

---

**FULL APPLICATION – CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL BARN TO 3 NO. LETTING ROOMS – BLEAKLOW FARM, BRAMLEY LANE, HASSOP (NP/DDD/0519/0462 TS)**

**APPLICANT: MR P HUNT**

**UPDATE**

1. The application was deferred at the Planning Committee meeting on 12 July 2019 to allow further information to be sought about the following:
  - The full extent of the holiday use proposed on the site.
  - The feasibility of an alternative or improved access being provided.
  - Consideration of the amenity impact of the increased use of the highway;

and also for the proposal to be considered in conjunction with a further application for ancillary domestic use in the stables on the site.

2. Application NP/DDD/0519/0460 to vary condition 1 on approved application NP/DDD/1117/1128 to allow the approved stable block to be used as ancillary accommodation for the main house is now on the agenda for this Planning Committee meeting. Each of the issues for which members requested further consideration and information are addressed in turn below:

The full extent of the holiday use proposed on the site:

3. Concerns were raised about the potential impact of traffic movements if the whole of the site was brought into use as holiday accommodation.
4. The house that is under construction has planning permission to be used as an open market private dwelling, which is C3 use as defined by the use class order. The applicant's agent has confirmed that it is the owner's intention to use the property within the scope of the C3 use class for which it has permission.
5. As such, there is no indication that the main house is intended to be used as holiday accommodation. However, the use of any dwelling for holiday lets can be part of the normal C3 dwelling house use, but it can conversely also amount to a material change of use, depending on the circumstances. When use of a dwelling as holiday accommodation results in a material change of use, the holiday accommodation use would be sui generis under the use class order.
6. To decide whether or not there has been a material change of use from a dwelling to a sui generis holiday let each case must be considered on its own facts. The case of Moore v SSCLG & Suffolk Coastal DC 2012 is often referred to as being important case law on this subject. In that case, the Court of Appeal upheld a Planning Inspector's decision that a holiday let was a material change of use because the character of the use of the holiday let was quite different from the use of a private family dwelling. The Inspector had highlighted the following considerations in coming to this decision:
  - The pattern of arrivals and departures
  - Associated traffic movements
  - The unlikelihood of the holiday let being occupied by family or household groups
  - The number of people in visiting groups
  - The likely frequency of party type activities
  - The potential lack of consideration for neighbours

- 
- The proximity of the property to other dwellings
7. It is important to stress that each case must be considered on its own facts, but the Moore case is a useful guide to the issues that should be considered to help inform a decision on whether a holiday let is being used in a way that is materially different to the normal use of a private family dwelling. Use Class C3 also provides some restriction in the use of the dwelling to persons forming a single household ie, family groups.
  8. The relevance of this to the current application is that the site has approval for use as a private family dwelling. There is no indication that the owner wishes to use the main dwelling for holiday accommodation, but he is of course free to do so, provided the use remains within Class C3, and is not materially different in character to a private family dwelling. If that point was reached, there may be a material change of use and further planning permission would be required. The Authority therefore has control over private family dwellings being used for holiday accommodation where that use is materially different to the authorised C3 use.
  9. The main dwelling is a substantially sized dwelling that has seven bedrooms as approved. It is therefore clearly suitable for occupation by a large family, which would fall within Class C3(a). Application 0519/0460, which is under separate consideration, seeks to add a further four bedrooms taking the total to eleven. These additional four bedrooms would increase the size of the approved house but are not proposed to be letting rooms. That application simply proposes additional bedrooms for the main house.
  10. The key issue in terms of holiday let use is that the main dwelling is approved as a private house. Using the property for holiday accommodation within the terms of Class C3, or in a way that is not materially different from the use of a private dwelling house would not be a material change of use and would not require planning permission. That applies as equally to this property as any other private dwelling. Whilst we have no indication that it is likely to happen, and in fact the applicant's agent has confirmed that it is intended to use the main dwelling under its approved C3 use a dwelling house, if the property was to be used for holiday accommodation in the future in a way that is materially different in character to a private dwelling house (using the tests from the Moore case to help inform consideration) then separate planning permission would be required. The Authority therefore has control over any future use beyond the scope of the established private dwelling house use of the main house.
  11. This application proposes the creation of a small unit of holiday accommodation within an existing outbuilding. The traffic impacts of the development must be assessed on the basis of it being the traffic generated by the approved private dwelling plus the traffic that would be generated by the three letting rooms that are proposed under this application. The cumulative impacts with the development proposed under separate application 0519/0446 are discussed further below.
  12. We cannot refuse the current application because of concerns that the main dwelling might also be used for holiday accommodation. If the main house is used for holiday accommodation in a way that is not materially different from a private dwelling then there would be no material increase in traffic beyond the approved use as a private dwelling. We could not make a case at appeal that the possibility of the owner using the main house for holiday accommodation under the approved C3 use would be harmful. The impacts of using the main dwelling as holiday accommodation under the existing use would be similar to using it as a private family dwelling. If the impacts were materially different then separate planning permission would be required.

