25 October 2024) has been submitted in support of the application proposal. In these regards, the application site is considered to be sustainably located close to Glossop town centre and is within a short walking distance of the various shops, services, and amenities available in the town centre. Furthermore, the site is well located with good pedestrian infrastructure and cycle access to a range of shops and services, together with good bus and train access. The TA concludes as follows:

“The impact of the vehicular trip generation associated with the site development on the surrounding roads will be very limited, with the new development generating being expected to generate significantly less traffic than the previous school on site during the morning peak and only 20 vehicles more during the evening peak hour. Therefore, the proposals will not be harmful for the surrounding highways’ operations.

On this basis it is concluded that the proposed development will not lead to any material reduction in highway safety”.

- 7.108 With regard to the potential vehicular impact of the proposed development on the highway network, the LHA generally accepts the analysis undertaken and the conclusions reached in the submitted TA. Accordingly, it is considered that the application would not have severe residual cumulative impact on the highway network or highway safety matters.
- 7.109 The revised Travel Plan (reference VN232727 Rev 03, prepared by SLR Consulting Ltd, dated 8th July 2024), together with updated access point drawings have been submitted to address Local Highway Authority (LHA) commentary as stated within the consultation section above to clarify the usage and control of individual access points. The revised cycle and pedestrian accesses to Talbot Road and North Road are now considered to be suitable as confirmed by the LHA in their revised commentary. In addition, the Travel Plan would be subject to an implementation and monitoring planning condition, in addition to the other recommended conditions.
- 7.110 A Travel Plan Monitoring Fee of £6,600 would be required to be secured via a s106 legal agreement.
- 7.111 The Council's Alliance Waste detailed commentary as set out in the consultation section above would be addressed at the reserved matters layout stage.
- 7.112 Accordingly, the scheme is considered to comply with LP Policy CF6 and the NPPF by securing development, which can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner and minimise the need to travel, particularly by unsustainable modes subject to the imposition of suitably worded planning conditions and s106 legal agreement.

Local Flood Risk / Drainage

- 7.113 LP Policy EQ11 'Flood Risk Management' states that the Council will support development proposals that avoid areas of current or future flood risk and which do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, where this is viable and compatible with other policies aimed at achieving sustainable patterns of development.
- 7.114 In addition, NPPF paragraph 181 states: "*When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment⁶³. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that:*
- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;*

- b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;*
- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;*
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and*
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan”.*

7.115 Furthermore, NPPF paragraph 181 states: “Applications which could affect drainage on or around the site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, and which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. These should provide multifunctional benefits wherever possible, through facilitating improvements in water quality and biodiversity, as well as benefits for amenity. Sustainable drainage systems provided as part of proposals for major development should:

- a) take account of advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority;*
- b) have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards; and*
- c) have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development”.*

7.116 The application site is located within the Environment Agency’s (EA) Flood Zone 1 with a low probability of flood risk.

7.117 An updated Drainage Strategy and Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Revision P5 ref. 00.23181-ACE-ZZ-ZZ-RP-C-0001 dated 21st August 2025, together with an amended Considerations Plan Revision V4 to correct the discrepancy between the surface water flooding as shown on the earlier Considerations Plan has been submitted to address the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) objections as follows:

“We are recommending an objection on the proposed development as it is not possible to provide an informed comment until such a time that the applicant has submitted further information to address the below points:

Properties around the boundary are modelled to be at flood risk, in particular to the southwest, this should be acknowledged in the FRA, i.e. the current risk.

Proposals have been put forward to capture flow from a spring and from outside the boundary and channel this around the site around the western boundary to the area at a high risk of flooding. No explanation of how these flows will be diverted safely off site without increasing the risk to adjacent properties has been provided. This would be described as an engineered point of discharge and as such needs to be addressed.

The culvert within the site is a proposed discharge point, however its condition and connectivity is currently unknown beyond that something is causing water levels to increase in the culvert. This prevented a survey of

the culvert to confirm its condition and onward connectivity, this needs to be addressed before the LLFA can comment further. In addition, the proposed basin is at a lower elevation than the pond, how the basin will drain should be addressed.

