

10 FULL APPLICATION – CONVERSION OF BARN TO LOCAL NEEDS DWELLING AT LEACH BARN, LEADMILL, HATHERSAGE (NP/DDD/1018/0951, AM)

APPLICANT: MR TREVOR SMITH

Site and Surroundings

1. The application site is located in open countryside approximately 850m to the south east of the centre of Hathersage. The site is located part way down a track off the B6001 adjacent to the Leadmill Bridge and the River Derwent. The garden to Leach House, a Grade II Listed former farmhouse, abuts the north-west side of the barns curtilage.
2. The site comprises a barn constructed from natural gritstone under a stone slate roof. There is a single large central doorway and smaller blocked doorway in the eastern elevation and a single smaller door in the rear elevation. The building is a typical small Peak District combination barn formerly used to house livestock and to store threshed straw or hay. It sits in the corner of a large field used for grazing horses and although previously in common ownership with the field, the barn was sold separately in 2016.
3. The barn is currently disused, a previous planning permission for use of the building as a workshop was granted on a personal basis only to a former occupier. It is understood that the building was refurbished at that time and a concrete floor put in. Subsequently it has been used for furniture storage in connection with the nearby Plough Inn and also rented out as local painter and decorators store for several years from around 2005/7 until the owner sold the building. Prior to the sale pre-application advice to the tenant farmer who was understood to have had an option to purchase advised that it was not suitable for conversion to a dwelling. Therefore the planning use of the building appears to be either a storage use or the former agricultural use.
4. Access to the site is via the track from the B6001 which is also the route of the public footpath which follows the route of the River Derwent towards Grindleford. The application site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

Proposal

5. The conversion and extension of the barn to one affordable dwelling to meet local need. The submitted plans have been amended following discussions between the agent and the Environment Agency.
6. The amended plans show that the proposed dwelling would have one bedroom. Internally the floor level of the proposed bedroom and kitchen would be raised 1.04m above the existing floor level of the barn accessed by a staircase from ground level and from a new doorway and external staircase formed in the north elevation.
7. The barn would be converted to a one bedroom dwelling provided on the raised floor within the building. A bedroom, bathroom and kitchen / living area would be created with access down the new external stairs to the proposed terrace area. The floor area for the dwelling would be 36.5 square metres.
8. Two window openings would be installed in the west elevation along with a new door opening to provide access to a walled terrace area to the side of the barn. The doorway on the west elevation would be provided with a half glazed frame.

9. The existing large central doorway on the east elevation would be glazed with timber frames and the existing smaller doorway would be opened and provided with a new partially glazed frame.
10. The existing western boundary wall would be lowered and a new wall erected to the east elevation to form a terrace to the side of the barn. An external store is proposed within the terrace area formed with timber walls under a slate roof.
11. The curtilage of the property would include the land to the west which would be utilised for the parking of two cars and the land to the east which is part of the field, separated from the rest with post and rail fencing.

RECOMMENDATION:

12. **That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:**

The proposed development would harm the significance of the barn and its setting within the wider landscape contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3 and HC1, saved Local Plan policies LC4 and LC8 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Key Issues

13. Impact of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the existing barn and its setting within the landscape.
14. Whether the proposed dwelling would meet established local need for affordable dwellings.
15. Whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle in terms of flood risk.

Planning History

16. 1984: NP/WED/0584/225: Planning permission granted conditionally and on a personal basis for change of use of barn to workshop.
17. 2013 – 2017: Various pre-application enquiries received in regard to potential development to convert the barn.
18. 2017: ENQ 30759: Pre-application advice in relation to the current proposals. The following advice was given:
19. *“I have outlined below the current policy position and my views as to how an application for conversion to a dwelling would be likely to be viewed. As you will see, regrettably there are a number of planning policy issues which mean that a change of use of the building to a dwelling would not be supported in principle.*
20. *The National Planning Policy Framework states, amongst other things, that in determining planning applications local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation, and that Authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside apart from where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting.*
21. *Whilst not of such character or other significance to represent a valued vernacular building, the barn is still a heritage asset by virtue of its age and traditional design. The conversion would result in an isolated dwelling in the countryside however, and the*