13. It also follows that we could not substantiate refusal because of a concern that the site might evolve into a more-intensively used type of holiday accommodation in the future. This is because that is not what is being applied for. If the main house was to be used for a type of holiday accommodation that is materially different in character to a private dwelling then that would require different planning permission. Any concerns that apply to the possibility of the main dwelling be used for something different to the use for which it has permission apply equally to any other private dwelling in the National Park. It is essential that the application is assessed on the basis for which it is being applied for – that is the creation of three letting rooms within the curtilage of a private dwelling house.
14. Overall therefore, it is important to remember that this application proposes a small unit of holiday accommodation within the curtilage of a substantial private dwelling that already has planning permission.

The feasibility of an alternative or improved access being provided.

15. The submitted plans show that the proposed letting rooms would be accessed from the unmade track to the south of the site and via the road that runs through Rowland village. There is an alternative access to the north of the site that connects with Bramley Lane and then heads west onto Moor Road towards Great Longstone. This route is also not maintained to the standard of a public highway open to traffic. Members asked that consideration be given to using this route as an alternative to the access from Rowland. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the site can indeed be accessed from either of these routes. Both routes already have access points to the Bleaklow Farm site and both have historically been used to access it. It is understood that construction traffic has been using the Moor Road access during the construction of the new dwelling. The applicant's agent has stated that once the site is brought into use that the applicant is willing to direct any visitors to the site to use the Moor Road access. The Moor Road access is therefore available to use for both the main house and the proposed letting rooms. The use of the Moor Road access would seem to alleviate the concerns that residents of Rowland have about the traffic impacts.
16. It must be remembered though that the road through Rowland is adopted public highway all the way through the village and the public highway continues along Bramley Lane to Hassop Road. Only the unsurfaced section of the access track from Bramley Lane to Bleaklow Farm is a private road. As such, whilst two access routes are available and the applicant can direct visitors towards the Moor Road route, it would not be possible to apply a planning condition to stop residents and visitors from using the Rowland access and they would be entitled to do so should they make that choice. As such, there are two access routes available but it is not possible to dictate through the planning application which one should be used. The option to use Moor Road is available though and that further weakens any argument that traffic levels through Rowland would be unacceptable, as is discussed further below.

Traffic and amenity impacts and the cumulative impacts

17. Concerns were raised about the cumulative traffic impacts with the separate application for creation of additional accommodation for the main dwelling within the approved stable block. That application is now also on the agenda for this meeting.
18. It is important to reiterate the established planning permission. The existing permission is for a seven bedroom dwelling with associated stables and an agricultural outbuilding. Application 0519/0460 proposes to replace the stables with four additional bedrooms for the main house. This would therefore increase the number of bedrooms in the main house from seven to eleven, but the site would no longer have a stable block.

