

9. FULL APPLICATION: REBUILDING OF BARN AND CONVERSION TO A DWELLING AT BARN TO THE WEST OF THE RAKE, MONYASH (NP/DDD/0419/0428, TS)

APPLICANT: MR AND MRS HOTCHIN

Summary

The application proposes the same development that was refused in March 2019. The current application includes some additional information about the structural condition of the existing building that is to be demolished and about the future occupancy of the proposed new build dwelling. However, as is discussed below, this does not address the fundamental issues with creating a new build house in an isolated location in the open countryside. The application should be refused again.

Site and Surroundings

1. The application site is located in open countryside approximately 450m to the south west of the edge of Monyash village. The site lies in an agricultural field that forms part of an area of medieval fossilised strip fields to the west of The Rake and just to the south of Barrowstones Lane, which is an unmade track.
2. The site comprises of a ruinous field barn and an area of the agricultural field that it sits in. The former barn is in a very poor state of repair with only the eastern gable end still intact. Parts of the southern and eastern walls remain. The northern elevation has completely collapsed. There is no roof structure remaining. The walls that do remain are constructed from natural limestone.
3. Access to the site is via Barrowstones Lane track from the The Rake which is also the route of a public footpath. The track is an unmade green lane.
4. The site is outside of the named settlement of Monyash and is located some 400 metres from the nearest other building. The site is therefore in the open countryside for development plan purposes (because it is outside of a named settlement) and in an isolated location because of its distance from other buildings.

Proposal

5. The application seeks full planning permission for the rebuilding of the ruinous former barn and change of use to form an open market dwelling.
6. The proposal involves the demolition of almost all of the remaining walls of the existing building. A new building that replicates the appearance of the former barn would be constructed. This therefore amounts to the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new dwelling, rather than the conversion of an existing building.
7. The proposed new building would replicate the size and form of the former barn, would replicate the former pattern of window and door openings and would be constructed using stone reclaimed from the existing building as far as possible. The roof of the new building would be covered in either stone slates or blue slate.
8. The proposed new dwelling would have a living room and kitchen to the ground floor and three bedrooms and a bathroom to the first floor. The dwelling would be accessed using Barrowstone Lane which would be improved and resurfaced in order to make it suitable for use by a family car. Domestic curtilage would be created to the east and south of the host building with two parking spaces immediately to the eastern side.

9. The development is the same as the one proposed under the application that was refused in March 2019 under application NP/DDD/0119/0042. There have been no changes to the development since then. The new application does however contain some additional information about the structural condition of the existing barn that is to be demolished and the future occupancy of the proposed new-build house. These matters are discussed in detail further below.

RECOMMENDATION:

10. **That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:**
1. **The proposed development would create an isolated new build dwelling in the open countryside that would not deliver conservation or enhancement of a valued vernacular building. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy HC1 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to avoid isolated homes in the countryside.**
 2. **The proposed development would result in the almost total demolition of the existing field barn which is a non-designated heritage asset, resulting in almost complete loss of the non-designated heritage asset, and would harm the character of the agricultural strip field system in which the barn is set and which is also a non-designated heritage asset. There are no public benefits that outweigh the harm to the non-designated heritage assets. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC10 and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.**
 3. **The creation of a new dwelling in this isolated location within the open countryside and the domestication of the site would result in significant harm to the landscape character and scenic beauty of the National Park. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3 and DMC3 and paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Key Issues

11. The principle of constructing a new open market dwelling in this location.
12. Impact of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the existing barn and its setting within the landscape.

History

13. Planning application NP/DDD/0119/0042 for an identical development to the current application was refused by Planning Committee on 12 March 2019. The application was refused for the following reasons:
- The proposed development would create an isolated new build dwelling in the open countryside that would not deliver conservation or enhancement of a valued vernacular building. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy HC1 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to avoid isolated homes in the countryside.
 - The proposed development would result in the almost total demolition of the existing field barn which is a non-designated heritage asset, resulting in almost complete loss of the non-designated heritage asset, and would harm the character of the agricultural strip

field system in which the barn is set and which is also a non-designated heritage asset. There are no public benefits that outweigh the harm to the non-designated heritage assets. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3, LC4, LC8 and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- The creation of a new dwelling in this isolated location within the open countryside and the domestication of the site would result in significant harm to the landscape character and scenic beauty of the National Park. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3 and LC4 and paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Consultations

14. Monyash Parish Council: *"The Parish Council have not changed their opinion and still support this application"*.
15. District Council: No response to date.
16. Highway Authority: No objections.
17. PDNPA Senior Archaeologist: Confirms that the objection to the previous application still applies. For reference, the key points of the previous objection were as follows:
 - *I have concerns about this proposals and the impact of the change of use of the physical structure and fabric of the building itself, and resulting harm to its historic and archaeological interest. I also have concerns about the change of use to a dwelling and the impact of this on the immediate setting of the barn and on the historic landscape character, and the requirements to update access and the impact of this on the historic landscape character.*
 - *The proposed change of use of the ruined barn to a dwelling house intends only to retain the base courses of the structure, and rebuild from this base. This would result in almost the complete loss of a non-designated heritage asset, and its historic and archaeological interest and significance. No structural assessment has been submitted in support of this application, therefore, it is not clear whether more fabric could be retained. I strongly recommend that the primary starting point for any development should be the retention of the historic structures, with appropriate repair, restoration and rebuilding only where required to retain them.*
 - *There is currently very little information in the application with respect to the proposed domestic curtilage, parking arrangement and access- these don't seem to be depicted on any plans. The development of the ruined barn into a permanently occupied dwelling house will harm both the agricultural setting of the barn, which positively contributes to its significance, and will harm the historic landscape within which the ruined barn is located. With respect to the historic landscape, currently as unoccupied, ruinous buildings the site is integrated within its surrounding agricultural landscape, and it owes its existence and position to the way this landscape, enclosure and farming practice has developed from the medieval period onwards. The introduction of a residential and domestic use into this location within this historical landscape, with everything this entails (domestic curtilage and paraphernalia, parking, provision of services, light pollution, movement of vehicles, provision of a bin store etc.) would introduce elements that are out of place, incongruous and are harmful to this important heritage asset.*
 - *From an archaeology perspective we would object due to lack of information, and would seek that any development proposals be supported by appropriate plans and*

specification in relation to domestic curtilage and access arrangements. An appropriate assessment of the significance of the historic farmstead and traditional farm building that is the subject of this application is also required.

- *However, using the existing information available and taking into account the harm identified above, and the need to weigh this in the planning balance against public benefit, I would suggest that even with the supporting formation, from a Cultural Heritage perspective we would likely still not be in position to support the positive determination of this application as it would likely be contrary to the Local Development Framework (policy L3).*
18. PDNPA Public Rights of Way: *Barrowstones Lane carries the route of Public Footpath No5 – Monyash across its whole width and along the whole length that is detailed in the application. The line of this public right of way must not be obstructed in any way. Any proposals to install gates or other restrictions to restrict the free movement of the public on foot must be discussed with the Highway Authority Rights of Way Team (Derbyshire County Council), the applicant should also discuss any proposed works that may impede or endanger the public's use of the footpath with the Highway Authority as they may require a temporary closure during significant construction works.*

Representations

19. Eight letters of support have been received. The letters support the application on the following grounds:
- Would provide housing for a local family
 - More houses are needed in the area
 - Would make use of an existing building
 - Would fit into the landscape
 - Important to keep young families in their local communities to support local facilities
 - Would benefit the local community
 - Would restore a historic field barn
 - Important to keep field barns standing
 - The building will be left to decay and create an eyesore if not used
 - Would not harm any neighbours

Main Policies

20. Since the previous application was refused at Planning Committee in March 2019 the Development Management Policies document which forms part 2 of the local plan has been adopted. The previous Local Plan policies have now been deleted. As such, no weight is now given to policies LC4, LC8, LC15, LC16, LC17, LC22, LH1, LH2, LT11 and LT18 that were previously referred to. Instead, the policies of the Development Management Policies document listed below are now relevant.
21. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3, CC1, CC5 and HC1
22. Development Management Policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMC11, DMT3.

National Planning Policy Framework

23. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies document 2019. 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.
24. 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.'
25. 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 deliver affordable housing to meet the needs of local communities.
26. 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.
27. 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.
28. 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

29. 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). GPS1 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. GSP2 sets out that opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon.