- proposed use and conversion works would not result in an enhancement of the immediate setting of the building in this context. Therefore, the development is not considered to comply with the Framework in this regard.*
22. *As noted, the site is in the open countryside - clearly separated from the settlement of Hathersage, where the Authority's local planning policies are also more restrictive. The Authority's Development Plan policy DS1 - which sets out the general development strategy for the National Park supports the principle of conversion of traditional buildings for housing, community facilities, and business uses including visitor accommodation. In terms of housing conversion though, policy HC1 of the Development Plan further restricts conversion of buildings in the countryside to those cases where the conversion is required to conserve a valued vernacular building.*
23. *In this case the building, whilst traditional, is of modest size and simple form and character, and would not be considered to be of valued vernacular. It would not therefore be suitable for conversion to a dwelling under the Authority's adopted planning policies and for this reason my view is that conversion to a dwelling would not comply with policy HC1.*
24. *In terms of detail, Policies L1, L3, LC4 and LC8 address matters of landscape impact, design, protection of heritage assets, and conversion of traditional buildings. The primary matters addressed by these policies are the need for any development to conserve the buildings character and appearance, and for it to have an acceptable relationship with the wider landscape. The proposed extension, by virtue of its massing and detailing would be overly dominant and would not reflect the character of the existing building, detracting from its appearance.*
25. *Additionally the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3, as designated by the Environment Agency and as you have determined in the submitted FRA. As also noted in the FRA, the use you are proposing falls in to the 'more vulnerable' classification. More vulnerable development would only be permitted in Flood Zone 3 if other less vulnerable sites are ruled out (in this case the building is pre-existing, so obviously it could not be sited elsewhere) and where the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk; and where a site-specific flood risk assessment is undertaken and demonstrates that the development will be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.*
26. *Both elements of the test have to be passed for development to be permitted. I do not consider that conversion to a market dwelling would offer wider sustainability benefits to the community that would outweigh flood risk, and so an application would raise objections on these grounds."*
27. 2018: Planning application for conversion of barn to local need dwelling withdrawn prior to determination.

Consultations

28. Parish Council: Make the following comments.
29. This is known to be a very wet area of ground due to the proximity of the leat. The building is a substantial stone barn in an historic setting. The building appears to be structurally sound at this time and this proposal will ensure that the building is maintained and be of heritage interest. It is preferred that this development provides accommodation to satisfy local need.
30. District Council: No response to date.

31. County Council Emergency Planning: Consider the submitted Flood Evacuation Plan to be suitable and sufficient in that it has assessed potential access/egress routes in a flood event, and that the availability of an Environment Agency 'Flood Warning' service at this location would allow sufficient time to evacuate safely.
32. Highway Authority: No objections subject to conditions.
33. Lead Local Flood Authority: Refers Authority to standing advice.
34. Environment Agency: Makes no objection subject to the imposition of conditions to secure finished floor level and makes the following comment.
35. *"The proposed development will only meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework if the following measure as detailed in the flood risk assessment submitted with this application is implemented and secured by way of a planning condition on any planning permission."*
36. *The proposed development is conversion of a barn into a residential building in Flood Zone 3a which is classed as more vulnerable development. The proposed development habitable floor finished floor level to be set at 137.82m AOD as outlined in the FRA.*
37. *The current available model for River Derwent is the River Derwent Recalibration, Black and Veatch, 2005 model (only in channel flood levels and flood outlines available). This model does not currently have updated 30% and 50% climate change (CC) allowances built in to it. For More Vulnerable developments in Flood Zone 3a, the FRA should consider the Higher Central (30%CC) and Upper (50%CC) estimates. Thus, the design flood for More Vulnerable developments is a 1% annual probability (a 1 in 100 chance each year) and therefore the '2080s' (2070 to 2115) epoch should be applied and mitigated to. Given the proximity of the development to Flood Zone 3b a design flood of 100yr 50%CC is adopted to be mitigated."*
38. The Environment Agency also gives the following advice to the Authority:
39. *"The planning practice guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework states that, in determining whether a development is safe, the ability of residents and users to safely access and exit a building during a design flood and to evacuate before an extreme flood needs to be considered."*
40. *The main access road (from B6001) to and from the property is flooded for any flooding events larger than 20 years. Thus, access road to and from the development during a design flood could impede dry access.*
41. *The LPA must determine, in consultation with their emergency planners, whether the arrangements for access and egress are acceptable. The Environment Agency does not comment on or approve the adequacy of flood emergency response procedures accompanying development proposals, as we do not carry out these roles during a flood. Our involvement with this development during an emergency will be limited to delivering flood warnings to occupants/users covered by our flood warning network."*
42. PDNPA Conservation Officer: The Authority's Conservation Officer made the following comments on the scheme as originally submitted. Further comments have been sought on the amended plans.

