

6. MAJOR APPLICATION: IMPROVEMENTS AND EXPANSION OF THE EXISTING CAR PARK ASSOCIATED WITH CHATSWORTH HOUSE, TOGETHER WITH THE CREATION OF A NEW ACCESS ROAD VIA A SPUR OFF THE EXISTING A619/A621 ROUNDABOUT EAST OF BASLOW (NP/DDD/1018/0911, ALN)

APPLICANT: MR STEVE PORTER – CHATSWORTH HOUSE TRUST

Summary

1. The application seeks to reconfigure and extend the main visitor car park at Chatsworth and create a new arm and link road to the roundabout to the north of the Estate. In the planning balance, subject to conditions, including that there be no public parking below the Bastion Wall over and above the 3 major 'events,' the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the harm, such that this major development is recommended for approval.

Site and Surroundings

2. Chatsworth House is a stately home situated on the eastern edge of the National Park, approximately 4km north east of Bakewell. It is a grade I listed building and the 765 hectare park and garden in which it sits is included on the Historic England register of parks and gardens at grade I. The Estate is a major tourist destination within the National Park, attracting around 640,000 paying visitors each year.
3. The main access to Chatsworth House is via Paines Bridge on an unclassified road that links to the B6012 to the south east. Access can also be gained via the Golden Gates from the A619 to the north.
4. The application site edged red encompasses two locations: an area that includes the existing main visitor car park to the north of Chatsworth house; and an area on the south side of the 'Golden Gate' roundabout on the northern boundary of the parkland. The two sites are linked by an existing private parkland drive known as the 'North Drive'
5. There are a number of other listed buildings in close proximity to the car park. These include the Stables (grade I), North Lodges (grade I), game larder (grade II), James Paine's three arched bridge (grade I), and the terrace walls to the west of the house (known as the Bastion Walls)(Grade II). To the south of the roundabout are the Golden Gates and Lodges (Grade II).
6. The existing car park has developed and expanded incrementally over a number of years and currently can accommodate approximately 675 vehicles.

Proposal

7. This is a major planning application which seeks planning permission for two areas of development as follows:
8. To reconfigure and extend the main visitor car park to increase capacity by 30% from approximately 675 spaces to 895 spaces (plus 13 coach bays). The main elements of the scheme are as follows:
9. Re-configuration and resurfacing of the existing car park area to provide more formalised parking bays (including 40 disabled spaces).
10. Expansion of the car park to the north, west and east of the existing footprint to increase capacity.

11. Creation of a more level surface by 'cutting' material from the southern area and 'filling' within the northern area.
12. Creation/retention of a green 'picnic area' around the veteran trees in the centre of the site.
13. Relocation of ticket kiosks to the entrance to the northern zone of the car park, with a one-way system into and out of the car park.
14. Bollards, kiosks and temporary fences removed from the North Lodge car park and area of hardstanding reduced.
15. Removal of row of car parking spaces directly in front of the principle (west) elevation of the Stables.
16. Relocation of coach parking bays to the northern edge of the car park.
17. Creation of dedicated footpath links from the car park to the house/stables.
18. Widening of the access road to the west of the car park.
19. Dedicated bus stop and 15 secure cycle racks.

20. The create a fourth arm to the southern side of the roundabout to the east of Baslow. The main elements of the scheme are as follows:
 21. New arm of the south side of the roundabout including realignment of the existing arms.
 22. New access road from the roundabout through the woodland to the south and across an area of parkland to link with the existing access track to the south of the Golden Gates.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- 1. 3 years implementation period**
- 2. Adopt amended plans**
- 3. Once the new park is first brought into use, no public overflow parking shall take place between the Bastion Wall and the River Derwent (in the area marked green on the attached plan) over and above the operational days of the three major events – RHS flower show (5 days per year), Country Fair (3 days per year) and Horse Trials (3 days per year)**
- 4. The proposed access off A619 shall not be taken into use until the modifications to the roundabout have been fully completed, generally in accordance with the application drawing, but fully in accordance with a detailed scheme first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Authority.**
- 5. The proposed turning area demonstrated on the application drawings for the northern access road shall remain available for use at all times.**
- 6. In association with Condition 4 an 'Access and Signage Strategy' shall be submitted prior to the new access being taken into use, detailing the proposed operation of the new access and restrictions to the existing 'Golden Gates' access for approval. Once approved the proposed access shall be operated in accordance with the proposed Strategy unless otherwise agreed in writing.**
- 7. Recommendations at section 6 of submitted Arboricultural Assessment by the 'Tree and Woodland Company' and advice in the Arboricultural Advice note (July 2019) by Anderson Tree Care to be fully adhered to.**

- 8 **Hard and soft landscaping scheme (including details of all surfacing and new railings to top of earthwork feature) to be submitted agreed and thereafter implemented.**
- 9 **Management plan for the ongoing management of Heath Lea Wood to be submitted and agreed and thereafter implemented.**
- 10 **Proposed works to create an improved environment for the ancient trees in the centre of site to be completed before the extended part of the new car park is first brought into use.**
- 11 **Lighting scheme to be submitted and agreed.**
- 12 **Removal of car parking in front of the stable block and works and improvements to the northern forecourt to be carried out in full accordance with the approved plans before the extended part of the new car park is first brought into use.**
- 13 **Surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and agreed.**
- 14 **Archaeological scheme of works to be submitted, agreed and implemented for works to create the new access road and the car park.**
- 15 **Travel Plan to be submitted and agree and thereafter implemented.**
- 16 **Recommendation at section 4 of the submitted bat survey by Peak Ecology to be fully adhered to. Location of proposed bat boxes to be submitted and agreed.**
- 17 **Recommendations in section 4 of the submitted badger survey by Peak ecology to be fully adhered to including that works to the western access road shall be carried out between 1 July to 31st November.**
- 18 **Full details of signage to be submitted and agreed including number, location, design and finish. Thereafter scheme to be implemented.**
- 19 **Full details of all service routes including ducting, power and water supply to be submitted and agreed.**
- 20 **Details of any CCTV installations to be submitted and agreed.**

Key Issues

- Need for the proposed development.
- Impact on the setting of heritage assets and landscape character
- Ecological impacts
- Impact on arboricultural interest
- Archaeological impacts
- Flood Risk and Drainage issues
- Traffic impacts
- Overflow parking and broader sustainability principles.

