

6. FULL APPLICATION – DEMOLITION OF FORMER RISING SUN HOTEL AND ERECTION OF HOTEL (CLASS C1) INCORPORATING GROUND FLOOR FLOORSPACE WITH FLEXIBILITY TO BE USED FOR RESTAURANT/BAR (CLASS A3/A4 USES) AND FUNCTION FACILITIES, ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING SITE ACCESS, CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS AT THE RISING SUN, HOPE ROAD, BAMFORD (NP/HPK/0718/0597, JK)

APPLICANT: GiGi Developments Limited

Site and Surroundings

1. The Rising Sun Hotel is located on the north side of Hope Road (A6187) which forms the main road through the Hope Valley. It sits on the valley floor in open countryside between Bamford village (1.5 km to the north east) and Hope village (2.4kms to the west) with the smaller hamlet of Thornhill some 0.75km to the north. The Hope Road runs broadly parallel with the river Noe which lies a short distance farther to the south across open fields. To the north of the hotel, across an open field, lies the Hope Valley railway line running east/west linking the Hope Valley to Sheffield and Manchester, the nearest station to the site being at Bamford. For planning policy application purposes the site therefore lies in 'open countryside' being well outside of a town or village.
2. The current hotel building sits around 15m back from the main road within a roughly rectangular plot bounded by mature trees and hedging which extends to approximately 0.62 Ha. The building has a two storey linear form with a frontage length of over 50m broken up by projecting gables and entrance porches. Whilst the front of the building has a reasonably unified two storey form the rear elevation presents a cluttered mass of two and single storey extensions, most of which are flat roofed.
3. There is car parking to the front and east side of the building with 60 spaces accessed via two separate vehicular entrances located at the east and west ends of the site. There is a large lawned garden area to the rear of the hotel which backs onto fields and affords views up towards Win Hill to the north. The western boundary has a 4m high conifer hedge screening the hotel from the neighbouring detached house, Rowan Lodge. This has an extensive garden area which abuts the site with the dwelling sitting some 40m to the North West of the hotel. Beyond Rowan Lodge is a further bungalow, Icarus Close, and beyond that open fields. Immediately to the east of the site is a paddock and beyond that a group of 5 houses the nearest of which is approximately 120m from the hotel.
4. The hotel accommodation had 12 bedrooms with a bar and restaurant providing 65 covers, together with a separate function room capable of accommodating 200 covers. It ceased trading in 2017 after the applicants explained it became unviable in its current condition. The site is fenced off to the public and the building is now in a very poor condition. It has been stripped out internally of all fixtures and fittings and is essentially now a brownfield site in need of redevelopment/regeneration. The applicants have developed a business plan since closure based on demolition of the current building and the construction of new, purpose-built premises to provide the standard of facilities customers now demand and level of accommodation necessary to secure a long-term future for the site.
5. A major constraint to redevelopment of the site is the presence of a pressurised mains sewer pipe which runs in an east-west direction under the lawn area across the back of the hotel.

Proposal

6. The application has been amended since submission and the amended scheme now comprises the following;

7. Demolition of the existing hotel followed by the erection of a new 72 bed hotel (6 less than submitted), five of which would be accessible rooms, with 150 cover restaurant with bar and function facilities. Outside would be a car park with 114 parking spaces (down from 117 spaces as submitted) which includes 2 dedicated electric vehicle charging spaces, 7 accessible and 3 staff spaces, together with a detached flat, green roofed 24 space cycle storage/wash/workshop building. There would also be a dedicated drop off area next to reception and a separate service vehicle delivery bay.
8. The new hotel building would sit to the front of the site, around 10m back from the road, some 5m closer than the existing hotel. It would have a wide 'H' shaped plan form comprised of a 2 ½ storey high central block flanked by 3 storey blocks. The central block with its lower roof would have the third floor rooms in the roof space lit with box profile dormers set back behind a flat roofed parapet. Either side of this central section the 3 storey (down from submitted 3 ½ storey) conventional pitched roof blocks would have wide gable ends facing the road and project out in front of the central section. The main entrance would be sited within a recessed area cut out from the front corner of the eastern gable. The predominant walling material would be coursed natural gritstone with ashlar gritstone used for the central main vertical parapet wall and some accent areas on the gables. On the rear elevation a limited use of render would be employed in addition to natural stone. The roof would be clad with natural blue slate. Windows and doors would be aluminium frames.
9. The main vehicular and pedestrian entrance would be at the eastern end of the site. This would lead first to drop off parking and accessible parking spaces next to the building before leading back into the main car park at the rear where there would also be a green flat roofed cycle store. The access would then circle around the back of the hotel building past the service area to an exit only egress point at the south western corner of the site. Outside the application site and within the public highway opposite the proposed hotel a central pedestrian refuge area is also proposed.
10. The new building would have a 19% increased footprint over the existing and in its amended form now have a gross internal area of 3049.5m² (282.5m² less than 3,332 m² submitted from the loss of the 6 third floor rooms, excluding voids). The ground floor would house the kitchen and service/staff facilities along with the public, front of house areas with hotel reception, a 150 cover restaurant with public/hotel bar area for hotel guests and other visitors, as well as function and potentially some conference facilities. Landscaped external areas to the immediate front and rear of the building would provide space for outside seating and dining. The 72 bedrooms would be accommodated on part of the ground floor of the eastern wing and all of the first and second floors.
11. Documentation submitted in support of the application includes;
 - a. A planning Statement
 - b. Architectural plans
 - c. Design and Access Statement
 - d. Heritage Impact Assessment & Historic Buildings Appraisal
 - e. Landscape Character and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)
 - f. Ecology Report
 - g. Arboricultural Impact Assessment
 - h. Transport Assessment & Travel Plan
 - i. A Viability report

RECOMMENDATION:

- 12. That the application be APPROVED subject to the following;**
- A. The prior entry into a Section 106 agreement covering highway requirements for i) the funding of the 40mph highway speed limit extension and the monitoring of the Travel Plan. ii) The submission and agreement of a scheme for the provision of a pedestrian refuge/safe crossing point for bus passengers (including revised kerbing and tactile paving/precise bus stop location) on Hope Road outside but adjacent to the site, and**
- B the following planning conditions:-**
- 1. Commence development within 3 years.**
 - 2. Carry out in accordance with specified amended plans and supporting information.**
 - 3. Define and limit approved use to be as an Hotel (Class C1) with ancillary restaurant and bar open to non-residents (Class A3/4) with function capability only and for no other purpose within use Class C1.**
 - 4. No development shall take place including any works of demolition until a construction management plan or construction method statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Authority.**
 - 5. The premises shall not be taken into use until the existing accesses to Hope Road A6187 have been modified in accordance with the application drawings, laid out, constructed and provided with 2.4m x 145m (to the west) and 2.4m x 122m (to the east) visibility splays in accordance with Drawing no 1707404c.**
 - 7. The premises shall not be taken into use until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with drawing No 1707405A for vehicles to be parked and for the loading and unloading of vehicles and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear.**
 - 8. The premises shall not be occupied until the cycle parking facilities shown on the approved drawing No PA-PL-005 Rev B have been implemented and made available for use and thereafter retained for use by the occupants of, and visitors to, the development at all times.**
 - 9. There shall be no gates or other barriers within 10m of the nearside highway boundary and any gates shall open inwards only, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Authority.**
 - 10. The Approved Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timescales specified therein, to include those parts identified as being implemented prior to occupation and following occupation, unless alternative timescales are agreed in writing with the Authority. The Approved Travel Plan shall be monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan targets.**