43. The introduction of parking and small curtilage would go some way to negating such rural charm as the building has. Design amendments are suggested including removing the proposed external doors to the main elevation and altering the roof light and additional window on the east elevation to ‘ventilation slits’.
44. PDNPA Archaeology: Makes the following comments.
45. *“Leach Barn is a non-designated heritage asset and is of local historic, archaeological and architectural interest. Leach Farm is identified in the Peak District National Park Authority’s Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record and the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record, as a partially extant 19th century farmstead, L-shape in plan with an attached farmhouse and agricultural buildings forming one side of the yard, with detached elements to the main plan. Leach Barn forms one of these detached elements.*
46. *It is a typical of a small Peak District combination barn, the typical kind of barn on Peak District Farmsteads, used to house livestock and used to store threshed straw or hay. Leach Barn has a typical arrangement with a large opening marking to position of the threshing bay in its east elevation, with a typical cambered arch opening, and a smaller winnowing door in the west elevation to provide a through draft for threshing. It also has a now blocked entrance to the cow housing in the east elevation, and a pitching hole for the movement of the stored crop. The fact that the access door to the former area for cow housing suggests a change of use, and perhaps a change in farming practice. This is atypical for Peak District examples where more typically where a change of use has occurred, it has been the threshing bay entrance that is blocked related to the reduction in the production of grain crops. The barn has lost its former internal partitions that would have divided the hayloft and threshing area from the cow housing. The Significance and Impact Statement submitted in support of this application indicates that the barn is likely to date to the 18th century and that the roof structure is original to the building (excluding the modern boarding). The hand sawn timbers and carpentry marks apparent in the roof structure would support this. The floor is of modern concrete, although it cannot be ruled out that historic floors survive beneath this, for example a surviving threshing floor could be made of stone slabs, beaten earth or more rarely timber. Any such surviving remains would have archaeological interest.*
47. *Historic map regression indicates that the barn was in existence at the time of the 1830 Hathersage Enclosure Award, and that by the time of the epoch 1 OS map of 1881 the building extended further to the north, with a roofed structure and two small folds occupying the area to the north of north gable end with the pitching hole. The Significance and Impact Statement presents evidence of a 20th addition with a large amount of glazing that is untypical of a combination barn and out of character with the traditional form, materials and function of this building.*
48. *The structure appears to be in relatively good condition and not in immediate danger or risk. The core significance of this non-designated heritage assets lies in its:*
- *traditional agricultural character – this demonstrates its agricultural origin and function*
 - *traditional materials – which are characteristic of the area*
 - *its surviving historic fabric – particularly the roof structure, which appears to be original*
 - *the location, form and size of historic openings – legibility of the historic function of the barn.*
49. *The proposed conversion will result in harm to the significance of this non-designated heritage asset. Changes to the historic fabric, including the insertion of a new opening in the north elevation to provide access, is in an area where the function of the barn meant there would not traditionally have been an opening; will affect the historic interest of the*

building. The proposed stepped access arrangement is out of character with the agricultural character of the building, and the rear roof light and proposed new opening in the west elevation, an elevation that historically only had the single opening as it faced away from the yard are to east, and there would be a limited need for opening because of the limited movement of people, stock, produce through this area and into the building, with this activity focused on the yard area and east elevation with the cart entrance and cow house doors, and the pitching hole for access to the hayloft in the north gable. Such changes will result in permanent changes to the visible fabric and structure of the building, which will affect the legibility of its function and historical development, changes affect an area of the building's core significance. Also of concern is that the proposed changes will result in harm to the traditional historic agricultural character of the building, again a core aspect of its significance.

50. *The conservation through finding a viable use of this non-designated heritage asset is a desirable outcome, but the new use must sustain its heritage values and significance. The current scheme is certainly less harmful than the previous scheme, but there will still be harm.*
51. *Should the proposals be considered acceptable with respect to planning balance and this harm is deemed to be outweighed by public benefit, then I advise that the archaeological and historic impacts detailed above be addressed through a conditioned scheme of building recording. This would need to be a programme of descriptive building recording that would supplement the existing Heritage Statement to achieve an overall level of recording in accordance with Historic England 2016 Understanding Historic Buildings guidance Level 2/3. This needs to incorporate a full visual record when the buildings have been emptied and cleared out and safe access provided to all areas. It would also need to include elements of a drawn record (annotated plan and elevation drawings showing the form and location of surviving historic fabric; photograph location and direction plan), and a written record and description of the buildings and historic features /fabric revealed, and analysis of historic use and development. This is in accordance with NPPF para 199, and a suitable condition to achieve this is suggested below."*
52. PDNPA Ecology: No response to date.

Representations

53. Three letters of representation have been received to date. All three letters support the application for the following reasons:
54. The development would be an enhancement to the locality.
55. The development would keep the building in good condition and be in keeping with the local environment.
56. The roof is in danger of collapse and if this happened there would be a ruin instead of an attractive barn on the site.

Main Policies

57. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3, CC1, CC5 and HC1
58. Relevant Local Plan policies: LC4, LC8, LC15, LC16, LC17, LC22, LH1, LH2, LT11 and LT18

National Planning Policy Framework

59. 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 the NPPF.
60. 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.'
61. The NPPF directly refers to the National Parks Circular which makes clear that the Government considers it inappropriate to set housing targets within the National Parks and instead that policies should seek to delivery affordable housing to meet the needs of local communities.
62. Paragraph 78 and 79 of the NPPF re-inforce this approach together saying that planning authorities should seek to promote sustainable affordable housing in rural areas and that permission for isolated new housing in the countryside should only be granted where there are special circumstances.
63. Paragraph 155 of the NPPF says that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
64. Paragraph 164 of the NPPF says that applications for some minor development and changes of use should not be subject to the sequential or exception tests but should still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments.
65. Para 190 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
66. Para 197 of the NPPF states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Development Plan policies

67. 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.
68. Policies GSP3 and LC4 set out development management principles and state 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.
69. 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.
70. The approach to housing and conservation in the NPPF is consistent with the Authority's development strategy (Policy DS1) which says new residential development within the National Park should normally be sited within named settlements, and Policy HC1. C which sets out very similar criteria to the NPPF in terms of the exceptional circumstances in which a new house can be granted planning permission in the National Park.
71. Policy HC1. C I and II states that exceptionally new housing will be permitted in accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2 if it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings or where it is required in order to achieve conservation or enhancement within designated settlements.
72. Policy L2 states that development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate their setting. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to have an adverse impact on any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance or their setting that have statutory designation or are of international or national importance for their biodiversity.
73. Policy LC17 provides more detailed criteria to assess development that may affect protected sites, species or habitats.
74. Policy L3 states that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings, including statutory designations and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to the significance of any cultural heritage asset of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance or its setting, including statutory designations or other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest.
75. Policy LC8 provides more detailed criteria to assess development proposing to convert existing buildings to new uses respectively. Policies LC15 and LC16 provide detailed criteria to assess development that affects archaeological and historic sites.

76. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources, taking into account the energy hierarchy and achieving the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency. CC1. B says that development must be directed away from flood risk areas, and seek to reduce overall risk from flooding within the National Park and areas outside it, upstream and downstream.
77. Policies LT11 and LT18 require development to be provided with appropriate access and parking provision which conserves the environmental quality of the National Park.
78. Further detailed policy on appropriate design for new housing is provided in the Authority's supplementary planning documents: the Design Guide and its appendix, the Building Design Guide.
79. It is considered the Authority's adopted design guidance and the wider range of design and conservation policies in the Development Plan are consistent with national policies in the NPPF, which emphasise the great weight that should be attached to the conservation and enhancement of the National Park landscape, its wildlife and cultural heritage in any planning decision, and also promote high standards of design that would be sensitive to the valued characteristics of the National Park.
80. Emerging Development Management Policies
81. The Authority has reached an advanced stage in the production of Development Management Policies. The process has now moved beyond publication and examination, taking into account earlier representations and the Inspector's interim views on soundness. The Authority considers that the revised version of the Publication Document addresses the remaining soundness issues and therefore may be afforded significant weight as a material consideration in the determination of this application.
82. The emerging conservation policies reflect the policy approach in the NPPF in requiring development to conserve the valued characteristics of the National Park and in requiring an assessment of impact of development upon the landscape, biodiversity and cultural heritage asset.
83. Policy DMC10 is relevant for conversions of heritage assets and says that this will be permitted provided that it can accommodate the new use without changes that would adversely affect its character, that the building is capable of conversion and that the changes brought about by the new uses conserves the heritage asset, its setting and landscape character including dark skies.
84. Policy DMH1 is relevant for affordable housing and says that affordable housing will be permitted outside of Core Strategy policy DS1 settlements by conversion of existing buildings provided that there is a proven need and any new build housing is within adopted size thresholds.
85. Policy DMH2 says that in all cases new affordable housing must be first occupied by persons satisfying at least one of the following criteria:
86. (i) a person (and his or her dependents) who has a minimum period of 10 years permanent residence in the Parish or an adjoining Parish inside the National Park and is currently living in accommodation which is overcrowded or otherwise unsatisfactory; or

87. (ii) a person (and his or her dependents) not now resident in the Parish but having lived for at least 10 years out of the last 20 years in the Parish or an adjoining Parish inside the National Park, and is currently living in accommodation which is overcrowded or otherwise unsatisfactory; or
88. (iii) a person who has an essential need to live close to another person who has a minimum of 10 years residence in a Parish inside the National Park, the essential need arising from infirmity.

Assessment

Justification for proposed dwelling house

89. The relevant housing policy is Core Strategy policy HC1. This policy continues the Authority's long standing policy position that housing will not be permitted solely to meet open market demand. This approach is consistent with the National Park Circular and the NPPF.
90. Policy HC1 therefore sets out the exceptional circumstances in which new housing will be permitted within the National Park. The approach of allowing affordable housing and workers housing where there is an established need, and, of allowing market housing where it is required to achieve significant conservation and enhancement in accordance with policies GSP1 and GSP2 is considered to be a sustainable approach for providing housing within the National Park without undermining the landscape and valued characteristics.
91. This application is for an affordable house to meet established local need. Some information has been provided with the application in regard to the applicant's circumstances. From the information provided it is clear that the applicant would not meet any of the definitions of a person with local qualification set out by either saved Policy LH2 or emerging Development Management policy DMH2.
92. There is significant need within the parish of Hathersage for affordable housing and the Parish Council would prefer that this development provide affordable housing. The agent has indicated that if the applicant would not be considered to have a local qualification then the dwelling would be required to meet the wider need within the parish.
93. There is an up-to-date parish need survey for Hathersage which establishes that there is a need for affordable housing within the parish that is not currently met. The identified need is for two bedroom, four person houses and bungalows, and three bedroom houses. The survey states that there are sufficient existing one and two bedroom affordable flats within the parish to meet need.
94. Therefore while there is an established need for affordable housing, the parish need survey states that there is no requirement for additional one bedroom properties which this development would deliver. It is therefore considered that there is no established need for the proposed affordable dwelling contrary to saved Policy LH1 and emerging Development Management policy DMH1.
95. Policy HC1 does make provision for the creation of market housing if it is demonstrated to be required to achieve conservation or enhancement of a valued vernacular or listed building. It is clear from the submitted application and from consultation responses received from the Authority's Conservation Officer and Archaeologist that the application building should be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.

96. Therefore irrespective of whether the proposed dwelling was to be affordable to meet local need or a market dwelling a key issue would be whether the development is required to achieve conservation or enhancement of the building.

Impact of development

97. Leach Barn is a non-designated heritage asset and is of local historic, archaeological and architectural interest. Leach Farm is identified in the Peak District National Park Authority's Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record and the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record, as a partially extant 19th century farmstead, L-shape in plan with an attached farmhouse and agricultural buildings forming one side of the yard, with detached elements to the main plan. Leach Barn forms one of these detached elements.
98. The building is typical of a small Peak District combination barn, the typical kind of barn on Peak District Farmsteads, used to house livestock and used to store threshed straw or hay. Leach Barn has a typical arrangement with a large opening marking the position of the threshing bay in its east elevation, with a typical cambered arch opening, and a smaller winnowing door in the west elevation to provide a through draft for threshing.
99. The core significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset is considered to be its traditional agricultural character and its relationship to the wider landscape which demonstrates its agricultural origins and function, the use of traditional materials, surviving historic fabric, in particular the roof structure which appears to be original and the location, form and size of historic openings.
100. Significant concerns have been raised by the Authority's Conservation Officer and Senior Archaeologist about the impact of the proposed development upon the significance of the barn.
101. The proposed raising of the main floor by over 1m to mitigate for potential flood events creates differing levels internally which would contrast with the plain, simple and bold symmetrical form of the building reflecting its former function.
102. The proposed external staircase would further disrupt the simple symmetrical form of the building and require the creation of a new door opening in the northern gable which would require the removal of a significant amount of historic fabric in a position where there is no evidence of a former opening and where historically there would not have been an opening.
103. The proposed two long and narrow window openings to the east elevation and the glazing to the large central opening and glazing to the smaller doors would add domestic elements and further erode the simple functional appearance of the building.
104. The creation of a domestic curtilage to the east of the barn, formed by inappropriate post and rail fencing and its use as a domestic garden would severely compromise the character of the building which currently fronts directly onto the open field. The functional and physical relationship of the building with the field is a critical element of the historic character of the building. The parking of domestic vehicles to the west of the barn would add further domestic elements. Taken together the impact of the proposed domestic garden and parking areas would significantly harm the setting of the barn within the landscape.
105. The combined impact of the proposed alterations and change of use of the building to create a dwelling would seriously compromise the core characteristics of the building which form its significance and for which the building is valued.

106. The conservation of the barn through finding a viable use of this non-designated heritage asset is a desirable outcome, but within the National Park great weight must be given to the landscape and cultural heritage. The benefits of the proposed development would not outweigh the harmful impact of the development upon the barn and therefore the proposal is considered to be contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3 and HC1, saved Local Plan policies LC4 and LC8 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Flood Risk