UU have indicated they may accept a discharge to the Talbot Road surface water sewer but given the site topography this will require a pumped solution. A pumped solution has not been discussed in the event the culvert can't be utilised. As a statutory consultee for surface water the minimum details required on all major planning applications are as follows. The applicant has addressed most of these points, however, point 3 remains outstanding" ... "3. Appropriate evidence to support how the site will drain, including confirmation of where the surface water will outfall to (photographs / maps / a confirmation letter from a water company)".

7.118 Members will be brought up to date in relation to flood risk and drainage matters via the Updates Report published on the 5th September 2025.

Pollution and Unstable Land

7.119 LP Policy EQ10 'Pollution and Unstable Land' seeks to protect people and the environment from unsafe and polluted environments, requiring mitigation if necessary. In addition, LP Policy EQ6 'Design and Place Making' stipulates that development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and should not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity. Similarly NPPF paragraph 135(f) requires a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

7.120 The 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment' section paragraph 187(e) of the NPPF states "*new and existing development should not contribute to, or be put at an unacceptable risk from, or be adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability*".

7.121 The 'Ground conditions and pollution' section paragraph 196 states: "*Planning policies and decisions should ensure that:*

- a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation);*
- b) after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and*
- c) adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments.*

- 7.122 In addition, NPPF paragraph 198 requires: *“Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative 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. In doing so they should:*
- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life⁷²;*
 - b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and*
 - c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation”.*
- 7.123 The Council's Environmental Health Department has accepted the following submitted contaminated land assessments: HSP Consulting, “Phase I Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report” (ref: HSP2021- C3678-G-GPi-439), dated 10 March 2022 and HSP Consulting, “Phase II Geo-Environmental Assessment Report” (ref: HSP2022- C3678-G-GPii-518), dated 10 March 2022.
- 7.124 In these regards, the reports have identified limited contamination and conclude remediation may be required to render the site suitable for residential use. The proposed end use of the development is noted as being particularly sensitive to the presence of land contamination and therefore a full land contamination condition has been recommended by the Council's Environmental Health Department.
- 7.125 Other planning conditions are recommended in relation to controlling noise, dust, vibration including any proposed piling activities in relation to safeguarding the amenity of nearby sensitive properties during the scheme's site preparation and construction phases.
- 7.126 A revised air quality screening assessment Air Quality Assessment Talbot Road, Glossop Derbyshire County Council ref: VAL-24-0073 dated July 2025 has been submitted to address the Council's Environmental Health Department's earlier holding objection on the grounds of insufficient information concerning resultant adverse air quality impacts from the scheme. Consequently, a conditional response has been issued requiring a prescriptive set back of dwellings from Talbot Road and control of construction dust with regard to a construction management plan and would be secured via suitably worded planning conditions.
- 7.127 Accordingly, the scheme is deemed to be acceptable to accord with LP Policy EQ10 'Pollution and Unstable Land' and the NPPF subject to the imposition of suitably worded planning conditions.

Planning Obligations

7.128 LP Policy CF7 'Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure' requires development proposals to provide planning obligations where relevant and necessary to mitigate against the impact of the development. In addition, the Council's Developer Contributions 2023 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides detailed guidance on the type and extent of developer contributions that the Council may seek to secure from development.

7.129 The planning obligations sought for the scheme for up to 110 dwellings are as follows:

Open Space, Sports & Recreational Facilities

Requested off-site financial contributions towards existing facilities within a 2-mile radius of the site:

- Play - £249.30 x 110 = £27,423
- Parks & Gardens - £620.40 x 110 = £68,244
- Allotments - £91.30 x 110 = £10,043
- Built Sports Facility towards the provision of a new leisure centre in Glossop, including combined wet and dry facility:-
 - Swimming pool - £59,941
 - Sports hall - £50,361
- Grass playing pitches towards enhancing, developing and maintaining grass pitches within a 2-mile radius of the site:-
 - £26,253 – contribution towards a new grass pitch
 - £52,670 maintenance costs over 10 years towards Cemetery Road (£5,267 x 10 years).

TOTAL = £294,935

Affordable Housing Provision

7.130 This matter has been considered in the relevant part of the report above, however, the onsite 30% affordable housing provision should be satisfactorily addressed within a s106 legal agreement.

County Education (School Facilities)

7.131 A financial contribution of £89,441.97 is sought towards the provision of Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) places.