11. **Submit for written agreement full details of the landscaping scheme comprising both hard and soft external works together with implementation timetable. Scheme to provide for additional planting to the rear boundaries of the car park and for a hedge backing the frontage stone walling. Thereafter complete and maintain in full accordance with approved scheme.**
12. **Submit for written agreement an amended external lighting scheme which omits tall lighting poles and thereafter complete in full accordance with agreed scheme.**
13. **Agreement over sample panels of stone, render and roofing materials.**
14. **Agreement over door and window details/finishes.**
15. **Minor detailed design matters e.g. Rain water goods, other joinery details.**
16. **Carry out the development in full accordance with the recommendations set out in the submitted Final Ecology Report ref 9537_R_APPR_20117.**
17. **No development shall take place until a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site (in accordance with the principles outlined within DEFRA Non-statutory Technical Standards for sustainable drainage systems (March 2015)), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. The approved drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved detailed design prior to the use of the building commencing.**
18. **No development shall take place until a detailed assessment has been provided to and approved in writing by the Authority to demonstrate that the proposed destination for surface water accords with the hierarchy in paragraph 80 of the planning practice guidance.**
19. **No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for a scheme of archaeological monitoring and recording has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.**
20. **Submit and agree in writing a detailed scheme of environmental management of the building and site with specific measures to meet the aims of PDNPA Climate change policy together with an implementation programme. Once agreed carry out in full accordance with approved scheme.**
21. **Submit and agree details of an acoustic fence along the boundary of the car parking with the neighbouring residential garden together. Thereafter install in accordance with agreed details and maintain.**

Footnotes / Informatives covering the following:-

- i. **No works within the limits of the public highway without the formal Agreement of the Highway Authority. Public transport services in the vicinity of the site must not be adversely affected by the works.**
- ii. **Prevention of mud or other extraneous material being carried out of the site and deposited on the public highway.**
- iii. **Effective monitoring of the Travel Plan recommended by the Highway Authority using the STARSFor Travel plan toolkit: <http://www.starsfor.org>**

- iv. **Drainage footnotes covering such matters as the need for relevant consents regarding sustainable drainage and surface water disposal.**
- v. **Suggest the inclusion of warning signs at the exit of the car park, making drivers aware of the presence of walkers and cyclists when exiting the development.**

Key Issues

- 14. The principle of a replacement hotel of a scale that would represent ‘major development’ (General Development Order definition) and whether, having regard to local and national policy, the material considerations in this case would amount to the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify such major development in the Peak District National Park, with particular reference to: the impact of the scale of development and the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape.
- 15. The design and scale of the proposed hotel and its impact upon the street scene and wider landscape.
- 16. The highway impacts of the proposed development
- 17. The impact of the proposed hotel upon the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- 18. The impacts upon any archaeological interest in site.
- 19. The impacts upon any ecological interest on the site

The site’s Planning History (relevant summary)

- 20. The site has a long history of extensions and alterations including unimplemented consents in the 1980’s and 90’s for additional letting/staff and conference accommodation.
- 21. 2018 – Planning enquiry from the applicants regarding demolition and erection of a replacement hotel. Officers responded positively regarding the principle of a replacement building but expressed strong concerns over the scale with particular regard to the overall height and massing of proposed building. Applicant responds by reducing height a little and engages with officers over the design details. These do not overcome scale issue with agent citing the size is the minimum necessary for viability of the project and the height is closely linked to the location of the pressurised sewer which prevents any development any further back into the site. Applicant also confirms their business plan prevents consideration of a separate accommodation block to the rear of the site as a means to reduce the scale and massing of development to the front of the site.

Wider Planning History

- 22. Members will no doubt mostly be aware of the stalled redevelopment of the former Marquis Hotel site at Sickleholme to the east. The Authority granted planning permission for ‘major development’ in respect of a large replacement hotel on the site some time ago and work commenced with the full demolition of the hotel and a start to site service provision. Work then stopped and the developer states that the hotel will not now go ahead in the current economic climate facing the hotel industry and he is now in discussions with officers regarding potential alternative uses.

Consultations

DCC - Highway Authority (HA) comments on the proposal as submitted.

23. In summary - Raise no objections in principle and recommend conditions and advisory note in the event of an approval. In addition the HA made the following summarised comments;
24. A Travel Plan was sought due to the level of parking proposed and the somewhat remote location of the site. There are few residential properties within walking distance and there is no linking footway on the development side of the road. Any pedestrians are forced to cross Hope Road - 50mph, unlit and wide with no formal crossing points. There is only one bus stop, located opposite the proposed hotel, which is used as a 'both-way' stop.
25. The County Council Sustainable Travel Officers comments on the Travel Plan are attached - in the event that a S106 Agreement is secured this authority would seek monitoring fees of £500 pa x 5 years - total £2500. The comments are generally advisory and seek to provide information for staff and customers.
26. To encourage access to the hotel, or more likely the restaurant or bar, by public transport, the current facilities will need to be upgraded - the provision of bus shelters can be funded by the applicant but they will need to be taken on by either the District or Parish council for future maintenance.
27. In view of the nature of Hope Road, and the lack of fronting footway it is considered that the applicant should provide a formal refuge to improve the safety for pedestrians crossing onto both the footway and to access the bus stop. The proposals are likely to introduce walkers to the area. A scheme to provide this should be submitted for approval by the County Councils Traffic Management team.
28. The Transport Assessment figures are generally considered acceptable. The capacity of Hope Road, taking account of the current traffic levels is not considered to be an issue and the accident data provided does not reveal any trends or features of the highway that are contributing to a pattern of accidents. The provision of secure cycle parking is noted and welcome

Response to the amended details

29. The applicant has taken on board the highway comments and demonstrated improvements to the bus stops and the provision of a pedestrian refuge. In principle these are acceptable subject to detailed design and conditioned for final approval.
30. Raise concerns about pedestrians crossing an unlit road subject to a 50mph limit, especially with the potential increase in footfall. There may be the opportunity to extend the existing 40mph to include the frontage of the hotel which would cost the applicant in the region of £5000.
31. The loss of parking spaces to accommodate landscaping and improved pedestrian access is noted and as advised, not something that the Highway Authority would wish to object to.
32. The revised Travel Plan addresses all the major comments, specifically the provision of a pedestrian refuge and enhanced bus stops on the main road. Any comments that are not specifically picked up on the revised plan are 'desirables' and can be addressed during the Travel Plan process. One minor design comment is that ground floor staff locker room facilities, should include showers.

33. Subject to the above being addressed, the Travel Plan is considered fit for purpose. In the event that a S106 Agreement is secured this authority would seek monitoring fees of £500 pa X 5 years - total £2500.
34. Suggest Conditions covering the following;
1. A construction management plan or construction method statement.
 2. Visibility splays.
 3. Provision of a safe crossing point and improved public transport facilities.
 4. No occupation until parking/turning/loading/unloading space provided.
 5. No occupation until the cycle parking facilities have been implemented.
 6. No gates or other barriers within 10m of highway.
 7. Travel Plan to be implemented then monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan targets.