- 
19. The as approved scheme for a seven bedroom dwelling would appeal to a large family, it is quite possible that a future household could have more cars than an average household. It is very difficult to quantify or predict that though. The proposed addition of four further bedrooms may result in some further increase in traffic movements if extra people live at the site or if there are more visitors as a result of it having more space, but these bedrooms would still be extra bedrooms for the main house and would not create a separate dwelling. No significant increase in traffic could be attributed to creating four additional bedrooms for an already substantial private dwelling because those four bedrooms would only be extra space for the existing dwelling.
20. It is also important to note that the site would no longer have any stables. Whilst the stables are only approved for the private use of the site, and not for commercial livery purposes, even private stables would inevitably generate some traffic through vets trips, feed and bedding deliveries, horse box movements to take horses to and from the site etc. As such, it would be very difficult to argue that four additional bedrooms for a private house would generate significantly more traffic than the existing stables that would be lost. The Highway Authority has raised no objections to the separate application to convert the stables into additional bedrooms.
21. In terms of cumulative traffic therefore the following key points apply:
- The additional four bedrooms to the main house to replace the approved stables as proposed under the separate application would be very unlikely to materially increase traffic movements over and above the approved situation.
  - An argument cannot be sustained that using the main house for holiday accommodation would intensify traffic movements over and above the approval for a large private dwelling – if the traffic movements generated by using the main house for holiday accommodation were significantly different then it is likely that would constitute a material change of use for which separate planning permission would be needed. The acceptability of any such increased traffic impacts would be considered at that point, and cannot be pre-empted.
  - The cumulative traffic impacts are therefore the traffic generated by the approved private dwelling plus the traffic that would be generated by the three letting rooms that are proposed under this application. The traffic impacts of the three letting rooms are discussed further as follows:
22. As set out in the main body of the report below, the proposed holiday accommodation comprises of three double en-suite bedrooms. A small kitchenette is proposed but no communal living space is provided. It is intended that the letting rooms would be bed and breakfast style accommodation with the owner of the main farmhouse managing the holiday accommodation. The letting rooms could be booked by a group who would take all three rooms, by three separate parties or a combination. It is highly unlikely that each bedroom would generate more than one car journey to access the site. This means that a maximum of three parking spaces are required. The whole site has ample car parking within the courtyard and approved car port. Assuming each room generates one car, and that car arrives at the site in the morning, leaves during the day, returns during the day, leaves the site in the evening and then returns later in the evening (which seems a 'worst-case scenario' realistically) then that would be a maximum of 15 vehicular movements for the proposed letting rooms per day. These movements are very unlikely to all happen at the same time. Spreading the movements out throughout the day, this would equate to about one extra car movement per hour on top of the traffic that would be generated by the approved private dwelling use.
23. The Highway Authority have been very clear that the level of traffic generated by the letting rooms would not cause highway safety concerns. Whilst the access is unmade

from the junction with Bramley Lane, this does not mean that the access track is dangerous. Because of the unmade nature of the track, vehicle speeds are inevitably low on the access track between Bramley Lane and Bleaklow. The public highway that runs through Rowland is surfaced so it is acknowledged that vehicular speeds will be higher on here. However, it would be very difficult to substantiate a view that the additional traffic going through Rowland would be harmful to highway safety, given the low level of traffic that would be generated by the proposed holiday lets use. A refusal on highway safety grounds could not be substantiated and it highly unlikely that an appeal could be defended on this basis.

24. It is acknowledged that highway safety impacts and the amenity impacts caused by additional traffic are two separate considerations. Members asked that further consideration be given to the amenity impacts of the additional traffic upon the amenity of local residents.
25. It should be noted that there are no neighbouring dwellings within about a 900m radius of the site. As such, there is no impact from vehicles parking at the site or using the unmade access track. It is acknowledged though that cars driving through Rowland village could have some impact on amenity of residents of houses in the village. It is also acknowledged that Rowland is a small village with only 12 houses that lie either side of the road. As such, existing levels of car movements are likely to be low and residents may be more sensitive to increases in traffic than larger communities within the National Park. However, it still remains the case that the holiday let use is unlikely to generate more than one or two additional car movements through the village per hour when averaged throughout the day. Even taking the very quiet and tranquil nature of the village into account, an argument that the noise and disturbance caused by this very low level of additional traffic would be significantly harmful to the amenity of local residents could not be substantiated. This is particularly the case now that it has been clarified that there are two separate accesses available to the site. The use of the Moor Road access would have no impact at all on the residents of Rowland. Whilst we cannot control visitors to the proposed holiday accommodation using the Rowland access, the applicant has stated that visitors would be asked to use the Moor Road access. Assuming that some visitors take note of this advice, the low level of traffic associated with the proposed letting rooms would be further reduced in terms of movements through Rowland village.
26. It is not possible to identify any significant harm to the amenity of residents of Rowland village given the low level of traffic that would be generated by the proposed letting rooms and it would not be possible to substantiate a reason for refusal on this basis.