History

There is a detailed and extensive planning history for development on the Estate but in relation to the specific application site:

October 2017 – pre-application enquiry submitted with regard to the current proposals.

April 2018 – (Enq ref 32709) formal EIA screening request submitted for the current proposals. The Authority came to the view that the development does not constitute EIA development

Consultations

23. **Highway Authority** – *‘Whilst the introduction of the additional arm to the roundabout is generally supported in principle the Highway Authority would prefer to see the use of this arm become a more regular access to the premises. Without an expectation of emerging vehicles, drivers on the roundabout could potentially start to ignore the arm, on the assumption that it is never used. Use of the existing Golden Gate access could be downgraded and limited to pedestrians/cyclists only with all vehicles using the new access, It is noted that following discussion with the Highway Authority a turning area has been demonstrated in front of the new gates the remove the need to vehicles to reverse onto the roundabout – whilst demarked as ‘extant of highway works’ this area would remain private. The proposals include the provision of a significantly increased number of parking spaces which would not suggest a sustainable development. Whilst there may be planning policy issues in relation to the provision of more parking with no associated development, it is assumed that with the inefficient use of unmarked parking area, that some of this parking already occurs, albeit in a more ad-hoc overspill arrangement.’* Recommends conditions that the access is not brought into use until after the modifications to the roundabout have been implemented; the turning area to remain available at all times; Access Strategy to be submitted and agreed and the new parking areas to remain ancillary to and in association with Chatsworth House.

24. **District Council** – no response

25. **Baslow Parish Council** – *‘The Parish Council support the application as long as it removes traffic from Baslow and to enable this, the new access should remain open all the time and not just during events. No traffic from Bakewell or Manchester direction should be re-routed through Baslow but continue to use the existing main entrance. Is the roundabout layout the best for traffic flow or should the exits be more evenly spaced?’*

26. **Historic England** - *‘The new submission includes a revised design and access statement and a transport strategy. We welcome an holistic approach to the management of vehicles across the Estate but remain concerned that the sustainable limits of visitor parking and events in the Park have not been tackled more robustly. Whilst it evidently desirable that the public enjoy this exceptional place, its ability to absorb this much interest without being itself consumed is necessarily finite. The overall carrying capacity of the estate and the attritional effect of parking upon the significance of the Grade I Park and associated listed buildings remains of concern. In addition to the intrusion of parking in key views and upon the appreciation of the House in its designed setting we are particularly concerned at the impact of parking on earthwork and buried archaeological remains which contribute to the significance of the Grade I registered park and other assets.*

27. *As set out in the submitted additional information the scheme now offers a clear reduction in non-event days on which parking will occur on the grass below the Bastion Wall (i.e. in the principal view of the House). What is now offered is a limit of ten days per a year in addition to those days upon which 'events' occur. This limit is a benefit to the conservation and experience of the House in its parkland setting and can be set alongside the reduction in parking impact upon the Grade I Listed former stables by virtue of the parking being set back from the existing line and the benefits offered to veteran trees. These heritage benefits should however be weighed against the impacts of the new parking and access works themselves, including the archaeological impacts of the new roadway at the northern end of the Park.*
28. *Were that your authority were minded to grant consent for the scheme as now proposed it should secure the benefits offered by the use of robust conditions to planning consent addressing the following issues:-*
- A) That the applicant be restricted to X number of days per a calendar year in which vehicles may be parked or events held on the ground below the Bastion Wall so as to give certainty as to the overall impact upon the significance of the Grade I Listed House and Registered Park permitted. (where X is calculated by the Local Planning Authority from the data submitted in the applicant's Design and Access Statement.)*
- B) That the applicant shall not permit vehicles to be parked in Chatsworth Park in conditions or in a manner likely to result in damage to archaeological earthworks or buried remains, so that the significance of the Grade I Park and the setting of the Listed Buildings may be preserved.*
29. *With regard to the sufficient assessment of the likely impact of construction works upon archaeological remains and the mitigation of archaeological impacts more broadly we refer you to the advice of the National Park Senior Conservation Archaeologist.'*
30. **Gardens Trust** – *'It is clear from the documents submitted with this application that the current parking arrangements are insufficient and unsatisfactory, leading to the unwelcome build up of traffic, congestion in Baslow, possible damage to the Grade I Three Arch Bridge, as well as occasional overflow parking to the west of the house. The GT welcomes the careful consideration given to overcoming these problems. We feel that the new entrance off the A619, the removal of pay kiosks from the north front, the resulting improvements in traffic flow and the increase of pay kiosks at the northern end of the car park extension will outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to the setting and significance of the Grade I RPG.'*
31. **Environment Agency** – no comments to make.
32. **Lead Local Flood Authority** – *'After review of the submitted FRA the LLFA would require some clarification on the proposed Car Park aspect of the development. In terms of the proposed run-off rate the applicant has indicated that a 30% betterment on the existing situation will be provided. The LLFA would expect a discharge rate close as reasonably practical to the greenfield run – off rate, this would be in line with S3 of DEFRA's Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems. Currently this appears not to be the case. The applicant is proposing to discharge surface water to 2 existing culverts, however it is unclear if there is sufficient capacity to accept additional flows and what the current condition of the culverts are. It is noted that attenuation storage shall be provided by geo-cellular storage, however it appears the applicant has not fully considered a range of SuDs features. The LLFA would expect full consideration for a whole range of SuDs features.'*

33. Natural England – no objections

34. **Authority’s Ecologist** – (in summary) following completion of activity surveys during the course of the application, no objections with regard to potential impacts on bats. Any lighting scheme will need to be designed to be minimal and low level to ensure minimal impact on bat foraging use across the site, dark space and tree habitats. Still raises concerns with regard to the impacts of works to the car park on veteran trees, and that the proposed enhancements to the veteran trees resource would not outweigh the removal of trees, and severance of woodland. No objections with regard to impact on fungi. With regard to badgers, requires clarity on the location of the road widening to ensure that works are not within a 30m buffer zone of an identified sett. Following receipt of further information, is satisfied that the proposals would be unlikely to affect great crested newt. The new access road off the roundabout will result in severance of semi-natural broadleaved woodland. Notes that the surrounding woodland plantation will receive additional management to improve its structure and diversity through selective thinning and understorey planting. Requests that this be secured by means of a condition.

35. **Authority’s Archaeologist** – (in summary) the groundworks required to create the car park and the access road will result in direct and irreversible harm to features of archaeological interest, where they survive, and cause harm to the archaeological interest of the site as a whole. Taking into account the nature and significance of these features is confident that should this aspect of the development be deemed to be acceptable, the impacts can be appropriately mitigated by a conditioned scheme of archaeological work. Has concerns with regard to the long term sustainability of the proposed parking strategy because of the cumulative impact of parking within the parkland in areas with extant archaeological earthworks. Parking over earthworks, particularly when the ground is wet/saturated, could result in harm to the earthwork remains. Concerns about the level of public benefit the development would achieve without the removal of car parking below the Bastion Wall. If areas of archaeological earthworks are used to ease pressure on the use of the Bastion Wall, then the harm will be displaced elsewhere rather than removed. If the application is deemed to be acceptable, recommends conditions for:

- Restricting the number of days that events can be held or cars can be parked below the Bastion Walls.
- Ensuring that there is no parking in the parkland within areas of archaeological works.
- An archaeological scheme of work for the new access road and car park.

36. **Authority’s Landscape Architect** – no landscape visual objections to the proposed alterations to the car park. Welcomes the arboriculture report it is *‘very clear and gives good recommendations for tree protection and management of existing and proposed trees.’* Raises some detailed queries with regard to some detailed elements of the car park design.

37. **Authority’s Conservation Officer** - A full car parking strategy which removes overflow car parking in front of the Bastion Wall, as requested by the Authority and Historic England at the pre-application stage, has not been provided. Car parking in this location has a negative impact on the setting of the Grade I listed Chatsworth House, Grade II listed Bastion Wall and other associated designated heritage assets, causing less than substantial harm to their significance. Parking on the grass in front of the Bastion Wall also risks long-term harm to the fabric of the Grade I Registered Park and Garden in this exceptionally sensitive location. As noted by Historic England, without a full car parking strategy which addresses, and resolves this issue, I would not support approval of the proposed improvements and expansion of the car parking.

38. **Authority's Tree Conservation Officer** – no objections. The 'betterment works' provide exceptional reasons, which is to improve the root environment of the existing veteran trees and would not result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats.

Representations

39. 3 letters of objection from Friends of the Peak District/CPRE have been received over the course of the application. In summary the letter raise objections to the proposed car park extension, to any parking below the Bastion Wall and to the proposed new access road. They support the improvement to the existing car park. Points raised include:
- Measures to encourage sustainable travel are insufficient. The submitted Travel Plan continues to meet demand for car parking – instead Chatsworth should use current parking capacity as a demand management tool to reduce car dependant trips and increase incentives to use bus, car share and cycle.
 - Since the application was submitted climate change has development to an existential threat and emergency – it is imperative that traffic reduction should be implemented urgently and Chatsworth should play its part.
 - New access track would lead to loss of boundary mixed woodland, 6 trees and a strip of medieval and post medieval field system and tracking, the impact of which is considered permanent and irreversible by the PDNPA.
 - With the North Drive in place traffic impacts would occur regularly on two routes. This would spread the cumulative impacts of moving traffic across a wider area detracting from the landscape, visual enjoyment and cultural heritage. The benefits have not been adequately demonstrated.
 - Concerns about impacts of overflow parking.
40. Seven individuals have written in to object (one individual wrote three letters). The letters raise the following points (in summary):
- Application narrowly focuses on, without question, on meeting and increasing demand for car-based visitor travel. Instead the proposals should manage demand. Increasing supply will worsen problems in years to come.
 - Climate change and localised pollution impacts are ignored.
 - The applicant wishes event parking to set aside as a separate issue but it is not.
 - Use of the north drive as a main access would ruin the peaceful aspect of the parkland, it is currently only used for events.
 - If the north access is used regularly by vehicles, it would not be useable by families with small children, wheelchair users etc.
 - The applicant needs to look at the bigger picture – proposals offer short term solution by increasing car park capacity. The problem will then need to re-visited again before long.
 - Chatsworth should look at off-site parking and ride and real incentives to use public transport.
 - Application does not uphold Chatsworth's so called 'green credentials'.
 - New spur to roundabout will create gridlock in Baslow as those leaving the Estate will have priority over those leaving Baslow.
 - No account taken of existing car parks at Calton Lees, the garden centre and the farmshop. A shuttle bus operates from Calton Lees over the Xmas period but this is not mentioned. Use of Calton Lees could ease pressure on areas near the house.
 - No analysis of the impact of additional traffic when approaching the Estate from the A6 through Rowsley.
 - Applicant makes much of the benefit of moving car parking way from the stables but then the whole area in front of the stables is used for a market over the Xmas period.

- Applicant has provided much detail with regard to its carbon footprint in recent applications for solar panels but fails to do so on this major application.
41. One letter of support has been received from ‘Marketing Peak District and Derbyshire’ on the grounds that the proposals would improve accessibility to the Estate by private and public transport; would encourage visitors to stay longer and increased their spending; and the road would improve traffic flows, reduce congestion and benefit the wider economy.

Main Policies

42. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3, RT1, CC1, T1, T2, T3, T7
43. Relevant Local Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC9, DMC11, DMC12, DMC13, DMT3, DMT2, DMT7
44. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for national parks in England and Wales: Which are; to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public. When national parks carry out these purposes they also have the duty to; seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Parks.

National Planning Policy Framework

45. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been revised (2019). This replaces the previous document (2012) with immediate effect. The Government’s intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date.
46. Para 172 of the NPPF states the 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. The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. 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.
47. National policies with regard to promoting sustainable transport are set out in chapter 9 of the NPPF. Para 102 states that transport issues should be considered at an early stage so that: the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed; opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised ; opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued; the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.

48. Para 108 states that in assessing applications for development, appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location; safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.
49. Para 109 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
50. With regard to the historic environment para 193 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Para 195 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.

Development Plan

51. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies (DMP), adopted May 2019. These Development Plan Policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. In this case, it is considered there are no significant conflicts between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and government guidance in the NPPF.

Core Strategy

52. Policy GSP1 E states that in securing national park purposes major development should not take place within the Peak District National Park other than in exceptional circumstances. Major development will only be permitted following rigorous consideration of the criteria in national policy. GSP2 states that opportunities should be taken to enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park. This is expanded in policy L1 which relates directly to enhancement of landscape character, L2 to sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance and policy L3 relating to the conservation and enhancement of features of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance.
53. Core Strategy policy T1 seeks to encourage sustainable transport and reduce the need to travel through giving priority to conservation and enhancement; encouraging modal shift to sustainable transport and minimizing traffic impacts within environmentally sensitive locations.
54. Core Strategy policy T2 C states that no new road schemes will be permitted unless they provide access to new businesses or housing development or there are exceptional circumstances. Those road schemes (including improvements) that fall outside of the Planning Authority's direct jurisdiction will be strongly resisted except in exceptional circumstances.

55. T3 seeks to achieve high quality design in transport infrastructure. T7 states that non-residential parking will be restricted in order to discourage car use and will be managed to ensure that the location and nature of car and coach parking does not exceed environmental capacity. New non-operational parking will normally be matched by a reduction of related parking spaces elsewhere and wherever possible it will be made available for public use.
56. 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.
57. Policy RT1 states that the National Park Authority will support facilities which enable recreation, environmental education and interpretation, which encourage understanding and enjoyment of the National Park, and are appropriate to the National Park's valued characteristics. Opportunities for access by sustainable means will be encouraged. New provision must justify its location in relation to environmental capacity, scale and intensity of use or activity, and be informed by the Landscape Strategy. Where appropriate, development should be focused in or on the edge of settlements. In the open countryside, clear demonstration of need for such a location will be necessary.

Development Management Policies

58. Policy DMC3 expects a high standard of design that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape.
59. Development Management policy DMC5 states that applications affecting a heritage asset should clearly demonstrate its significance including how any identified features will be preserved and where possible enhanced and why the proposed works are desirable or necessary. Development of a heritage asset will not be permitted if it would result in harm to, or loss of significance character and appearance unless the harm would be outweighed by public benefit. DMC8 states that planning applications involving a Registered Park and Garden and/or its setting will be determined in accordance with policy DMC5.
60. DMC7 aims to ensure that development preserves the character and significance of listed buildings.
61. DMC11 seeks to achieve net gains to biodiversity or geodiversity as a result of development. DMC12 aims to safeguard sites, features or species of biodiversity interest.
62. DMC13 states, amongst other things that trees and hedgerows, including ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees, which positively contribute, either as individual specimens or as part of a wider group, to the visual amenity or biodiversity of the location will be protected. Other than in exceptional circumstances development involving loss of these features will not be permitted.

63. DMT3 states, amongst other things that where new transport related infrastructure is developed, it should be to the highest standards of environmental design and materials and in keeping with the valued characteristics of the National Park. Development, which includes a new or improved access onto a public highway, will only be permitted where, having regard to the standard, function, nature and use of the road, a safe access that is achievable for all people, can be provided in a way which does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality and where possible enhances it.
64. DMT7 states that new or enlarged visitor car parks will not be permitted unless a clear, demonstrable need, delivering local benefit, can be shown. Where new or additional off-street visitor parking is permitted, an equivalent removal of on-street parking will usually be required. In considering proposals for new or enlarged car parks in the Natural Zone and in Conservation Areas, the developer is expected to have assessed alternative sites located in a less environmentally sensitive location, capable of being linked to the original visitor destination either by a Park & Ride system or right of way.
65. DMT2 seeks to achieve any local road improvements in a way that does not cause harm to the landscape. Schemes with the sole purpose of increasing capacity of the network will not be permitted.

Assessment

Whether the proposals represent major development

66. In terms of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 the current proposals represent 'major development' as the application site edged red extends to more than 1 hectare (in fact it extends to 5.6 hectares). In planning policy – both national and local – the term major development is also referenced. Specifically paragraph 172 of the NPPF and Core Strategy policy GSP1 seek to resist 'major development' in National Parks in all but exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that they are in the public interest.
67. Para 131 of the Authority's Development Management policy document provides clarity on the issue. It points out that 'Footnote 55 of the NPPF (2019) states, *'whether a proposal is 'major development' is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated or defined.'* In making this assessment close regard should therefore be had to the impact of a scheme on the special qualities of the National Park utilising the Landscape Strategy and other tools advocated by this document.'
68. In this case the application site is located within the Chatsworth Parkland which is a highly sensitive landscape in that it is a grade I Registered Park and Garden and there are numerous listed buildings and undesignated heritage assets within the vicinity of the site. In addition, Chatsworth is an extremely popular tourist destination, with the park and gardens holding a central place in the history of English landscape design. Taking into account this sensitive setting and the significant operational development that is proposed, the view is taken that the proposals do indeed constitute major development within the National Park. Planning permission should therefore only be granted if it is considered that exceptional circumstances exist and that the proposals would be in the public interest. The public interest benefits that would arise are discussed further in the relevant section of the report below.

Whether the principle of the proposed development is acceptable.

69. With regard to the proposed car park extensions, Core Strategy policy T7 and Development Management policies DMT7 together make it clear that new or enlarged visitor car parks will not be permitted unless a clear, demonstrable need, delivering local benefit, can be shown. Furthermore policies T2 and DMT2 seek to resist new local road schemes unless there are exceptional circumstances and provided they do not cause harm to the landscape.
70. Furthermore consideration with regard to the impact of the proposals on the significance of the identified cultural heritage assets; on archaeology; and on ecology interests including trees are crucial to the determination of this application.
71. The acceptability of the principle of the development in this instance therefore rests upon a balanced view being taken as to whether or not any harmful impacts from the introduction of a major form of development would be outweighed by public benefits. This analysis will take into account the 3 criteria that para 172 of the NPPF refer to with regard to assessing major development in National Parks i.e.
- The need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitted it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
 - The cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
 - Any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities and the extent to which that could be moderated.
72. The report will look at need, then the physical impacts of the development and finally the broader issues of overflow parking and sustainable development and will seek to provide a 'planning balance' between them.

Issue 1: Need for the proposed development

73. Car park re-configuration/extension

74. The application is accompanied by a Design, Planning and Access Statement, a Transport Assessment and a Transport Statement. These documents explain that the main car park at Chatsworth House is used to park general visitors to the property, numbering on average 24,700 to 26,000 cars per month during the open season between April and December. When the House and Gardens are closed numbers per month average between 6000 and 6,500. In addition the car park is used by staff, volunteers and contractors, together with coaches.
75. The information provided demonstrates that the main car park (675 spaces) is frequently unable to meet regular demand for parking spaces leading to overflow car parking on grassed areas within the parkland. The locations used vary depending on weather and ground conditions but the most frequently used are the 'Helipad' (south east of the house) and 'below the Bastion Wall' (in front of the principal elevation of the house). These provide 250 and 350 extra spaces respectively. In 2017 there were also 32 days (excluding the 3 major 'events') upon which parking demand exceeded the 1275 parking spaces provided by all these areas and on those days further overflow parking takes place on areas of parkland the north of the house.
76. In addition to what the Estate describes as these 'general operational days' (which include the Christmas period) Chatsworth also runs three large scale events, which attract very high demand for parking. It is stated that each event has an individual plan for parking associated with it. The events include The Horse Trials (3 days in May), the

RHS Flower show (5 days in June) and the Country Fair (3 days in September). The Horse Trials attract approximately 8000 vehicles, the RHS 23,000 vehicles and the Country Fair 16,000 vehicles.

77. It is stated that Chatsworth has undertaken an exercise to consider various options, including moving parking further away from the House to a new location. The Estate considers that whilst the benefits to heritage assets would be clear, a completely new car park with capacity to hold 700 cars would need to be created with service links to the House and the potential impacts on the parkland and potentially on local villages would be significant. It is stated that a Park and Ride scheme at Barbrook (on the north side of the site of the old walled garden at Home Farm just south of Baslow) was considered but this was discounted for a number of reasons including the planning policy issues of constructing a large new car park, the prominence and harm of a car park in this location, build and operational costs and lack of enthusiasm by visitors to use Park and Ride (as evidenced by visitor comments when a shuttle bus was operated during the Christmas markets).
78. Consequently the Estate has decided to focus on improving/expanding the existing car park and the application seeks to create an extra 220 parking spaces to meet demand, by a combination of the reconfiguration of the existing car park and by extension into the adjacent parkland. It states that there are a number of issues relating to the existing parking arrangements as follows:
- There are no defined parking bays leading to inefficient use of the space and sometimes resulting in parking on grass.
 - Parking surfaces are poor and badly eroded due to lack of effective drainage systems.
 - The sloping ground and loose surfacing compromises safe access and leads to negative customer feedback.
 - The car park arrangements impact on the health of veteran trees as well as the setting of the House.
 - There is no formal traffic flow and limited signage creates conflict between vehicles entering and exiting as well as conflict between vehicles and pedestrians.
 - Public bus stop facilities are basic and there are poor pedestrian links to the visitor entrances.
79. Our view is that the issues with the layout, surfacing and traffic flow with regard to the existing car park are recognised and in principle (subject to consideration of impact on heritage assets, ecology, archaeology etc.) the rationalisation and improvement of this area is welcomed. However, the expansion of the car park is less clearly supported by policy. With regard to potential alternative schemes/sites, there have been no detailed pre-application discussions with regard to these and so it is difficult to come to a view on their acceptability. It is consequently difficult to conclude that the scheme genuinely results in the highest possible standards of carbon reductions as required by policy CC1. If the current scheme were deemed to be unacceptable in the planning balance then Chatsworth could be asked to investigate alternative proposals but the applicant has made it clear that they do not consider alternatives to be feasible and consequently the current application must be considered on its own merits.
80. New access road link
81. The Design and Access Statement states that the proposals for the new north access have been brought about by a number of issues. As there is a weight limit on Paines Bridge, (on the main access to the south of the house), delivery vehicles and heavy traffic particularly during events are directed through the Golden Gates on the northern boundary of the parkland. The gates (Grade II listed) have recently been refurbished and there have been issues with damage to the gates by delivery vehicles/HGVs etc. The

existing junction between the driveway and the A619 east of Baslow has limited visibility to the west which raises safety issues. When this drive is used at times of high traffic demand, temporary traffic lights have to be deployed on the A619, leading to tailbacks into Baslow village. It is stated that the new arm off the roundabout will negate the need for traffic lights and will enable traffic to flow more freely on entering/exiting Chatsworth. The new access road, which by-passes the Golden Gates will reduce any potential direct impact on their significance.

82. Whilst new road schemes are usually resisted, in this case, only the new arm onto an existing roundabout (within the highway verge) would become part of the public highway. Beyond the highway boundary to the south the new road would be a private access road only and consequently, subject to an assessment of the impacts on traffic flows within the local area and physical impacts such as impacts on landscape character, heritage assets, ecology and archaeology it is considered in principle that the proposals can be compliant with T2 and DMT2.

Issue 2: Impact on the setting of heritage assets and landscape character

83. Car park re-configuration/extension

84. There would no impact upon the fabric of any of the heritage assets at Chatsworth as the proposals relate only to groundworks and operational development in and around the car park. However, there is clearly potential for the proposals' to impact upon the setting of the various assets including grade I listed buildings which are of exceptional national importance.
85. There would be some heritage benefits to the scheme. At present there is a row of parking spaces placed directly to the west of the grade I listed stable block. When looking along the formal approach to the stables from the west, the parked vehicles intrude into the view of the northern corner of the building, causing harm to its setting. The submitted plans show that this row of parking spaces would be removed and the area returned to grass. Because of the levelling works that would be carried out within the car park a 'ha ha' embankment feature would be created to define the edge of the car park at this point. Subject to agreement of any fencing to be erected on top of the embankment it is considered that the feature would be a natural looking feature that would also help to screen the cars to the north.
86. At present there is a clutter of pay kiosks, temporary fencing and general activity of vehicles manoeuvring directly in front (to the north of) the grade I listed North Lodges and the grade I listed House. By moving the pay kiosks to the north side of the car park this will reduce the clutter and the movement of vehicles in this area and parts of the currently wide expanse of hardstanding would be returned to grass in a style more reflective of the historic layout.
87. Removing coach parking from along the access road to the south of the car park would also enhance the setting of the House, Stables and Game Larder.
88. There is potential impact by virtue of the proposed 'levelling' works which seek to create a more level surface by 'cutting' material from the southern half of the existing car park and using that material to 'fill' in the newly extended northern area. The existing car park is situated on land that slopes quite steeply upwards from west to east as well as upwards from north to south. This respects the surrounding topography in that Chatsworth is set into the valley side to the north of the river Derwent and has itself been constructed on a raised platform. An overly engineered, level surface would appear at odds with these natural surroundings. Sections have been provided during the course of the application which demonstrate that there would still be an 11m fall across the 170 width of the car

park from east to west and 15m fall across the 250m length from south to north. Consequently whilst the overall surface would be more even, the car park as regraded would still on the whole be sympathetic with the prevailing levels in the area.

89. The existing surface to the car park is a poor and un-bound light coloured gravel material that causes harm to the setting of the listed building. It is proposed to use a bitumen surface with a decorative gravel top dressing in a manner used elsewhere on the Estate. Subject to agreeing a sample the proposed this would be an enhancement.
90. In terms of wider landscape impact the loss of a total of 62 trees including 16 mature oak trees in addition to the engineering and surfacing works that will take place means that in the short to medium term the car park is likely to be more prominent and therefore more harmful in views across the parkland from the south and the west until the additional replacement tree planting proposed (101 trees in total) is mature enough to provide an effective screen.
91. The main area where harm would be caused would be by the loss of approx. 0.24 ha of the grade I registered parkland to car parking, mainly to the north and east of the existing car park. To the east the area in question is part of a grassed embankment that separates the car park from the 'Farmyard' area and to the north it is an area of parkland grass and mature trees. A significant number of mature trees (16 in total) would be felled (the impact of this is assessed later in the report) and the areas in question would be levelled and hard surfaced. Officers concur with the submitted Landscape Impact Assessment that the proposals would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the grade I Registered Park and Garden. The NPPF makes it clear that great weight should be given to conserving heritage assets and that any harm should require clear and convincing justification.

New Road Link

92. There would no physical impact on the fabric of any listed buildings. However the proposals have the potential to impact upon the historic parkland and the setting of the Grade II listed Golden Gates Lodges. At the north entrance to the estate a belt of woodland trees known as Heath Lea Wood defines the northern boundary of the designed landscape and provides an effective screen from the public highway. The loss of a 22m wide strip of this woodland, to create the new access road would cause some harm (although the plantation would still be an effective boundary). In addition there would some loss of parkland grassland and individual trees which would represent a permanent change to the surface along the line of the new driveway and the fact that there would be two exit/entry drives at this location rather than one as historically designed. This would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the grade I Registered Park and Garden and to the setting of the grade II Lodges by the addition of a second driveway close to it.

Issue 3: Ecological Impacts

93. An ecological appraisal and fungi survey were submitted with the application and during the course of the application a badger survey and bat surveys have been submitted.
94. The submitted surveys identified two trees with bat roosting potential which were to be felled as part of the proposed development. As a result the Authority requested that activity/emergence surveys were undertaken. These have now been completed and the Authority's ecologist is satisfied that there would be no adverse impacts on bats subject to the recommendations of the reports being adhered to and any lighting scheme to be agreed in order to ensure minimal impact on bat foraging use across the site, dark space and tree habitats.

95. There are no objections with regard to impact on fungi or great crested newt. A badger survey was submitted during the course of the application and we are satisfied that the proposals would not adversely affect local badger populations.
96. The new access road off the roundabout will result in severance of semi - natural broadleaved woodland. The Authority's ecologist notes that the surrounding woodland plantation will receive additional management to improve its structure and diversity through selective thinning and understorey planting as mitigation and requests that this is secured by means of a condition.
97. Subject to conditions it is considered that the proposals would not adversely affect the ecological interests listed above in accordance with Core Strategy policy L2.

Issue 4: Arboricultural Considerations

98. Paragraph 175 of the NPPF states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists
99. An arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. This explains that there are large number of trees within the application site, with a total of 88 trees and 9 groups of trees in the visitor car park and 21 trees, 5 groups of trees and one area of woodland within the site for the new access routes. A high number of these are categorised as high and moderate quality and represent a significant asset to the landscape.
100. The proposals would have a significant impact on trees. A total of 35 trees would be felled at the visitor car park, consisting of 20 Category B trees (mature trees of moderate quality) and 15 Category C trees (trees of low quality). At the north access a corridor of woodland 22m wide (0.14ha in area) would be removed together with 11 individual trees (4 category B and 7 category C).
101. The Arboricultural Assessment concludes that the loss of trees (in particular the 16 Category B oaks at the car park would have a detrimental impact on the landscape value and associated tree benefits in the immediate vicinity of the site but concludes that the impact would not be significant given that other existing mature tree cover will be retained.
102. As an enhancement measure the scheme proposes to retain, protect and enhance the 21 Category A veteran trees at the car park. Of those trees there is a group of 3 ancient trees within a central grassed picnic area and two veteran oak pollards located within the car park near the picnic area that have been heavily compromised by surfacing and parking within their entire root zone.
103. It is proposed to increase the green buffer zone around these trees by restoring the compacted ground to grassland and where surfacing is to be retained, the existing compacted surface would be removed, the tree roots protected with webbing and the new permeable surface installed.
104. During the course of the application the Authority's ecologist raised concerns with regard to the impacts of parking space within the extended car park on the eastern boundary. Two ancient trees sit on the grass banking above the car park and to date there has been no incursion into their root zones. As submitted the plans showed the introduction of parking space within the root protection zones which would cause harm to the trees

contrary to the NPPF. As a result, and following negotiations, amended plans have now been received showing the parking spaces within these root zones removed and replaced with parking spaces on the road spur up to the farmyard instead.

105. The proposed north-south access road in this area would also have impacted on the root zones and so this has been shifted slightly to the west. Whilst this brings the road closer to veteran trees to the west than previously proposed, the new roadway would still be further away from the trees than exists at present so there would still be an overall enhancement.
106. As amended the Authority's Tree Conservation Officer is satisfied that the proposals would enhance the environment for the veteran trees. Nonetheless the proposals would result in the loss of a significant number of trees overall, which weighs against the proposals in the planning balance.

Issue 5: Archaeological Considerations

107. Both the site of the car park remodelling and extension and the proposed northern access road are sites of archaeological and historic interest and contain extant earthwork features and predicted below ground archaeological remains.
108. The Authority's senior archaeologist concludes that both the proposed northern access and the works to the car park will result in permanent and irreversible harm to archaeological features but that this harm can be appropriately mitigated by a scheme of archaeological survey and monitoring secured by condition.
109. She does express concerns however about the cumulative impact of overflow parking in the parkland, on archaeological features and this is discussed later in the report.

Issue 6: Flood Risk and Drainage Issues

110. A flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application. This confirms that both sites are within flood risk zone 1 (low risk of flooding) and therefore the Sequential Test is deemed to have been addressed and the Exception Test need not be applied.
111. The report states that disposal of surface water from the refurbished car park via infiltration (the preferred option within the Planning Policy Guidance) is not practicable due to underlying ground conditions and also the steeply sloping nature of the site. Surface water attenuation storage will be provided via below ground geo-cellular crates, which will include petrol, oil and grit separators in the interest of pollution control. At present there is no interception of surface water run-off and so the proposals would represent a betterment on the existing situation with regard to the potential for pollution of the water environment.
112. A number of comments were made by the Local Lead Flood Authority on the proposals and the engineers who compiled the flood risk assessment have responded. We are satisfied that subject to a condition to submit and agree full details of the drainage scheme, the proposals accord with Development Management policy DMC14 in respect of pollution and disturbance and addresses the requirements of CC1 with regard to flooding.

Issue 7: Traffic Impacts

113. A transport assessment has been submitted with the application which analyses the impacts of the proposed development on the local highway network.

114. The report explains that the main vehicular access to the estate is from the B6012 from where visitors enter and exit the main car park via Paine's Bridge. A secondary vehicular access is provided to the north of the Estate via a junction located 110m to the west of the A619/A621 three-arm roundabout. This lead to the Golden Gates which are open and used by general traffic only during large events.
115. The assessment states that the proposed new arm to the roundabout and the new access road will be used at peak times and during large events (i.e. not every day). The intention is that traffic from the Estate can exit without travelling through the village of Baslow and without the need for temporary traffic lights as at present. Through modelling of existing and predicted traffic growth the report concludes that all four arms of the roundabout would operate within capacity during a future year 2023.
116. Consequently the report concludes that the residual traffic impacts of the proposed development are not considered to be severe within the context of the NPPF and therefore the highway impacts are acceptable.
117. We concur with these findings overall. Some objectors have expressed concerns that vehicles exiting the Estate on the new arm of the roundabout would have priority over those leaving Baslow and therefore congestion could occur within the village. Whilst this point is noted, it is also true that the Estate could open the Golden Gates and allow traffic to use the substandard existing access at any time without any control from the Authority. The new arrangement would negate the requirement for temporary traffic lights and overall the proposals are likely to result in more free flowing traffic through the village than at present during large events.
118. The Highway Authority has expressed a desire to see the new arm open and available for use at all times so that drivers using the roundabout do not start to ignore the new junction if it used infrequently. They have stopped short however of requesting this as a condition. Whilst the Highway Authority's reasons for taking this view are noted as are the views of the Parish Council that year round permanent use would result in less traffic through the village, there are arguments against this scenario. Some local objectors have referred to the tranquil and peaceful character of the northern end of the parkland and its value for pedestrians to walk into and out of the Estate from Baslow. If the new northern access were to become a permanent vehicular access point into the Parkland then the constant movement of traffic along the north drive would be detrimental to the quiet enjoyment of the National Park in this area, contrary to Core Strategy RT1 (which states that development must not on its own, or cumulatively with other development and uses, prejudice or disadvantage peoples' enjoyment of other existing and appropriate recreation, environmental education or interpretation activities, including the informal quiet enjoyment of the National Park).
119. Officers' view is that the use of the new access at the busiest times and during events would be the most appropriate use in order to secure the character of the northern parkland and to ensure that the historic main approach to the house via Paines Bridge is maintained. A condition to submit and agree an Access and Signage Strategy to agree the operation of the new access and any restrictions to access to Golden Gates as suggested by the Highway Authority is considered to be sufficient to overcome the concerns.

Issue 8: Overflow Parking and wider sustainability issues

120. One of the main concerns raised by consultees (including Historic England and the Authority's archaeologist and conservation officer) and by objectors is the wider sustainability credentials of the proposals and in particular the continued proposals to

make use of the wider parkland for overflow car parking, despite the proposed increase in capacity of the car park by 220 spaces.

