

9. FULL APPLICATION - ERECTION OF A STEEL FRAMED BUILDING WITH A CANOPY AND AN EXTERNAL MUCK MIDDEN TO BE USED FOR THE HOUSING OF LIVESTOCK ALONG WITH THE STORAGE OF STRAW AND HAY AT STANEDGE GRANGE NEWHAVEN, (NP/DDD/0817/0880 P3218 416315 / 359968 21/8/2017/SC).

APPLICANT: MRS MARY BUNTING

Site and Surroundings

Stanedge Grange is a working farm, situated in open countryside overlooking the A515 approximately 300m south of Newhaven and 1km north-east of Biggin. The farm complex comprises the farm house, a farm shop and a range of both modern and traditional outbuildings. A manege has been approved to the north of the main group of farm buildings. Two Public Rights of Way (PRoW) run in an east west direction, one from the A515 crossing the north side of the farm and the other along the farms access track, through the farmyard and conjoining with the other before bearing west to meet with the Tissington Trail.

Proposal

Planning consent is being sought to erect a modern steel framed agricultural building and muck midden. The agricultural building and midden would be sited within a field to the south west of the main farm complex. The agricultural building would measure approximately 30m in length x 13.7m, with a height of 6.5m to ridge, and would create a floor area of approximately 411m². The roof would be clad in blue fibre cement roof sheets, with vertical timber cladding above concrete panels to the gable and rear elevation; the front of the building would be open. The proposed muck midden would be attached to the west gable of the building, constructed with 2m high concrete panels enclosing an area of around 13m x 9m with an open frontage. According to the applicant, the building has been designed in conjunction with the operation of the essential day to day running of the working farm and would provide the farm with housing for ewes and lambs over the months before and during lambing season and for the housing of stores lambs and a number of cattle.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed agricultural building and muck midden would be sited in an open setting, appearing isolated from the existing farm buildings whilst visible from long and short range vantage points, therefore creating a harmful impact upon the local landscape character and the wider scenic beauty of the National Park. Moreover, it is considered there is insufficient justification at this stage to demonstrate that the buildings are essential for the agricultural need and as such the benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the landscape harm that would arise from the development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3, L1, Local Plan Policies LC4 and LC13, and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Key Issues

1. The principle and agricultural need
2. The impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape.
3. Highways considerations
4. Amenity considerations

History

There are a number of planning applications for development related to the farm dating back to the late 1970's. The most recent applications being the erection of a livestock building (2010), erection of two hanging signs (2012), manege (2012) and conversion of redundant farm buildings to tea rooms (2016), all granted conditionally.

Consultations

Highway Authority - No objection, subject to all use remaining ancillary to agricultural operations at Stanedge Grange

District Council - No response

Parish Council - Supports the application for a new agricultural shed and muck midden.

PDNPA Archaeology - The site is of archaeological interest which has some impact, but capable of mitigation by condition.

Representations

No third party representations have been received during the course of the application.

Main Policies

Core Strategy

DS1 and L1, supports agricultural development in the open countryside, provided that development respects, conserves and enhances the valued characteristics of the site paying particular attention to impact upon the character and setting of buildings and siting, landscaping and building materials.

Local Plan

LC4 expects a high standard of design, with particular attention being paid to scale, form and massing, building materials, landscaping, amenity and privacy.

LC13 allows for development necessary for the purposes of agriculture, provided that they are close to the main group of buildings wherever possible and in all cases relates well to existing buildings and landscape features, respects the design of existing buildings and building traditions, makes use of the least obtrusive location and does not require obtrusive access tracks, roads or services.

Further advice is given within the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Agricultural Developments in the Peak District National Park.

National Planning Policy Framework

It is considered that the adopted Core Strategy policies are consistent with the NPPF and further its intention in a manner that is appropriate in a National Park. It is therefore considered that in this case there are no significant conflicts between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues raised. In particular Paragraph 28 states, that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development.

Wider Policy context (if relevant)

GSP1 seeks that any development proposal will comply with core policies so that any development in the National Park must satisfy the statutory purposes of national park designation. GSP3 states the overarching principles for development management to be considered in all circumstances and requires that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings that are subject to the development proposal.