Suggested advisory notes (summarised)

- i. No works within highway without the formal written Agreement of the County Council as Highway Authority. It must be ensured that public transport services in the vicinity of the site are not adversely affected by the development works.
- ii. Steps to be taken to ensure that mud is not carried on to the public highway.
- iii. Effective monitoring of the Travel Plan: recommends the use of the STARSFor Travel plan toolkit: <http://www.starsfor.org> - Fees are levied for the use of this system.

Section 106 Contributions:
Travel Plan monitoring - £2500
Speed limit extension - £5000

DCC - Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA)

35. Would expect to see consideration of surface water discharge into the drain on the eastern border of the site in line with the drainage hierarchy in recommended Condition 2. In addition to consideration of discharging surface water as high up the drainage hierarchy as practicable the LLFA notes there may be an increase in impermeable area therefore it should be made clear which areas of the proposed carpark will utilise permeable paving. (Officer note – the amended plans make clear that the car park now comprises of 56 spaces that area permeable and 58 which are hard surfaced) The proposals indicate an increased area of roof space will utilise existing drainage, the applicant should demonstrate that runoff from the site will not increase post development as per DEFRA's non-statutory technical standards and that runoff has been reduced where reasonably practicable.

Recommend conditions covering:

1. Submission and agreement over the detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site followed by implementation prior to the use of the building commencing.
2. No development until a detailed assessment has been provided to and approved in writing by the Authority to demonstrate that the proposed destination for surface water accords with the hierarchy in paragraph 80 of the planning practice guidance.

Advisory/Informative Notes:

- i. The County Council do not adopt any private SuDS schemes. As such, it should be confirmed prior to commencement of works which organisation will be responsible for SuDS maintenance once the development is completed.
- ii. Any works in or nearby an ordinary watercourse may require consent under the Land Drainage Act (1991) from the County Council (e.g. an outfall that encroaches into the profile of the watercourse, etc.)
- iii. The Authority should be mindful to obtain all the relevant information pertaining to the proposed discharge in land that is not within the control of the applicant, which is fundamental to allow the drainage of the proposed development site.
- iv. The applicant should demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Authority, the appropriate level of treatment stages from the resultant surface water in line with Table 4.3 of the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753. This type of development usually requires >2 treatment stages before outfall into surface water body/system which may help towards attainment of the downstream receiving watercourse's Water Framework Directive good ecological status.
- v. The County Council would prefer the applicant to utilise existing landform to manage surface water in mini/sub-catchments. The applicant is advised to contact the County Council's Flood Risk Management team should any guidance on the drainage strategy for the proposed development be required.

Environment Agency –

36. No environmental constraints associated with the site which fall within the remit of the Environment Agency.

Natural England – No objection - subject to appropriate mitigation being secured

37. Without appropriate mitigation the application would have a significant impact on the purposes of designation of the Peak District National Park and in order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following mitigation measures are required / or the following mitigation options should be secured:
38. Amend proposal in line with comments from Peak District National Park landscape adviser and secured by an appropriate planning condition or obligation attached to any planning permission.
39. Natural England notes that the landscape adviser for the Peak District National Park stated in their response that because of the visual impact of the scheme they could not support it, however they have offered suggested amendments that would make it acceptable.

High Peak District Council – No response

Parish Council

40. Does not object in principle to the building of a new hotel, and has no significant objections to the architectural style being proposed. However, raise the following concerns;
41. Notes the viability argument for scale of bedrooms, but remain doubtful that enough demand exists to achieve a high level of occupancy leading to concerns over longevity

of business and question if a smaller number of bedrooms could be workable – with less risk.

42. Concerns over how the business is going to be satisfactorily staffed and with 55 FTE staff, do not believe that enough of these are likely to be found locally. If recruited further afield, there will be a need for good public transport - which is not the case currently, with no buses at all for staff who work early or finish late. Also evening buses along Hope Rd are subsidised by DCC, and so must be at significant risk of withdrawal in the near future. Neither Hope nor Bamford railway station is near enough to the hotel for easy staff commuting (and the hotel's lack of staff bedrooms is a further impediment).
43. Traffic on Hope Rd has been growing in recent years, and councillors are keen to discourage further increase. Assuming customers and staff will all come by car is not acceptable and consider the Travel Plan to be a largely worthless document, containing factual errors and also providing no worthwhile proactive strategies on travel beyond what could be gleaned from an online journey planner urge PDNPA to ask for revisions as well as the provision of a complimentary minibus service to/from Bamford or Hope stations for the use of guests (or staff), as a proactive means of encouraging people not to bring their cars to the hotel.
44. There have been fatal accidents on the bend immediately east of the Rising Sun, and consider it most unwise to add to this risk by having the proposed hotel entrance so close to that bend. Urge that the hotel entrance/exit be as far away from that bend as possible - in order to maximise available sightlines. (problem could be ameliorated if the road speed here was reduced from 50mph to 40-mph)
45. The footways both east and west of the hotel are of poor design and are also poorly maintained. Improvements to these footways are still badly needed, and we ask that PDNPA obtains a S106 contribution from the developers to that.
46. The hotel will increase pedestrians crossing Hope Rd. Provision of a formal pedestrian crossing to make this safer should be considered (and again we ask that PDNPA seeks S106 monies towards this) - the crossing would necessitate the speed limit becoming 40mph.

PC Comments on revised scheme;

47. Re-asserts its previous comments including that the hotel is too large. The applicant's state that a business of the size of the former *Rising Sun* is "simply not viable"; the Council notes the *Rising Sun* did struggle under recent management, it is not that many years ago when it was a well-run, extremely thriving business.
48. The amended Travel Plan is only slightly more acceptable as it does not adequately address the transport issues (including the lack of a credible means of reaching the proposed hotel from Hope or Bamford stations, and the inadequate footways along the A6187) and also still contains some inaccuracies.
49. The proposed traffic island on the main road would be inadequate, a zebra or pelican crossing would be far better for pedestrians to/from the footway (which is only on the far side of the road - there is no footway on the hotel side).
50. Urge creation of a turning-right lane for westbound traffic, to avoid vehicles waiting to turn being shunted by a following vehicle.

51. The proposed "zebra" crossing on the hotel's land is largely pointless since it leads from the hotel to a footway alongside the A6187 which doesn't actually exist. It would be safer for pedestrians to cross this entry road further away from the junction.
52. Supportive in principle of the now-proposed planting scheme along the road facing elevation of the hotel, but size of trees shown too small to make much difference - taller vegetation is needed.
53. Would like to see a greater provision for electric vehicles than the 2 charging-points proposed.

PDNPA Landscape Architect

54. Summary ; - Does not support the submitted scheme, but with amendments to the car park and landscape layout it may be possible to mitigate the adverse landscape and visual effects of the scheme to an acceptable level (the visual impacts of greater massing and extent in views and the lack of enhancement to landscape character).
55. The building proposed is 6.5m higher than the current hotel, with a 25% larger footprint. Much of the remaining site area is taken up with access roads and areas of car parking. As a result, landscape areas (to screen, soften and integrate the development into the surrounding landscape) are severely limited in both extent and usefulness. While it seems to be positioned on a similar building line to the existing building, visually it is brought forward towards in views from the Hope Road due to its greater mass. In views from the north the proposed building is also more prominent due to its greater height and extent.
56. The rear of the building uses extensive areas of render, but colour will need to be agreed as it has the potential to result in the building being visually very prominent. Lighting is not considered and this will also need to be agreed as this could have potentially significant effects if not considered sensitively.
57. The car park is very large (when considered against the overall site area) with limited areas of landscape treatment – this does not allow either it or the building to be accommodated / integrated into the landscape or break up the development in wider views from the north. Would like to see the applicant to explore whether it is possible to slightly reduce the number of parking spaces to free up space for additional landscaping. This would be beneficial in views of the development from the north.
58. There are no details shown for the bike store – this has the potential to look prominent in the main area of car parking. I would like to see the applicant explore whether it is possible to relocate this (to be associated with the building) and thus free up space for additional landscape in the main car park. If it is not, then this feature needs to be detailed (will it be stone-faced? Could it have a green roof / wall etc.?).
59. The East gable facing Hope Road is visually dominant – it may be possible to integrate this with additional tree planting on the road frontage. The landscape area to the scheme frontage is rather constrained in places and would benefit from being more generous (with additional tree planting – taking into account sightlines).
60. In terms of a planting strategy generally, a greater number of larger tree species would be beneficial. (Crack willow is not an appropriate choice adjacent to a car park due to its tendency to drop branches). The landscape buffers to the Hope Road and north boundaries could be strengthened, the car park could be broken up more and the north boundary of the garden area could be strengthened.

61. The LVIA considers landscape effects on the overall LCT rather than the local landscape. While it is agreed that the overall significance of effect on LCT are not likely to be significant, localised effects are likely to be more significant (unless mitigated by a stronger landscape strategy than that which is currently proposed).
62. The proposed landscape scheme does not manage the built environment to enhance landscape character and as such conflicts with the landscape guidelines for this LCT. In terms of the visual assessment, view value is not considered so therefore the assessment of sensitivity is flawed. In terms of assessment of visual effects, VPs 3, 4 & 5 are representative of views of the development from the north – these are not taken in winter, so represent a greater screening effect of tree cover. The greater height and extent of the new hotel are noticeable in these views. It is agreed that the significance of visual effect is moderate (and therefore potentially significant). However, I do not agree with the assessment of ‘nature of effect on visual receptors’ – I do not believe that this translates to a minor adverse nature of visual effect.
63. While a number of visual effects are significant, I think that amendments to the submitted landscape scheme and car park layout can potentially reduce these. Therefore, while I do not support the scheme as it stands, I think with amendments to the car park and landscape layout (see attached mark-up as guidance) it may be possible to mitigate the adverse landscape and visual effects of the scheme to an acceptable level (the visual impacts of greater massing and extent in views and the lack of enhancement to landscape character).

PDNPA Transport Officer

64. No objections but makes a large number of detailed comments on the submitted travel plan and transport assessment as well as the PDNPA transport policy context.

General Comments:-

65. Overall, the travel plan is well thought through and supported. It will offer opportunities to influence the travel behaviour of both staff and guests. It is important that the commitment to employ a Travel Plan Coordinator and that the promised ongoing delivery and monitoring are all fulfilled. The requirement for a Travel Plan has been maintained within the revised NPPF (paragraph 111). The provision of two charging points as part of the development is supported.
66. The current Parking Standards (Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001, Appendix 1), date back to 1994. Vehicle lengths and widths have increased over the last 24 years – the preference would be for the bays to be a standard 5 x 2.5m. This is the standard size recommended within the Peak District National Park Parking Standards, which form an Appendix to the Authority’s Development Management Policies (currently undergoing an Examination in Public).
67. Overall, the transport assessment appears robust; however, it should be noted that residents living alongside the A6187 between Sickleholme and the Rising Sun Inn have raised concerns about road safety, particularly at weekends. These concerns are in relation to the existing speed limit, safety and severance, and have identified a number of un-reported RTC’s affecting properties along the route. Any increase in traffic associated with the scheme may worsen the real and perceived dangers on this section of road. As a result of their concerns, residents have submitted a petition to the highway authority (Derbyshire County Council) seeking a review of the existing 40mph speed limit. Given these concerns, it would be useful to know the expected directional bias for staff and guests of the hotel; i.e. is the assumption that the majority of associated traffic will come from the east to access the hotel.

68. Paragraph 5.2.2 of the Transport Assessment shows figures for the inter-peak and PM weekday peak periods, but not the AM peak periods. Presumably, the assumption is that no staff or guests will be entering or leaving the site during the AM peak period? Whilst the details of the operation are not part of this report, it is not unreasonable to assume morning shift changes for staff and occasional pre 9am checkout for guests. It may be worth assessing this against the AM peak period traffic flows.

Travel Plan(June 2018)

69. Provision of charging points for electric Vehicles (might offer a good option for staff / visitors to the hotel.
70. The references to the 'Council's Travel Plan Officer', will be Derbyshire County Council. Initiatives to promote and facilitate cycling are good, but should also include shower facilities and lockers for employees.
71. The Cycle to Work scheme – will only apply to employees for whom the monthly repayments do not take them below the National Minimum Wage. This will need to be made clear to staff, and may rule out casual and / or part time employees.

Comments in relation to Transport Policy Context

72. The travel plan, if fully delivered should encourage modal shift for members of staff making regular journeys to and from the site. However, this will be dependent on the employment catchment.
73. The travel plan itself will not achieve the goal of the policy, it is through its effective delivery that the intent of the policy can be achieved.
74. The design of the car park incorporates landscaping features, retained trees and hedgerows, which will help to screen the car park from the surrounding area. The incorporation of a greened area for overspill parking will reduce the visual intrusion, when this area is unoccupied. This area can also offer sustainable drainage.
75. The development is likely to require access by large goods vehicles servicing the hotel; however, the development is located on the A6187, providing a strategic link to Sheffield via the A625. There are also links southwards via the A625 and the B6001.
76. The scheme appears to provide sufficient space for service vehicle to access, drop-off and leave the premises. In relation to the number of parking spaces, The provision of 114 spaces, whilst it is above the maximum number stipulated within the Parking Standards, it is only by three spaces overall. Given that the hotel lies outside of a settlement, a slight over-provision would be acceptable in this case.
77. The development is located on a regular bus route linking Sheffield and the Hope Valley, within close proximity to bus stops. Similarly, the site is in close proximity to two railways stations served by the Manchester to Sheffield railway, with a regular stopping service.
78. It is unclear whether the developer expects the site to be a destination for coaches. If this is the case, then provision for on-site pick-up and drop-off of passengers should be incorporated into the design. The use of the highway in front of the development for drop-off and pick-up is likely to impact on other road users and potentially compromise the safe drop-off and pick-up of passengers by service buses.

79. The provision of secure cycle parking is supported, it is assumed that this will be made available to both staff and residents.
80. The design appears to allow for safe access into and out of the site for all users. However, given the existence of the cycle path within the highway, we would suggest the inclusion of warning signs at the exit of the car park, making drivers aware of the presence of walkers and cyclists when exiting the development.
81. The proposed scheme provides sufficient parking provision for disabled users in relation to the existing Parking Standards (Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001, Appendix 1). These spaces are located in close proximity to the building and provide level access to the site.

PDNPA Ecologist

82. No objections subject to the inclusion of the following condition in any approval: Works shall be carried out in complete accordance with the Bat Mitigation and Compensation Strategy (October 2018), and the remaining recommendations in Section 5 of the July 2017 Ecology Report.