30. 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.
31. 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.
32. 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.
33. 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.
34. 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.
35. Policy DMC11 provides more detailed criteria to assess development that may affect protected sites, species or habitats.
36. 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.
37. Policy DMC3 states that where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place.

38. Policy DMC5 states that Development of a designated or non-designated heritage asset will not be permitted if it would result in any harm to, or loss of, the significance, character and appearance of a heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), unless:
- (i) for designated heritage assets, clear and convincing justification is provided, to the satisfaction of the Authority, that the:
 - a) substantial harm or loss of significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; or
 - b) in the case of less than substantial harm to its significance, the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
 - (ii) for non-designated heritage assets, the development is considered by the Authority to be acceptable following a balanced judgement that takes into account the significance of the heritage asset.
39. Policy DMC10 sets out that the conversion of a heritage asset will only be acceptable when the building can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character, such as major rebuilding. The building must be capable of conversion. The changes brought about by the new use must conserve or enhance the heritage significance of the asset, its setting and landscape character. In all cases attention will be paid to the impact of domestication and urbanisation brought about by the use on landscape character and the built environment.
40. 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.
41. Policy DMT3 requires that a safe access is provided in a way which does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality and where possible enhances it.
42. 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.
43. 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.

Assessment

Justification for proposed dwelling house

44. 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.

45. 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.
46. As was the case with the application that was refused in March, this application is not for an affordable house to meet an identified local need, it is for an open market dwelling. A lot of weight has clearly been given by the Parish Council and third parties who have supported the application due to the applicants' local connections. The supporting information states that one of the applicants was born in Monyash so has a local connection in this regard. However, the applicants already own a property in Bakewell so would not meet the qualification criteria for a new local needs dwelling. Furthermore, even if the application was proposing a new affordable dwelling to meet an identified local need, this site is a wholly unsuitable location for new affordable housing. The Authority's housing policies are clear that new affordable local needs housing should be located within named settlements, not in isolated locations in the open countryside such as this. If a housing need and local occupancy qualification were to be demonstrated then the Authority would work to identify suitable sites within the village in which new housing could be delivered in a sustainable manner. The approach of addressing housing provision by constructing new dwellings in isolated locations in the open countryside (both inside or outside National Parks) is wholly contrary to national and local policy and is highly unsustainable. Whilst the comments of the Parish and third party supporters of the application in respect of the applicants' local connections are noted, this should be given no weight in the decision making process for an application for a new build dwelling in the open countryside that would not be affordable.
47. Unlike the previous application, the supporting information for the current application suggests that the applicants would be willing to enter into a legal agreement that requires the house to be occupied by someone who meets the Authority's local occupancy criteria if the current applicants choose to sell the house in the future; i.e. the house would become a local needs dwelling at some unknown time in the future. This approach is wholly contrary to the Authority's housing policies.
48. It is fully acknowledged by the applicants that they do not meet the local qualification criteria for a new build affordable dwelling. There is no way that the Authority could reasonably justify granting permission for a house that is not restricted to local needs at the time of approval but with a requirement for it to become a local needs house in the future.
49. Paragraph 5 of the NPPF makes it very clear that planning obligations can only be imposed where they are:
 - a) necessary to make the development acceptable;
 - b) directly related to the development; and
 - c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
50. If a local needs restriction is required to make the development acceptable in planning terms (which it would not in any case) then this would need to be imposed from the outset and apply to all occupiers, including the first occupiers. There is no way that a legal agreement along the lines of the one the applicant has suggested could be said to be necessary to make the development acceptable. It would also not be directly related to the development as it would be for something different to the development for which planning permission is being sought. A legal agreement requiring the house to become restricted to local occupancy at some unknown period in the future would be wholly

contrary to the tests for planning obligations. The Authority would not be able to secure a legal agreement for this and as such no weight at all should be given to this suggestion.