Assessment

Principle and essential need

Authority's Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on Agricultural Developments (SPD) states that if inadequate information to justify proposals is supplied then applications may be refused. Submitted information sets out that the applicant owns and farms approximately 36 acres of land and rents a further 235 acres, with a stock of 65 ewes (to increase to 100) and 4 store cattle (to increase to 12), plus 20 ewe lambs to run as replacements. In this case, the farm supports the applicant on a full time basis and her son on a part time basis in conjunction with the farm's butchery business, which is located at the site. According to the applicant, the farm has recently been divided between herself and her husband, with the main modern farm buildings and land (amount not known) being retained by the latter. The applicant has kept the farmhouse, an array of traditional outbuildings and land as stated above. Part of this land (subject of this application) is sited to the west of the main farm complex and would provide the location for the proposed buildings. No evidence has been submitted which addresses why the existing buildings on the farm are not available or are unable to support or cope with the existing or intended demand. Subsequently, Officers consider that there is insufficient information to demonstrate that there is a genuine agricultural justification for the proposed building and midden, particularly as there are existing buildings on the farm that could potentially support the applicant's existing and intended need. As is discussed further below, it is considered that the proposal would result in landscape harm. In the absence of strong agricultural justification for the development, it is considered that the benefits of the proposed scheme would not outweigh the landscape harm that would arise from the development.

The impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape.

The main building itself would be designed as a modern agricultural general-purpose building and constructed of materials that are appropriate for this type of structure. The building would incorporate a coloured fibre cement sheeted roof, incorporating roof lights and a vented ridge with vertical timber boarding to the gables and rear elevation, with concrete panels below. The midden would be attached to the west gable elevation of the agricultural building and constructed on two sides with concrete panels to a height of approximately 2m, with the front remaining open. It is considered that the design and materials of the proposed building and midden would be broadly acceptable.

However, the proposed building and muck midden would be sited approximately 15m south-west of the nearest farm building. A new access track would be required along the northern boundary of the field to link an existing field gate adjacent to the farmyard with another existing field gate providing access to the development site.

It is considered that the proposed building and midden would appear isolated and detached from the existing group of farm buildings. The field in which they are proposed is predominantly open and therefore the structures would appear highly visible when viewed from public viewpoints. Officers consider that the development would have a significant visual impact on the surrounding open landscape. The buildings would be visible from public vantage points and whilst new landscaping could potentially mitigate its appearance in the longer term, it would still be highly visible from public views close by on the PRow's to the north and south east of the development site and at distance along a stretch of the main A515 to the east. Therefore the proposal is considered to conflict with policy LC13, as the buildings would not be easily assimilated into the

landscape in this submitted location.

In landscape terms therefore, by virtue of their siting, the building and midden would appear as a visual intrusion into the open landscape and would be highly visible from public views. It is considered that the development would have an adverse visual impact on the valued character and appearance of the locality and the surrounding countryside contrary to policies DS1 & L1.

Archaeological issues

The Authority's Archaeologist has stated that the proposed development is a site of archaeological interest. In this case, a number of earthwork features were identified in an archaeological survey of the Newhaven area which was undertaken in 2008. This survey depicts extensive earthworks in fields around Stanedge Grange, and particularly relevant to this development in the fields immediately to the north and south of the proposed development site. Although no earthworks were recorded in the field of the proposed development itself, the close proximity of the earthworks in the fields to the north and south are a strong indication that as yet unidentified archaeological remains may survive below ground, in the area of the proposed development.

The current planning application does not acknowledge the archaeological interest of the site, nor that the proposed development would impact a non-designated heritage asset. This is contrary to para.128 of NPPF that requires applications to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a development to a level of detail proportionate to the assets' significance and to a level sufficient to understand the potential impact of the development proposals on their significance. It also requires, that the site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include (as is the case here) heritage assets with archaeological interest, therefore local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk based assessment, and where necessary field evaluation. In this case, the current application does not provide the information required by the NPPF.

Consequently, should members be minded to grant consent, a staged programme of archaeological works, should be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced individual/contractor to a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and approved by PDNPA's Senior Conservation Archaeologist. This could be conditioned accordingly.

Highways

The Highway Authority raises no objections, subject to all use remaining ancillary to agricultural operations at Stanedge Grange. As such, the proposal would remain acceptable in highway terms, in accordance with LT11 & LT18.

Amenity

The nearest residential properties are sited over 400m away to the east. At this distance, the occupants of those properties are not considered to be adversely affected by the development. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with GSP3 & LC4.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Officers have assessed the proposal against Development Plan policies, the National Planning Policy Framework, and all other material considerations and concluded that it represented a form of development that was not capable of being amended in a way which would make the scheme acceptable within the current application. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil