

9. FULL APPLICATION - ERECTION OF OPEN MARKET DWELLING AT FORMER SEVERN TRENT PUMPING STATION SITE, MAIN STREET, TADDINGTON - (NP/DDD/1018/0942, P1171, MN)

APPLICANT: MR ALLEN

Site and Surroundings

1. The application site is a former water pumping station, located approximately 80 metres to the south of the main road (Main Street) through Taddington village.
2. The site is accessed along a single lane access track and comprises the former pumping station building and an area of hardstanding in front of this. The building itself dates from the 1950s and is a small single storey building of davy block construction with a tiled roof.
3. To its northern side the property bounds the residential property of Beech Croft. It is bounded by fields to the south and west, and by the public right of way to the east, which is partly lined with trees.
4. In addition to the footpath to the immediate east of the site – which shares the line of the access track – there are further footpaths in close proximity to the north and west of the site, all of which have views across it.
5. The site is within the Taddington conservation area and is identified in the Taddington Conservation Area Appraisal as an Area of Important Open Space.

Proposal

6. To demolish the former pumping station building and build a two storey open market dwelling and double garage on the site.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- i. **The provision of open market housing is contrary to policy HC1 other than in exceptional circumstances which do not apply in this case.**
- ii. **The location of the dwelling would detract from the open character of the identified Important Open Space and the dwelling would appear isolated, harming the character and appearance of the Taddington Conservation Area and the landscape character of this part of the National Park, contrary to Development Plan policies LC4 and LC5.**
- iii. **The site access is substandard in terms of both its width and in regard to exit visibility on to the public highway, and intensification of its use would reduce highway safety and amenity, contrary to policy LT18.**

Key Issues

7. Whether the provision of open market housing in the proposed location is acceptable in principle
8. Whether the proposed dwellings would conserve the character and appearance of the landscape

9. Whether the development would conserve highway safety and amenity
10. The amenity impacts of the development

Relevant Planning History

11. 2017 – Planning permission granted for conversion of barn to dwellinghouse – the barn is located approximately 60m north east of the application site, and sharing the same access on to the highway. It is listed here due to the applicants reference to it in support of their proposal, which is addressed later in this report.

Consultations

12. Derbyshire County Council - Highways – Object to the application on the following grounds:
 - The proposals would introduce additional vehicle movements at a location where exit visibility (towards the highway) is restricted
 - It would increase vehicular use of a track carrying a public right of way, increasing the potential for conflicts with its users
 - It would result in a dwelling 80m from the highway that is served by a track that falls below the recommended minimum width to enable service/delivery vehicles to safely enter the site
 - The submitted plans do not demonstrate that vehicles could turn within the site in order to be able to leave in forward gear
13. Derbyshire Dales District Council – No response at time of writing.
14. Taddington Parish Council – Support the application.

Representations

15. Five letters of representation have been received, all supporting the proposal. The grounds for support are that it would bring a redundant site back in to use and improve its appearance, it would provide housing for the village, and that it would help to revitalise the village.

Policies

16. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for national parks in England and Wales:
 - Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage
 - Promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public
17. When national parks carry out these purposes they also have the duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the national parks.

National Planning Policy Framework

18. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. It was revised and republished in July 2018. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the

National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies in the Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.

19. Para 172 of the NPPF states that *'great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.'*

Development Plan policies

20. Policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GSP1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.
21. Policy GSP3 sets out development management principles and states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.
22. Policy L1 identifies that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.
23. Policy HC1 states that provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand. Exceptionally, it permits new housing (whether newly built or from re-use of an existing building) where it provides affordable housing to address eligible local needs, where it provides for key workers in agriculture, forestry or other rural enterprises, and where, in accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2:
- I. it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings; or
 - II. it is required in order to achieve conservation or enhancement in settlements listed in core policy DS1.
24. Policy LC4 of the Local Plan states that where development is acceptable in principle it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, conserves and where possible enhances the landscape, built environment and other valued characteristics of the area.
25. Policy LC5 states that development in conservation areas should assess and clearly demonstrate how the existing appearance of the conservation area will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced.
26. Policy LT11 requires that the design and number of parking spaces associated with a development respects the valued characteristics of the area.

27. Policy LT18 states that safe access arrangements will be a prerequisite to any development.
28. The adopted Taddington Conservation Area Appraisal is a further material consideration. This states that open spaces identified in the Appraisal are of particular townscape significance and should be protected from development.
29. The Authority's adopted design guidance documents 'Design Guide' and 'Building Design Guide' are further materials considerations.
30. Relevant Core Strategy (CS) policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, HC1
31. Relevant Local Plan (LP) policies: LH1, LH2, LC4, LC5, LT11, LT18

Assessment

Principle of constructing an open market property

32. Policy HC1 only permits the construction of new open market housing in settlements where it is required to conserve a valued vernacular or listed building or to achieve conservation or enhancement in settlements.
33. The proposal is for a new building, not for conversion of an existing valued vernacular or listed building, meaning the only way in which the development could comply with planning policy would be if the site was in need of conservation or enhancement and if the proposal would deliver this.
34. The current site includes a modestly sized building that by virtue of its massing, materials, and weathered appearance appears recessive in wider views and has a low impact in the landscape. The site is therefore not resulting in any significant degree of harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area or village and redevelopment of the site is not required for conservation or enhancement of the settlement. Further, a larger development on the site would have an increased prominence in the landscape and, as discussed in more detail below, would not enhance the appearance of the settlement.
35. The development would not deliver any conservation or enhancement benefits and the application is therefore contrary to policy HC1 and is unacceptable in principle.

Landscape impacts, design and impact on the Conservation Area

36. The application site abuts that of the residential property of Beech Close to the north, but the distance between the existing building on the site and this nearest neighbour is almost 45m. As a result of this and the fact that there are no other buildings in close proximity to the application site the current building appears isolated in the fields to the south of the village. It is single storey and modest in both gable width and length however and as a result, as noted above, it is small and has a low impact in the landscape.
37. The proposed building would occupy a similar position to the existing one but is a much larger structure in every regard, and would be a much more prominent building that would appear removed from the existing village development.
38. In particular, where visible from the main road to the north west and when viewed from the footpath network to the west the building would appear very isolated in an otherwise open and undeveloped area on the edge of the village. As a result it would appear incongruous and would have a harmful effect on the appearance of the landscape, detracting from its

rural character.

39. It would also represent development within an area of identified Important Open Space within the village Conservation Area, which the Conservation Area Appraisal resists on the grounds that these areas are largely – and historically – free from development and new development therefore results in harm to the heritage value of these areas of land and the historic pattern of settlements. The identified Important Open Space in which the application site is located makes an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. The erosion of part of the open space through the introduction of a much larger building than currently exists would result in the loss of the sense of openness in this part of the Conservation Area.
40. The development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
41. The application is therefore contrary to policies LC4 and LC5 of the Development Plan.
42. In design terms the building appears to seek to reflect the characteristics of a traditional local barn; although the number of openings, detailing of openings to the rear elevation, and adjacent double garage all serve to undermine this intent and result in an unsatisfactory appearance. Had the development been concluded to be acceptable in other regards then Officers would have worked with the applicant to overcome these concerns.

Amenity

43. The development would be positioned some distance from any other building, the closest is Beech Close to the north some 45 metres away. The boundary of this property's curtilage abuts the application site however, approximately 10 metres away from the front elevation of the proposed dwellinghouse. This would result in the potential for some overlooking of the neighbouring garden.
44. However, this garden is not private at present as it is already open to view from the surrounding footpath network due to low boundary walls and because the topography of the land allows views down in to the site from the footpath to the south. In this context, it is not considered that the development would result in a significant loss of privacy for the neighbouring dwellinghouse.
45. Due to its separation from other properties the development would not result in a loss of amenity for any other nearby residence.

Highway Considerations

46. The development would result in an increase in traffic movements to and from the site; the building is currently empty and generating no traffic movements but even its previous use as a pumping station would have resulted in very low levels of traffic.
47. The highway authority has raised concerns over increasing traffic movements along the access track serving the site, on the grounds that as a public footpath and conflicts with pedestrians would be increased. This is because its width is substandard for service and delivery vehicles, because service and delivery vehicles couldn't turn within the site, and because exit visibility where the track joins the highway is restricted.
48. Whilst a change of layout within the site could likely overcome the issue of turning vehicles, each of the other matters raised would result in adverse impacts to highway safety.
49. The applicant has contested the views of the highway authority, drawing comparisons between this application and an application approved in 2017 for conversion of a camping

barn to a dwelling, which shares the same access track as the current application. The highway authority raised no objections to that proposal. However, it was concluded in that case that proposal would not result in any significant increase in vehicle movements from the camping barn use. The two developments are therefore not directly comparable and the earlier decision can only be given very limited weight.

50. Overall it is concluded that the development would have an adverse impact on the safe use of the highway, contrary to policy LT18.

Conclusion

51. The provision of new build open market housing in this location is not required for conservation or enhancement of Taddington, and so the proposal fails to accord with the Authority's housing policies in principle.

52. Further, the siting of the development would have adverse impacts on the character and appearance of both the landscape and conservation area.

53. The development would also result in harm to highway safety and amenity.

54. Based on the above assessment the application is therefore in conflict with policies HC1, LC4, LC5, and LT18 of the Development Plan.

55. Having also taken all other material considerations in to account, the application is recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

None arising.

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

None

Report Author and Job Title

Mark Nuttall, Senior Planner