51. In any event, even if we were to consider that a legal agreement could be achieved, it remains the case that even a new build affordable local needs dwelling here would be contrary to our policies which make it clear that new build affordable housing in isolated locations outside of existing settlements is not acceptable.
52. In refusing the previous application Members agreed with our recommendation that this is an inappropriate location for a new build dwelling. There are no material changes that should lead to a different view being taken now.
53. The creation of a new dwelling in the open countryside would only be acceptable if it was required to deliver significant conservation or enhancement of a listed or valued vernacular building.
54. The existing barn is not listed but the Authority's Senior Archaeologist has appraised the building and is of the view that the former barn is a non-designated heritage asset. It is therefore considered to be a valued vernacular building for the purposes of policy HC1.
55. Consideration should therefore be given to whether or not the proposed development would deliver significant conservation or enhancement of the ruined barn.

Impact of development on the Heritage Asset and the Historic Landscape

56. The Parish Council and letters of support have referred to the development conserving the existing building and preventing the loss of the historic field barn. These comments are noted, however it is not considered that this is a supportable conclusion.
57. It must be stressed that the development would not retain the existing building. The building would be taken down and rebuilt. Following the refused application in March, the applicant has submitted a structural report with the current application.
58. This confirms that the remains of the existing building cannot be saved and reused. All three of the remaining walls are inherently unstable. Even if the walls were underpinned they would not be stable enough to bear the weight of a new roof. There is therefore no possibility of integrating the remains of the building into a scheme that would save what little historic fabric is left. The proposal is therefore still to demolish all that remains of the historic building and to construct a new building.
59. Whilst the rebuilt dwelling would replicate the former barn, it would be a new building and the historic building would be almost completely lost. There is no conservation value in taking down a historic building and constructing a new one unless it is to maintain the group value of other historic buildings. That does not apply in this case. The intrinsic historic value of the original building would be lost and the replacement would be nothing more than a pastiche.
60. The ruined barn is recorded in the County Historic Environment Record and the Peak District National Park Historic Building Sites and Monuments Record (MPD13325), as a former out farm. Out farms are multi-purposes farm buildings located within an outlying area of farm. The barn that is the subject of this application can more accurately be considered a field barn due to its form, a single building with no associated yard and its location within the well preserved fossilised medieval strip field system of Monyash. It was likely used for sheltering livestock (cattle or sheep), for storage hay, fodder and other crops, or a combination of these activities. The building has historic and archaeological interest, due to its traditional

agricultural character that demonstrates its agricultural origin and function, the traditional materials from which it is constructed, surviving historic features and fabric and the form and location of the openings, which provides legibility of the historic function of the barn.

61. The ruined barn is located within an area of known Ancient Enclosure in the form of a fossilised medieval strip field system, as identified in the PDNP Historic Landscape Character Assessment. These are fossilised medieval strip fields that relate to the Medieval open field system of Monyash, evidenced by map and field shape evidence (characterised by the enclosed narrow strips with a characteristic s-shaped curve). The fossilised medieval strip fields are a rare and precious landscape character type and important to the Peak District National Park. They are a non-designated heritage asset of archaeological interest and have intrinsic landscape value, providing the area a distinct character, a time depth to the landscape. They are the most important, and rarest, historic landscape feature type within the National Park. The barn sits within a field adjacent to Barrowstones Lane. This is not part of the road network from the village but a green lane, and likely formed part of the route system that gave access, initially on foot, across the medieval open field system.
62. Rather than saving the historic building, as has been suggested in the representations received in support of the application, the proposed rebuilding and change of use of the barn would result in almost the complete loss of the heritage asset. Only the base courses of the existing barn would be retained so all the other historic fabric and interest of the building would be lost. Policy DMC10 makes it very clear that conversion schemes are only acceptable when they can accommodate the new use without changes that would adversely affect its character, such as major rebuilding. In this case the building would be almost completely rebuilt resulting in the loss of almost all of the existing fabric and character. There is no doubt that this scheme includes major rebuilding and the proposal is clearly contrary to policy DMC10.
63. The building in its current form as an unoccupied, ruinous building is well integrated within its surrounding agricultural landscape. The domestication of the building and its immediate surroundings would be highly incongruous and harmful to both the barn and strip field heritage assets.
64. The building is in a very isolated position set in extensive otherwise undeveloped agricultural land. It is categorised as being within the White Peak Limestone village farmlands landscape character type area within the Authority's Landscape Strategy and Action Plan. This is a small-scale settled agricultural landscape characterised by limestone villages, set within a repeating pattern of narrow strip fields bounded by drystone walls. The pastoral farmland enclosed by limestone walls and repeating pattern of narrow strip fields are two of the key characteristics of this landscape character. Settlements and buildings in these areas tend to be strongly nucleated with dwellings concentrated into a central village. This is very much the case in Monyash.
65. The introduction of a new build residential dwelling in this location would domesticate the site and the landscape through the introduction of lighting, vehicle movements, parking areas, garden space and other domestic paraphernalia. The need to upgrade Barrowstone Lane would further domesticate the locality and erode the current agricultural character. It is considered that the domestication of this site would be significantly harmful to both the strip fields as a designated heritage asset and the landscape character of this part of the National Park. It is considered that this is a wholly unsuitable place to introduce a new residential dwelling.

66. The combined impact of the loss of almost all of the existing historic fabric of the ruined barn and the domestication of the site through the proposed change to residential use would seriously compromise the core characteristics of the building, the strip fields and the wider landscape character. Rather than conserving an existing building, the proposed development would result in significant harm to two non-designated heritage assets and the special qualities of this part of the National Park. It must be concluded therefore that there is no conservation or enhancement benefit arising from the proposal.
67. Letters of support have raised concerns about the building being an eye sore if it left undeveloped, or that it could be lost completely. The building is not an eye sore at present. It is well integrated into the landscape as set out above. The retention of the barn as a historic ruin is considered to be a positive contribution to the wider landscape, not a detracting one. It is acknowledged that the building has suffered partial collapse and there may be uncertainty about the retention of the building in the long term. The submitted structural report raises concerns about the potential for further collapse. However, the total loss of the building would be much less harmful to the character of the National Park landscape compared to the significant harm to the landscape that would be caused by the wholly inappropriate introduction of a domestic dwelling at this site. As such, the possibility that the existing building could be lost at some point in the future provides no justification for a new development that would be harmful for the reasons set out above.
68. Policy DMC5 and the NPPF say that where development would harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, such as the barn and strip field system, the Authority should take a balanced judgement weighing the benefits of the development against the harm. In this case the public benefits of allowing the development are considered to be very limited because the proposal would not meet an established local need for affordable housing. The Authority's housing policies provide for meeting the housing needs of the National Park in a sustainable way by requiring new housing to be in settlements where the impacts on the landscape of the National Park are most limited and the community benefits are highest. Letters of support have suggested that the development would support local facilities such as the village school and church. However, these benefits would be best realised through sustainable new housing within the village, not by creating isolated homes in the open countryside.
69. 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.

Highways

70. The proposed dwelling would be accessed via Barrowstone Lane. At present, the lane is clearly unsuitable for normal domestic cars to access the site due to its unmade and uneven nature. The supporting information states that the existing track is of sufficient width to accommodate the car and it would be improved to allow for a standard family car to pass along it by resurfacing the track with limestone chippings.
71. The Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal. It is considered that the traffic associated with a single dwelling would be unlikely to result in significant issues of highway safety.

Other considerations

72. Given the distance of the barn to the nearest neighbouring property 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.
73. A protected species survey has not been carried out because the ruinous state of the building and the absence of a roof means that the building is highly unlikely to be suitable to provide habitat opportunities for birds or bats. As such the development would be unlikely to harm the conservation of any protected species or ecology interests.
74. Barrowstone Lane is a public rights of way. The Authority's Rights of Ways team have not provided comments for the current application but raised no objections to the previous proposal, noting that measures would be required to ensure that the public footpath remains unobscured.
75. The submitted information also makes reference to the existing building possibly being a safety hazard and also that the development would allow the fallen stone from the building that currently obscures the public footpath to be removed. These are not material planning considerations and separate controls exist to deal with unsafe buildings and obstructions to public rights of way.

Conclusion

76. The proposed development would seriously harm the significance of two non-designated heritage assets in the form of the barn and the strip field system in which it sits. Furthermore, the proposed development would result in harm to the landscape character of this part of the National Park. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3 and HC1, saved Development Management Plan policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMC10 and the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no material difference in the application or to local or national planning policy since the previous application was refused and there is no reason to justify a different view being taken now.

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 prepared by Tom Shiels, Area Team Manager