121. For clarity, the Authority has never come to the view that the events (other than the RHS which is run by an outside organisation) or the use of the parkland for overflow parking constitutes 'development' because it can be considered to be ancillary and incidental to the main use of Chatsworth House as a stately home and major visitor attraction.
122. Core Strategy policy T1 states that conserving and enhancing the National Park's valued characteristics will be the primary criterion in the planning and design of transport and its management but also states that modal shift to sustainable transport will be encouraged. In this case a submitted Travel Framework does outline measures that the Estate takes and will continue to take to reduce car use and promote public transport. These include, amongst other things securing bike racks; continuation of partnership with local bus operators and £2 reduction (to increase to £4) of entry fee to those arriving by bus; better drop off and pick up location for bus passengers; discounts for coach/group visitors; cycle to work scheme for staff; and examination of potential for park and ride from outside of the parkland including Bakewell Show Ground, Peak Village Shopping Centre and Chesterfield Football Ground. Notwithstanding these measures, the Estate proposes that the main mode of transport to the Estate will continue to be by car and their overall approach is to continue to try to meet demand. Objectors feel that the Travel Plan measures do not go far enough and that the Estate should instead use current capacity as a demand management tool.
123. Our view is that the whilst the Estate is making concerted efforts to promote a shift to public transport, the approach taken with the current application, to focus on the expansion the car parking facilities does conflict with the thrust of the Authority's policies with regard to sustainable transport. The proposals are for major development within the National Park and should only be accepted in exceptional circumstances if there are definite and meaningful public benefits that clearly outweigh any harm. One of the main ways in which this can be achieved is by addressing the impacts of overflow parking.
124. As stated above, as well as the main car park, at busy times the Estate uses the 'Helipad' (which can accommodate 250 vehicles) and the area in front of the Bastion Wall (which can accommodate 350 vehicles). Information provided suggests that cars were parked below the Bastion Wall on 53 days (outside of the main 3 events) On 32 days of the year demand outstrips these areas too and further overflow parking takes place in areas to the north of the House. The Design and Access Statement states that the proposed increase in capacity of the existing car park by 220 spaces will lead to a reduction in the need to utilise the grass below the Bastion wall on 'operational days', which is welcomed. However the proposals are still to retain some overflow parking in this area, but to reduce the number of days to 10 in any one calendar year.
125. The impacts of overflow parking has been identified issue at Chatsworth for some time and at the pre-application stage the need to try to address the issue, particularly with regard to parking in the most harmful area below the Bastion Wall was emphasised. As stated by Historic England parking in this area is intrusive and harmful to key views and upon the appreciation of the House in its designed setting and also harmful to earthwork and buried archaeological remains which contribute to the significance of the Grade I registered park and other assets. Indeed the Estate's own Parkland Management Plan (2013) acknowledges that parking in this areas has a *'high visual, landscape and archaeological impact so an alternative solution must be found'*. We therefore consider that continued use of this area for parking, on top of the events that already take place in and have an impacts on the area is not acceptable. Development Management policy DMT7 makes it clear that where visitor parking is permitted, an equivalent removal of on-street parking will usually be required. As this is not feasible in this location, an equivalent

removal of harmful overflow parking in this area is considered to be a reasonable alternative.

126. To be clear, initially the application requested the use of the Bastion Wall for 28 days a year over and above the three main events. This was reduced to 10 days during the course of the application. The RHS show (which was granted planning permission in 2016) is open to the public for three days in June. However the information submitted with that planning application stated that there is a substantial 'setting up and taking down' period so that the total time that there is activity and visual intrusion in front of the House's principle elevation is 45 days in total. The Horse Trials (3 days) and Country Fair (3 days) are mainly located to the west of Paine's Bridge but car parking can take place in front of the Bastion Wall. It is considered that a further 10 days on top of this already substantial figure would be excessive, very difficult to enforce and harmful to the significance of the Registered Park and Garden and Grade I listed House. A condition that limited parking to 10 days would be so difficult to enforce that it would not meet the tests for planning conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Guidance. The benefits of removing parking from this area (other than during the major events) are clear, a condition that requires no public parking in this area over and above the 3 events is considered to be reasonable, enforceable, related to the development and otherwise in accordance with the tests. The Estate has made it clear that it does not agree to such a condition as 10 days is the minimum that they feel is required operationally. However we consider that the condition is necessary in order to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances required for major development, to ensure compliance with policies T7, L3 and DMT7 and to ensure that the public benefits clearly outweigh the harm that has been identified.
127. The Authority's archaeologist and Historic England have also expressed concerns about the impacts of overflow parking on archaeological remains in other areas of the parkland, as well as below the Bastion Wall. These concerns are acknowledged, and this is a wider issue for the Estate to address. However on balance, given that overflow parking can take place without permission at present, it is considered that the proposed restriction of parking below the Bastion Wall only, is the limit to which the Authority can reasonably restrict overflow parking such that the public benefits on the whole outweigh the harm brought about by this particular planning application.

Conclusion

128. In conclusion, there are a number of public benefits associated with this application. They include the removal of parking from the west of the stables; improvement to the layout and appearance of the north forecourt; improvements to the environments of ancient trees; improvements to the visitor experience of those visiting Chatsworth and the surrounding parkland and potential improvements to traffic congestion issues in an around Baslow. On the other hand there are areas where harm has been identified. These include the loss of parts of the grade I park and garden, the loss of 35 trees (including 16 mature oak trees) and an area of woodland and impacts on archaeological features. On balance we consider that the benefits would only outweigh the harm if the wider impacts of overflow parking are partly addressed by removing the most harmful parking from beneath the Bastion Wall in order to ensure that visitors can continue to enjoy the important grade I heritage asset within its designed landscape. We are satisfied that subject to such a condition the proposals would be in the public interest and would meet the tests for major development set out in the NPPF and adopted development plan policies. Consequently the application is recommended for approval.

Human Rights

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

130. List of Background Papers (not previously published)

131. Nil

Report Author: Andrea Needham, Senior Planner