Future Management and Maintenance (Proposed Access Roads, Public Open Space & Play Area)

7.132 The applicant should properly secure the future management and maintenance of the proposed access roads, Public Open Space, including

Local Play Area and incidental open spaces which would need to be satisfactorily addressed within a s106 legal agreement.

County Library (Stock Provision)

- 7.133 A stock only financial contribution of £7,751.92 is sought for Glossop Library.

County Travel Plan Monitoring

- 7.134 A financial contribution totalling £6,325 for a period of five years will be required for the Travel Monitoring fee.

NHS (National Health Service)

- 7.135 A financial contribution request is expected from the NHS towards enhancing capacity / infrastructure with existing local practices.
- 7.136 Accordingly, the above requirements arising from the development should be properly secured within a s106 agreement for the scheme to accord with LP Policy CF7 'Planning Obligations' and the Council's Developer Contributions SPD 2023.

Other Matters

- 7.137 Members will be brought up to date in relation to outstanding scheme matters, in relation to fire safety, flood risk matters, required NHS contributions and quantum of development via the Updates Report, which will be published on the 5th September 2025.

8. CONCLUSION & PLANNING BALANCE

- 8.1 As there is conflict with the development plan, there is a requirement to consider the proposal against the provisions of paragraph 11d) of the NPPF.
- 8.2 NPPF paragraph 11 (as amended) for decision taking states:

"Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. ...

For decision-taking this means:

- c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or*
- d) 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”.*

- 8.3 In terms of any heritage harm, the proposal would not raise any conflict with relevant local and national heritage planning policy.
- 8.4 Furthermore, the proposed housing scheme would be sustainably located within the built settlement of Glossop.
- 8.5 The proposal seeks to deliver up to 110 homes, 70% of which would be open market homes and 30% of which would be affordable homes, subject to an appropriately worded legal agreement. In terms of affordable housing, this level of provision would comply with Local Plan LP Plan H4 ‘Affordable Housing’ requirements. Despite some concerns regarding the application site’s ability to accommodate a totality of 110 dwellings, the delivery of both open market and affordable housing in this region would represent scheme benefits which can be afforded significant weight in the planning balance.
- 8.6 There would be economic and social benefits in terms of jobs created during construction and the additional local expenditure generated. These benefits may not be targeted specifically at Glossop, rather they would be more broadly spread across the Borough. Nonetheless, the boost to the local population would be likely to enhance the towns attractiveness as a location for investment in shops and services, in turn enhancing the long-term sustainability and vitality of Glossop. These benefits would accrue from any residential development and therefore should be afforded moderate weight in the balance.
- 8.7 The scheme would significantly enhance the biodiversity and ecology of the development site, subject to details being suitably secured. It would also include green margins along the site boundaries.
- 8.8 In the context of paragraph 11(i) of the NPPF, the application of policies protecting areas or assets of particular importance (in this case, designated heritage assets) do not provide a strong reason for refusing the proposed development whereby scheme impacts are considered to be neutral.
- 8.9 Turning to the second exception at paragraph 11 d) ii., the scheme’s adverse impacts regarding loss of playing field land and conflict with Local Plan Policies, including: S1, S5, H1, CF4 in particular should be considered as the wording in 11 d) ii. refers to ‘any adverse impacts’.

- 8.10 When considered particularly against the significant weight to be afforded to the delivery of both open market and affordable homes, the adverse impacts identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the above benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.
- 8.11 Accordingly, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies in line with NPPF paragraph 11.
- 8.12 In conclusion, there would be conflict with Local Plan Policies, including: S1, S5, H1, CF4 for the above reasons. The proposed development would accord with Policies including EQ5, EQ6, EQ7, EQ9, EQ10 and H4. The harm identified, however, is not considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme, including the delivery of housing to meet an identified shortfall in the Councils housing land supply position.
- 8.13 Accordingly, refusal of planning permission is recommended.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. REFUSE

1. The proposed development would involve the loss of playing field land, which is not associated with an alternative facility of equal or better quality to deliver benefits to clearly outweigh its loss and neither has an assessment been undertaken to demonstrate that the playing field land is surplus to requirements. In particular, 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. 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).

- B. In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.**

Location Plan