PDNPA Archaeologist

83. No objections; Some impacts but capable of mitigation by condition
84. The Heritage *Impact Assessment and Historic Buildings Appraisal*, demonstrates that whilst the vast majority of the Rising Sun complex is of little heritage value, the site does have some archaeological interest and evidential value, both with respect to the building itself and below ground archaeological potential. Examination of the building highlighted some fabric relating to the 18th century core of the building and that there is the potential for further 18th century fabric and structural elements to survive beneath the later plaster and remodelling and as such the building has some, but very limited heritage value, and is certainly of no more than local interest.
85. The heritage assessment also demonstrates that site also has archaeological potential with respect to below ground archaeological remains, both with respect to the footprint of earlier or demolished phases of the building and in relation to the potential previously unknown and unrecorded for Roman/Romano-British archaeological remains. Any such remains would be considered to be non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest and be of regional significance.
86. Taking into account the significance or potential significance of the heritage assets affected, and the scale of the likely loss or harm, should this application be positively determined these impacts could be appropriately mitigated through a scheme of archaeological recording and monitoring in accordance with para.199 of the NPPF. A suitable condition is suggested.

PDNPA Conservation Officer

87. Although there is a historic building at the heart of the current sprawling structure, it has insufficient integrity or other value to rank as a non-designated heritage asset. The building no longer has a vernacular presentation and modern alterations have rendered it unattractive, especially at the rear. It does not have historic group value with neighbouring buildings. I therefore have no objection to its demolition and suggest that no special justification is required from a heritage point of view, as it is not a heritage asset in my opinion.

Representations

88. There have been 21 representations at the time of drafting the report. 14 object to the scheme, 3 are in support of the proposals and 4 make general comments, including 1 from the local MP supporting a reduction in the speed limit to 30mph along this section of road.

89. General Comments

- Concerned about the size, height and appearance of the hotel not being in keeping with the local area.
- Building still too close to the road and/or would want to see more landscaping with shrubs and winter cover to break up a large building façade.
- Would like to see the frontage broken up even further.
- Suggest a smaller 'country style' hotel is more appropriate.
- Concerned that space is reserved for the bus stop and question if a shelter proposed.
- Suggest a right turn lane is provided in the highway for safety.
- The car parking provision is inadequate.
- Welcome proposals re: sustainability, energy and water use, environmental impact and encouragement of public transport and cycle usage.
- Some of the car park spaces could be moved further back to allow for more landscaping of green areas, trees/shrubs etc. nearer the buildings.
- Agree with some of the various 'traffic flows' described, especially for the one way system.
- Has consideration been given to incorporate part of the 'original'/existing frontage into plans? Or would this be seen as too complicated and messy for the design? On the other hand it would give some continuity and could be creative and innovative.

90. The objectors (including one from the Friends of the Peak District) raise the following summarised grounds;

- Main concern is size and scale – which is too big and out of scale and character with the locality - needs further reductions in height and length.
- PDNPA required to ensure new buildings appropriate to surroundings – there are no three storey buildings in the locality.
- Needs reconsidering.
- Too many bedrooms, a reduction to 50- 60 and a smaller function area would fit more into the local economy;
- Smaller 'country' hotel more appropriate.
- Excessive and damaging scale of car parking provision occupying a large footprint on the site, and without dense screening will be the dominant characteristic of the site. Amended plan for less parking for cars required.
- This significant car-based scheme is in contravention of Core Strategy policy T1 (reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport); and also policy T7 (B) and (C). However in the context of policy GSP2(B): the redevelopment offers an opportunity for enhancing the National Park, both visually and in terms of the recreation offer; but it has not been demonstrated that the benefits to the Park will be significant. The car-dependence of the scheme seriously risks undermining other objectives of the Core Strategy.
- Unacceptable transport impacts - Not a sustainable location for a large hotel - scheme defaults to car access, and is not pro-active about sustainable travel.
- The impact on the area both as a place to live and visit – i.e. scale. Feature of the Hope Valley area is the smaller, human scale of most developments. Larger scale operations have their place but not in the Hope Valley!

- Building should be moved further back from the road (bearing in mind the sewerage/water piping constraints) to allow for more and deeper landscaping.
- Design is wholly inconsistent with the requirements of policy GSP2 C
- Development fails the test of reasonableness with regard to policy GSP3 “Development Management Principles” because of the adverse impact of the considerably greater mass of the building, but also of the site coverage caused by the need to provide for an enhanced level of car parking and servicing..
- profound change involved in scheme is incompatible with the requirements of policy DMC1 and the very substantially increased massing and the degree to which
- extensive car parking areas penetrate the open land to the rear renders it in conflict with DMC3 of the emerging Development Management Policies
- National Planning Policy Framework in July 2018. The Government clearly places considerable importance in “achieving well-designed places”. Detailed considerations are set out in paragraphs 124 to 132. I draw particular attention to the requirements of paragraph 127 by which decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Paragraph 130 goes on to indicate that permission should be refused for a development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This requirement is not met in the current proposal.
- Dormer windows are not attractive feature.
- The main entrance seems reminiscent of a supermarket entrance, feel that a more imaginative response to this aspect of the building would produce a better outcome.
- Like to see further ‘breaking up’ of the frontage design
- Needs a less dominant building so close to the road.
- Take issue with the assumption that such a hotel needs to be so large to be commercially viable.
- The effect and impact on other hotels, and village pubs and tourist venues in terms of employment and viability through customer losses to this venue.
- Question how many jobs would be local.
- Further landscaping required and increasing biodiversity all around the building as it links into the local landscape.
- Noise from the hotel activities – like to see noise restrictions.
- A barrier is needed between hotel and immediate neighbour for noise and traffic
- Road safety concerns – accident blackspot means speed limit should be reduced to 40mph two request 30mph.
- A controlled pedestrian crossing required.
- Harm to health from extra traffic exhaust fumes
- There must be no demolition without redevelopment – don’t want another Marquis scenario so suggest escrow fund.
- There are no single or family rooms
- There is a restaurant but no lounge, bar or outside children play area.
- Concerns about ability to staff facility and will need to bus in employees.

91. *The supporters make the following summarised points:*

- Jobs created here would increase the use of the 271/2 busses and therefore make them less reliant on any subsidies. More use of train service.
- May help with provision of higher speed broadband for local community.
- Not concerned with increased traffic but would welcome reduced speed limit.
- Hotel would be a good and sustainable use of this brownfield site.
- Welcome contrasting architectural style and taller structure

Main Policies

92. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1 - 4, DS1, L1, L3, RT2, CC1, T1, T7.
93. Relevant Local Plan policies: LC4, LC16, LC21, LC22, LR6, LT10, LTLT13, LT17, LT22, and LT18
94. Emerging Development Management Policies: DM1, DCM1, 3, 5, 12 -14, DMT3 & 7.

National Planning Policy Framework

95. 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 policy in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.
96. Paragraph 172 states that "Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing 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 these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited
97. Para 172 goes on to state that "Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:
- a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
 - b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
 - c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.
98. As this application proposal seeks permission for a new hotel with a new floor area of more than 1,000 m², the proposal amounts to 'major development' in accordance with the definition set out in the Town and Country Planning Development Management Procedure Order.
99. GSP1 (D) in the Authority's Core Strategy says in securing National Park purposes major development should not take place within the Peak District National Park. Major development will only be permitted following rigorous consideration of the criteria in national policy.
100. Para 83 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should enable sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

101. Policy DS1: Development Strategy - sets out the principles that must be considered in determining new development proposals in order to the strategy to deliver sustainable distribution and level of growth and support effective conservation and enhancement of the Park. To achieve this it states in B that the majority of new development should be directed to within named settlements although development for recreation or tourism development will be acceptable in principle in the open countryside outside the Natural Zone.
102. 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.
103. Policy GSP2 builds upon this by stating that opportunities should be taken to enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park and, (in part D) specific opportunities should be taken to remove undesirable features or buildings. This is expanded in policy L1 which relates directly to enhancement of landscape character, and policy L3 relating to the conservation and enhancement of features of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance.
104. Policy GSP3 refers to development management principles. Relevant criteria listed in this policy relate to appropriate scale of development in relation to the character and appearance of the National Park, impact on access and traffic, and impact on living conditions of communities. Policy GSP4 recommends the use of conditions and legal agreements to ensure that benefits and enhancement are achieved.
105. Policy L1 states that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics. L3 seeks to conserve cultural heritage assets.
106. Policy RT2 states that proposals for hotels must conform to the following principles (relevant to this case) B; Appropriate minor developments which extend or make quality improvements to existing holiday accommodation will be permitted and C; new-build holiday accommodation will not be permitted, except for a new hotel in Bakewell.
107. Other relevant policies include policy CC1 relating to environmental management measures, CC5 relating to flood risk and the presumption against development which increases flood risk, and policy T1 which aims to reduce the need to travel by unsustainable means.

Peak District National Park Local Plan

108. Policy LC4 says 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 valued characteristics of the area. Particular attention will be paid to scale, form, mass and orientation in relation to existing buildings, design details, landscaping, the amenity, privacy and security of the development and nearby properties and nuisance or harm to the rural character of the area caused by lighting schemes.

109. Policies LT10 and LT18 require satisfactory parking provision and safe access as a pre-requisite of development within the National Park.

Supplementary Planning Documents

110. The Authority's adopted design guide and alterations and extensions detailed design guide are supplementary planning documents (SPD) and therefore should be afforded weight in the determination of this application.

Assessment

The principle of the development

111. GSP1 (D) in the Authority's Core Strategy says in securing National Park purposes, major development should not take place within the Peak District National Park other than in exceptional circumstances, and that Major development will only be permitted following rigorous consideration of the three criteria in the NPPF. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF adds a requirement to the exceptional test that it also be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of whether exceptional circumstances exist and whether such development is in the public interest is discussed below with reference to the three assessment criteria in the NPPF.
- a) *the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;*
112. The application explains the last business operating from the current hotel building proved unviable and this latest business closure followed a history of other failed business attempts over a number of years to develop and maintain a viable hotel at the site. The explanation given by the agent is that the current level of accommodation, the nature of the hotel and the particular food/beverage offered is not a viable proposition in the current market in the Peak District. Furthermore the agent cited the poor quality of the building itself as another factor, the condition of which has, since closure, further deteriorated.
113. The now empty and fenced off building is prominently sited on the major thoroughfare running through and serving the Hope Valley and its current condition detracts considerably from the valued character and appearance of the local area. The loss of the business has resulted in the loss of local employment opportunities and through the loss of visitor accommodation, both of which will have impacted adversely upon the wider local economy. Closure also constitutes the loss of a local community facility in strict planning policy terms, albeit the site lies outside of the nearest village and the previous hotel was therefore more of a 'destination business' than a local community pub/facility.
114. Officers recognise that the existing building has reached the end of its useful life and having been extended and altered many times, mostly in a poor manner, any interest it may once have had has been lost. The building is therefore considered to be no longer of any local heritage merit and there is therefore no overriding reason to retain it. Consequently, given the business history and the current state of the building, redevelopment with a replacement high quality hotel building is welcomed in principle as it would continue the long established use of the site, have the potential to bring considerable enhancement as well as long term benefits to the local economy. In this regard the application suggests the new business would provide for around 55 (full time equivalent) new employment opportunities on the site, as well as benefitting local suppliers and other businesses through increased visitor spend within the local economy. Redevelopment for a hotel is therefore considered to be in the public interest to pass the NPPF test in para 172.

- b) *The cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.*

115. The need for the development is site specific arising from the current empty and derelict hotel premises. Therefore the opportunity for significant enhancement would be lost if the development were relocated outside the National Park. There would also be a cost to the local economy from the lost jobs and lost business opportunities from local suppliers of goods and services and all those other businesses benefitting from the visitor spend in the local area. For these reasons your officers gave full support in pre-application discussions on the principle of a replacement hotel on the site. This was however subject to the replacement being of an appropriate scale and the normal planning requirements for a suitable high standard of design, layout and landscape all being satisfied. This is required both to meet Local Development Plan policy and the last NPPF criteria to justify exceptional circumstances for such major development which is as follows:

- c) *any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated*

116. The development would have no detrimental impact upon recreational opportunities so the key issue is therefore whether the proposed development can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site without harm to the valued characteristics of the Park which is discussed in detail below.

The scale and design of development

117. The existing hotel is largely a two storey building with some single storey elements. It has been extended and altered many times and no longer reflects the local building tradition, other than in its traditional two storey form and modest gable widths. It sits on the valley floor and beside the main road in open countryside away from the nearest settlement. The 0.62ha plot is bounded by hedging and tree planting which screens the site from the pair of low two storey and single storey dwellings lying immediately to the west of the site. The predominant building style in the locality and wider park is for two story buildings with a simple rectangular plan form and relatively narrow gable widths. There are occasional three storey buildings, mainly confined to larger dwellings and commercial buildings within the core of larger settlements. In the open countryside however buildings are almost exclusively two storey with the only tall buildings being the occasional former mill building or larger country house/hall.

118. The application site is neither a country house nor a mill and therefore at three storeys the proposed hotel would be out of keeping with the local building tradition. Furthermore, coupled with the three storey height, the overall scale of the replacement hotel with its long frontage and high floor to ceiling levels would therefore be considerably larger both in height (6m higher ridge height on the gables), and massing than the existing building. This greater massing would translate into a significantly more obvious building in the street scene, whose dominant presence would be greater as a result of being sited some 5m closer to the road than the existing building. In public views along the street the wide gables of the relatively complicated H shaped plan form (compared to the existing building and simpler local building tradition) would be dominant features, especially in the approach from the east. Views from the west would be partially screened in the approach from mature trees on the west corner of the site. In comparison with the existing Hotel building the new building would be:-

119. Existing hotel - Two storey form 5.07m eaves and 7.71m to ridge.
Proposed new hotel Three storey form - gables 9.26m eaves and 13.83m to ridge.

Central 2 ½ section 7.75m eaves and 13.14m to ridge.

Whilst the footprint would only be 19% larger the volume of the new building is much greater due to the additional floor.