107. Policies CC1 and CC5 in accordance with the NPPF and National Planning Policy Guidance seek to direct development away from areas of flood risk. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008 SFRA) which has been carried out and underpins the Authority's Core Strategy identifies the application site as being within Flood Zone 3b. Flood Zone 3b is the functional flood plain which is defined as land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood.
108. This application proposes the conversion of the barn to create a dwelling house which for the purposes of National Planning Policy Guidance is a 'More Vulnerable' use in relation to flood risk. National Planning Policy Guidance is clear that any use which is vulnerable to flooding is not appropriate within Flood Zone 3b and therefore the proposed development is not acceptable in principle on the grounds of flood risk.
109. The Environment Agency has, in responding to the previous application on this site, drawn the Authority's attention to the more recent SFRA carried out for Derbyshire Dales in 2016. This SFRA also identifies the application site as being within Flood Zone 3b.
110. The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which acknowledges that the site is identified as being within Flood Zone 3b by the 2008 SFRA. However the FRA provides analysis of modelled Environment Agency in-channel flood data which shows that the site is on land topographically higher than the more frequent flood events associated within the functional flood plain and therefore considers that the site is outside of Flood Zone 3b (and within Flood Zone 3a).
111. The change of use of the barn and site to a 'More Vulnerable' use in relation to flood risk is acceptable in principle within Flood Zone 3a provided that development can be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere and that safe access and escape routes can be demonstrated.
112. Discussions have been undertaken between the agent and the Environment Agency which has resulted in amended plans showing the finished floor level within the barn raised by 1.04m above the existing floor level of the barn. This is to ensure that the floor level is raised above the predicted 1 in 100 year flood event level plus 50% taking into account the impact of climate change.
113. The Environment Agency raise no objections to the development provided that the development is carried out in accordance with the revised FRA and that the lowest habitable floor levels are set no lower than this level and are permanently maintained. If permission were to be granted it therefore would be necessary to impose a planning condition to require this to ensure that occupants are safe during a 1 in 100 year flood event.
114. The Environment Agency go on to advise the Authority that in assessing if a development is safe, the ability of residents to safely access and exit a building during a 1 in 100 year flood event and evacuate before an extreme flood needs to be considered. The Environment Agency advise that the main access road (the B6001) is flooded for any

- flood event larger than a 1 in 20 year flood event which could impede dry access and egress.
115. Following this advice a Flood Evacuation Plan (FEP) has been submitted in support of the application and the Authority has consulted the Emergency Planning Team at Derbyshire County Council. The FEP has analysed the location of standing / slow flowing water along the evacuation route from the building and the depth of water.
 116. The FEP states that the risk of a rapid onset flood event with very little warning would be relatively low and that evacuation from the site can be achieved by travelling to and then north along the B6001 using two possible evacuation routes. These routes could be utilised if no flooding has occurred on the topographic low point.
 117. No true safe escape route could be guaranteed if the site flooded unexpectedly, however it may still be possible to evacuate the site if evacuation is sought after receiving a warning from the Environment Agency provided that flooding along the evacuation route has not exceeded 0.25m in depth. Safe refuge can otherwise be provided on site due to the proposed finished floor levels.
 118. The FEP therefore concludes that it would be imperative that the site owner sign up to the Flood Warning System.
 119. The Authority has consulted the Emergency Planning Team following the advice from the Environment Agency. The advice received is that the submitted FEP is suitable and sufficient as it has assessed potential access / egress routes in a flood event and that the availability of an Environment Agency Flood warning service would allow sufficient time to evacuate safely.
 120. Having had regard to the advice from the Environment Agency and the Emergency Planning Team it is therefore concluded that if the proposed development was determined to be acceptable in principle then the development could be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere and that safe access and escape routes have been demonstrated. If permission was granted conditions to secure the finished floor levels and implementation of the FEP would be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Other considerations

121. Given the distance of the barn to the nearest neighbouring property Leach House and the orientation of proposed openings and location of the curtilage there are no concerns that the development would harm the amenity, privacy or security of any neighbouring property.
122. Access to the property is good from the main B6001 road onto the track with ample visibility. There is also room within the site for adequate parking clear of the track but no room for on-site turning space. Vehicles would therefore need to make turning manoeuvres into and out of the parking spaces using the lane. However, this would be at low speed and unlikely to adversely conflict with users of the footpath. Therefore Officers agree with the Highway Authority that subject to conditions that the development would not harm Highway Safety.
123. A protected species survey has been carried out and submitted with the application. The survey report concludes that no evidence of bats, birds or any other protected species were identified on site. Therefore subject to the implementation of reasonable avoidance measures and suitable enhancements the development would not harm the favourable conservation status of any protected species or habitat.

Conclusion

124. The proposed development would harm the significance of the barn and its setting within the wider landscape contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3 and HC1, saved Local Plan policies LC4 and LC8 and the National Planning Policy Framework. The development would also be contrary to emerging development management policies DMC1, DMC5 and DMC10.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Report Author - Adam Maxwell, Senior Planner