

Policy comments: SMD/2026/0052 (Outline permission for redevelopment of the former Anzio site for residential dwellings, retail business, amenity space, internal roads, and associated hard/soft landscaping. Including the principal means of vehicular access from the A53 Buxton Road (all other matters reserved).)

I refer to my earlier policy comments in response to the pre-app PAD 25/0004. That scheme proposed a mix of uses including residential (including veterans' housing), holiday lodges and service facilities and my earlier comments were based on those uses.

The current outline application across 12ha of this brownfield site and now proposes: residential (including affordable) dwellings, retail business, amenity space, internal roads, and associated hard/soft landscaping with stated residential coverage of approx. 80% of site area. Between 275-285 dwellings are proposed at around 29-30 dwh. The fallback position of the extant planning permission for extra care housing, care homes, live work units, holiday lodge park, on-site services and facilities is referred to. It is pointed out the residential layout will be similar in footprint, but lower (2 storey) owing to the dwellings being lower than the approved residential care buildings.

The illustrative plan shows how main vehicular access would be achieved from the main Anzio Camp access road onto the Buxton rd, the housing would be accommodated along internal estate roads/cul de sacs within most of the site; with some internal greenspaces and peripheral landscaping mostly along west and south boundaries. The retail area with its parking would be located to the SW of the development. Submitted BNG report explains how BNG is unlikely to be achieved on-site therefore off-site solutions would be required. I am unclear if the scheme is intended to incorporate on-site SuDS.

A submitted TA argues “ *TA has demonstrated that the traffic associated with the development proposals can be accommodated on surrounding highway network without having a severe impact in accordance with the NPPF..*”. Reference is also made to a travel plan (has this been submitted yet?) that will sets out measures to encourage sustainable travel patterns and reduce the reliance on private car use. Refer also to SMLP Pol T1 regarding expected (proportionate) mitigations upon larger schemes having highways impacts.

I would re-iterate that adopted Policy DSR5 sets out the supported uses on the site (along with para 7.2.7 of CVMP], neither of which include general market housing. A view would

need to be reached whether the site is close enough to 'smaller village' Blackshaw Moor such that Pol SS9 (and Pol H1(4) with respect to infill/ribbon development) applies; if not Pol SS10 would apply by default. In any event both policies seem to effectively limit scale of new housing to that with limited (landscape/highways etc) impacts. Also a view of whether para 84 NPPF would need to be reached over isolated housing.

As a market residential scheme, the affordable housing expectations of Pol H3 (33%) would apply unless the applicant can satisfactorily demonstrate non-compliance; also the housing mix expectations of Pol H1(1-3) , Council SHMA, and NPPF para 63 etc would apply on this major scheme. Given the scheme's scale, density and proximity to the Peak Park (about 600m at nearest point) also refer to SMLP Poles DC1 and DC3.

Tilted balance

As the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5YHLS, refer to the guidance in NPPF para 11(d) (i) and (ii).

Para 11(i): refer to footnote 7 which lists national parks as 'areas of particular importance'. Given the design, density and landscape elements of the scheme it would need to be assessed whether this would have (eg visual, noise or traffic) impacts on the nearby NP; and if so do these provide a "strong reason" to override the tilted balance? Also note there are adjacent nature conservation sites such as Anzio Training camp SBI (also some adjacent woodlands?) which may also trigger footnote 7.

If not, next refer to para 11(ii). The most recent NPPF has been amended such that the requirement for scheme harms to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits [to outweigh tilted balance] is now conditioned by consideration "to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes". Therefore determination should be based on whether: the (non-) accessibility aspects of the scheme (taking into account some nearby local service/facilities); brownfield status of site; design and density and landscape impact of site; and whether the undertaking on affordable housing provision, would (alone or in combination) significantly and demonstrably outweigh scheme benefits including the provision of housing (in arguably a generally non-policy compliant location) against the Council's housing requirements.

David Davies Planning Officer

Development Services

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

Tel: **01538 395400 extension 4135**

www.highpeak.gov.uk | Follow HPBC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)

www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk | Follow SMDC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)