120. Built development of such a scale in this location would not normally be acceptable and officers therefore sought the reduction of the building to two stories with the additional massing pushed out at the rear instead of to the front. In response, the developers pointed out that development to any depth of the site is not possible due to the presence of the high pressure sewer main running across the back of the hotel. The agent states that enquiries with Severn Trent Water Authority have confirmed that this pipeline cannot be moved and that a 3.5m easement zone exists either side of the pipe, restricting any building on or bridging over, thus confining development to the front of the site. Officers therefore suggested that a separate accommodation block could have been sited at the rear beyond the sewer line to reduce the bulk of the frontage building. However, having letting rooms divorced from the main hotel building was not considered to be acceptable to the developer in this particular case who states such an arrangement would not be viable or indeed acceptable given their business plan/preferred hotel operator. Consequently although the applicant has reduced the number of letting rooms slightly which has allowed the reduction in height from 3 ½ stories down to 3 stories they argue that the 72 rooms now proposed are the minimum necessary to be viable.
121. In terms of viability the application is accompanied by a succinct 'viability assessment' produced by a consultancy firm experienced in advising and running hospitality businesses. It is not a full financial viability appraisal and essentially is providing information to demonstrate that for hotel development to go ahead and be realised it must obtain funding. In this regard there is a critical scale needed for an hotel to provide a suitable return which in this case must be a 78 bed hotel to be both fundable and secure an operator. In respect of an hotel development the viability information is logical, however no viability information has been submitted to rule in or out, smaller related developments on the site which potentially would provide a better fit with adopted policy and this particular landscape setting.
122. The design of the hotel attempts to mitigate the visual impact of the buildings large frontage by breaking up the overall massing into three distinct blocks in the H shaped plan form. This gives a recessed central block flanked by gables to each end. The scheme employs high quality materials with traditional local gritstone walling and a slate roof (traditional 35 degree pitch) to help blend the new building with the local building tradition. Whilst each gable presents an over-wide form, each is perforated by a number of openings and have a vertical emphasis created by the chimney line. Between the two gables the recessed central element has a strong horizontal emphasis created by the ashlar gritstone panelled façade which projects in front of the link block. This wall panel is visually separated from the flanking gabled blocks at each side by glazed panels and sits above the heavily glazed ground floor frontage to the principal public rooms. Above the central panel façade, rooms in the second floor are set back and located partially in the roof space with four flat roofed box type dormers formed with dark coloured profiled zinc cladding to help the dormers recede visually into the roof colour behind.
123. All the windows and doors would be aluminium framed units with the window openings framed by narrow sectioned full surrounds in natural gritstone which would project beyond the wall. The scale of windows, although large in some cases nevertheless retain a vertical emphasis through the opening size or, where openings are square, through the frame division. A full height glazed 'slot' feature opening in the prominent eastern 'wing' breaks the large mass into two visually shorter elements. Overall the openings retain a reasonably high solid to void ratio reflecting the local tradition. Two of the rear corner rooms would have Juliet balconies with frameless glazing to the inward opening doors which on this style of building would be acceptable.

124. The rear elevation is sheltered from public view and here the external cladding would change to a mixture of stone and coloured render. The area between the projecting gables has a similar ‘floating’ horizontal façade to the frontage but here there is an additional projecting canopy (dark grey PVC coating) over part of the external seating area.
125. Overall, despite some misgivings over the retention of the dormers (necessary to keep the central block as low as possible), the design, detailing and use of materials are of an acceptable and appropriate high quality. The overall scale of the building has, on balance, effectively been broken up by arranging the massing into the three blocks. This better reflects local forms, although the scale of the gables in particular remain wider than would normally be appropriate. Although the amended design of the building is now considered to be acceptable it would still be a large and overly tall building in the open countryside compared with the building it would replace and in respect of its height, out of keeping with the simple massing and local two storey building tradition. However this landscape impact must be considered in the context of development viability and the site constraints and be weighed against the potential benefits arising from the redevelopment. These benefits comprise the considerable level of enhancement to the site and the impact upon the local economy. For the new hotel to be accepted therefore, the treatment of the external areas must be of an equally high standard to the design of the building if the development is to be properly integrated into the site and not to appear unacceptably imposing in its landscape setting. Impact on landscape, traffic and neighbours is therefore considered in the following paragraphs
126. In respect of the cycle store this would be a flat, green roofed building clad with timber with metal reinforced doors. There are no objections in design terms to this design approach for what needs to be a simple low key building.

Landscape Considerations

127. The application site is located in the Derwent Valley Landscape Character Area and the ‘Valley Farmlands with Villages’ Landscape Character Type (LCT). Key landscape guidance priorities for this LCT are to protect historic hedgerows, manage and enhance linear tree cover and amenity trees and manage the built environment to enhance landscape character.
128. The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact assessment concludes that the visual significance of the proposed new hotel “is considered for most representative viewpoints to be minor or negligible, with only the closest views experiencing a moderate impact.” Subject to some additional planting, in long distance views the visual mass of the building would blend with the landscape due to the use of appropriate natural local materials and coloration. However, from close views along the main road, which will be the main viewpoint for the majority, the new building would have a significant adverse impact due to its greater massing and particularly its height which will tend to dominate the immediate street scene. This impact would be softened to some extent by the proposed walling and tree planting in the frontage and the use of natural materials and varying building forms to break up the massing.
129. The footprint of the building and associated car parking leaves little room for landscaping, nevertheless the amended scheme has increased the amount of planting. Along with trees to the frontage, further tree planting would now help break up and screen the rear car park, although officers consider there is some more scope to further reinforce the northern and north eastern boundaries. Almost half the car parking spaces at the rear are now proposed to be formed with a ground reinforcing system so they can be permeable and maintain a grassed appearance.

130. Whilst the proposed natural drystone boundary walling across the site frontage would match the general Peak District tradition, this immediate area is not generally characterised by boundary walls, especially to the street. Here the boundaries are mainly mixed thorn hedging to all but the largest properties. The planting of a further hedge behind the boundary wall would be an appropriate and essential addition in the event of any approval to further soften the landscape impact and help the site blend with the local landscape character.
131. The detailed landscape proposals also include protection measures for the existing site boundary which is characterised by generally native hedgerow habitat to the east and rear. To the west the 4m tall evergreen hedge is retained to continue the essential visual screening needed between the hotel grounds and the adjacent neighbour's garden.
132. Lighting is a concern for its potential polluting impact on both the local landscape setting as well as the Park's dark skies. Whilst a lighting scheme is included which shows a relatively restrained scheme for the illumination of the site frontage, officers do not consider the use of lanterns on 5m poles at the front corners or rear car park to be acceptable. It would elevate lighting sources and exacerbate impact even if directionally controlled. It would be more appropriate to omit these in favour of any approved scheme being confined to low level lighting. A revised scheme is considered essential and can be secured by condition.
133. In conclusion, subject to the aforementioned conditions to control and agree precise details, the landscape impact of the development from key vantage points to the north west and east would on balance be acceptable. From the southern side and especially along the public road the overall scale and impact of the height upon the street scene would remain clearly visible but would be seen behind and amongst an equally high quality scheme of landscaping. The residual harm to landscape would therefore on balance be small and in any case outweighed by the enhancement and wider economic benefits to the local economy.

Highway Considerations

134. The proposal would increase traffic generation to and from the site onto a 50mph section of highway where representation from local residents have highlighted concerns about highway safety. The proposal is not sited in a sustainable location and cannot be relocated so is accompanied by a travel plan which has been amended in line with consultation responses to minimise as far as possible dependence upon car access. The proposal include improvements to bus access via a pedestrian refuge and the in and out arrangements for the access. The Highway Authority raise no objections provided funding is secured from the developer to ensure effective monitoring and review of the travel plan and the extension of the 40mph speed restriction to include the site frontage. These are suggested in the recommendation to be secure via a Section 106 legal agreement along with a requirement for the agreement and provision of a scheme to provide a pedestrian refuge on Hope Road for the benefit of bus passengers. Subject to this legal agreement and suggested conditions covering provision and maintenance of adequate visibility sight lines and prior provision of parking before occupation the development is considered to be acceptable from a traffic and highways perspective.

Environmental Management

135. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) states that the proposed energy efficiency strategy for the hotel will begin with "a "Fabric-First" approach to construction, with responsibly sourced materials specified with low embodied energy, super-insulated

beyond the minimum requirements of current Building Regulations and methods incorporated to reduce base demand. Facilities are to be incorporated into the scheme to encourage recycling and re-use, therefore minimising waste. The energy that is required for heating, cooling and ventilation will be provided by high-efficiency appliances, incorporating renewable and low/zero carbon technologies with controlled emissions and noise outputs”. It goes on to say that “a detailed Low and Zero Carbon Report will be produced prior to construction to assess the most appropriate and economical solutions and which will inform a detailed suite of firm proposals”. This is welcomed and of course the detailed proposal would need to be submitted and agreed in writing with the Authority via a suitably worded condition along with implementation provisions and verification in order to demonstrate compliance with adopted climate change policy.

136. The DAS goes on to say that the use of public transport and cycles will be encouraged, through provision of the 24 covered cycle parking spaces with workshop and wash-down facilities and the adoption of a travel plan which has been amended to take account of officer comments. These also would need in any approval to be secured by suitably worded conditions suggested above.
137. The DAS goes on to say that water management and conservation strategies would include smart meters and leak detection, flow and temperature restricted efficient sanitary ware within bathrooms and fitted equipment within laundry, kitchen, housekeeping and landscaped areas. Sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) measures are proposed including a proportion of the car park (56 of the 114 total spaces) surfaced in permeable “grasscrete” to reduce the impact visually and on the sewer system. The agents state the area of SUDs drainage ensures there is no increase in drained hard-surfaced area within the site.
138. The agents supporting documentation concludes that the above measures will target a reduction in Energy consumption and carbon emissions by 10% compared to the Building Regulations Part L2A, to the economic benefit of the Hotel Operator and benefit of hotel guests, the local- and wider- environment. Consequently such measure would meet adopted policy and are acceptable subject to the aforementioned conditions.

Archaeological Considerations

139. In terms of archaeology the submitted report states that some fabric relating to the 18th century core of the building was identified along with potential for further 18th century fabric and structural elements to survive beneath the later plaster and remodelling. The building has some, but very limited heritage value, and is certainly of no more than local interest according to the PDNPA Archaeologist.
140. The heritage assessment also demonstrates the site also has potential with respect to below ground archaeological remains, both to the footprint of earlier or demolished phases of the building and in relation to the potential previously unknown and unrecorded for Roman/Romano-British archaeological remains. Any such remains would be considered to be non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest and be of regional significance. The Authority’s archaeologist therefore recommends a monitoring and recording condition during the works which represents an appropriate and proportionate approach to the likely archaeological interest in the site.

Ecological Considerations

141. The PDNPA ecologist raises no objections subject to the inclusion of a condition in any approval to ensure the works are carried out in complete accordance with the recommendations of the submitted ecology report which identified three trees on the east

site boundary as having bat roosting potential and are recommended to be retained. The main Rising Sun building was assessed to have moderate bat roosting potential and two common pipistrelle bat roosts, of single common pipistrelle bats were recorded in the building during the survey work. In order for the work to proceed a European Protected Species Licence will need to be secured. Precautionary measures with respect to nesting birds and reptiles are also recommended.

Neighbour Amenity Considerations

142. Given the relationship to neighbouring properties and the existing lawful use as an hotel, there are no concerns about amenity to the eastern dwellings which lie across a paddock some 120m away with intervening planting on the boundaries. The main likely impacts will be in respect of the immediate neighbour to the west, Rowan Lodge whose garden abuts the site and is separated from it by a mature 4m high coniferous hedge. The dwelling itself is part two storey and single storey. It is set back within the plot to the north west of the existing hotel building and angled so that it is facing SW away from the hotel, some 40m away from the nearest point.
143. Currently the height of the existing hotel building is such that only the tip of the roof is visible over the hedge. All the room windows in the rear of the hotel as existing fall below the top of the hedge so there is no overlooking back to the dwelling or garden. The previous amenity impact would therefore be limited to potential noise from the use of the garden and lawns as the car parking was sited over the other side of the plot and largely confined behind the building.
144. In respect of the proposed new hotel building the increased height of the building would mean that from the garden the second floor would be visible over the hedge. The second floor windows in the rear facing gable at the western end look out to the north and are capable of looking over the garden toward the neighbouring house. However, the intervening distance and relationship to the main windows of the house is at an oblique angle means there would be no direct overlooking. It is therefore considered on balance, that the relationship of the windows, although changed from before, is nevertheless on balance, acceptable.
145. The proposal would however bring the new larger car park to around 13-14m from the dwelling and only just the other side of the hedge from the garden nearest the house. This would bring the noise of vehicle doors, engines and customers much closer to the neighbouring house where it would be likely to be noticeably much more audible than the current situation, with the potential for disturbance late into the evening. The hedge would prevent any intervisibility but it would not make a significant impact upon noise transmission. In the officer's judgement, to mitigate against this potentially harmful noise impact, it would be appropriate to require a suitable acoustic fence to be installed down the side of the rear car park in the interests of neighbouring amenity. A condition requiring submission and agreement of suitable design and detail is therefore suggested.
146. With the above mentioned condition the proposed development would accord with adopted policy and guidance in terms of amenity.

Conclusion

147. There are no objections in principle to a replacement hotel on the site. The proposed hotel in this application is however of a large scale and a height that is out of keeping with the established local building tradition and has therefore proved difficult to accommodate on the site without some harm to the valued characteristics of the Park. The proposed building and external landscape works have however been designed to a high standard and subject to detailed conditions would largely mitigate against the

adverse impacts of the massing and height. However, despite these measures, its three storey form would remain a visually dominant form in the immediate street scene and the overall height would be clearly out of keeping with the scale of traditional buildings in the locality and wider area. This impact however must be judged against the benefits arising from the proposals. On balance, the benefits arising from the redevelopment of the site already discussed above, in terms of enhancement of a derelict site coupled with the benefits to the local communities and economy from the proposal would outweigh the visual harm, given the particular circumstances and site constraints in this scheme.

148. The proposal is acceptable from a highway safety perspective and with the appropriate conditions would not harm neighbouring amenity. There are no archaeological or ecological concerns subject to the above conditions and the proposed environmental management of the building and the site would meet the Authority's adopted climate change policies.
149. In the absence of any further material considerations this major development proposal is therefore considered, on balance, to be in compliance with current and emerging Development Plan policy and the NPPF and accordingly the application, as amended, is recommended for approval subject to the prior entry into the legal agreement and the conditions set out above.

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

Report Author – John Keeley – Planning Manager – North Area Team.