### **Update Conclusion**

27. It has been clarified that the owner intends to use the main dwelling under its approved C3 use as a private dwelling house. The application before us is for the addition of a small unit of holiday accommodation in the form of letting rooms within the curtilage of the main house. The levels of traffic generated by the proposed letting rooms are likely to be low. The separate application to add additional bedrooms to the main house, but to take away an approved stable block, would not generate significant additional traffic over and above the already approved large house. The traffic generated by the proposed letting rooms on top of the traffic generated by the approved large house would not cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The traffic movements through Rowland village would not cause significant harm to the amenity of residents of the village. The application is recommended for approval.

### **Summary**

1. The application is for the conversion of a traditional agricultural barn to holiday accommodation. The development would conserve the heritage interest of the building, would provide holiday accommodation in accordance with the Authority's adopted planning policies, and would not result in adverse planning impacts. The application is recommended for approval.

### **Site and surroundings**

2. Bleaklow Farm is a vacant farmstead situated in an isolated hilltop position close to the ridge of Longstone Edge, 900m north of Rowland hamlet. The farmstead is situated in a slight hollow and is bounded to its north, east and west sides by mature tree plantations. Although it is situated in a remote and isolated position it is not unduly prominent in the wider landscape, but is visible from a public footpath which passes directly through the farmstead.
3. The farmstead originally comprised a derelict farmhouse with adjacent outbuildings to the west and north sides, forming a courtyard. There is a further detached traditional outbuilding to the north of the farmhouse (subject to the current application) and formerly to the north of the courtyard buildings was a dilapidated range of modern farm buildings.
4. The former farmhouse was vacant and in a poor structural condition and appearance and had been the subject of inappropriate additions, including a 16.7m long x 4.5m wide single-storey extension attached to its western side.
5. Consent was granted in June 2014 for the demolition of the existing farmhouse and erection of a larger replacement farmhouse of a similar character to the original farmhouse. The approved scheme included the replacement of the single-storey extension with a contemporary extension, part rebuilding of the stable building at the western end of the courtyard, and the erection of a secondary courtyard of buildings behind the main building courtyard to accommodate stabling and garaging.
6. The applicant then began constructing the replacement dwelling, which has been constructed up to first floor level. However, following an officer site inspection it was subsequently discovered that the replacement dwelling was being constructed to significantly larger dimensions than that given approval, and other unauthorised design changes had been made to the scheme.
7. Rather than revert to the originally approved scheme, the applicant chose to submit a retrospective planning application to build the replacement dwelling to the larger dimensions and amended design, as presently constructed. This application was refused by Planning Committee on 11 December 2015. A subsequent appeal against the Authority's decision to refuse planning permission was dismissed on 19 May 2016. An amended scheme was subsequently applied for in November 2016 under application reference NP/DDD/1116/1095 which was approved in January 2017. A material amendment was made to this permission. That permission has now been implemented and construction work is ongoing.
8. Under the approved scheme, the traditional barn to the northern side of the courtyard, which is the subject of this application, is to remain in agricultural use. However, the site is no longer a working farm.

### **Proposal**

9. To change the use of the agricultural building that lies to the northern side of the courtyard to 3 letting rooms.

10. The proposed letting rooms each comprise of a double bedroom with ensuite bathroom. There would be a shared hall and kitchenette area. The existing openings would be re-used and the external alterations are minimal, comprising only of replacement windows and doors.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:**

1. **3 year implementation period.**
2. **Development to be carried out in accordance with specified plans.**
3. **Conversion to be carried out within the shell of the existing structure without rebuilding.**
4. **Holiday occupancy restriction and the holiday accommodation to remain under the ownership of the wider Bleaklow Farm site.**
5. **All services to be undergrounded.**
6. **Windows and doors to be timber.**
7. **Parking to be provided prior to the approved use commencing.**

### **Key Issues**

- Whether the development is suitable for conversion under the Authority's recreation and tourism policies
- The impact of the development on the character and appearance of the building
- The landscape impacts of the development
- The ecological impacts of the development
- Archaeological impacts of the development

### **History**

June 2014 – Full planning consent granted for the replacement farmhouse, demolition and rebuilding of stables to form additional living accommodation, erection of stable buildings and garaging.

December 2015 – Full planning application to regularise unauthorised amendments to the previously approved scheme. The application was refused by Planning Committee. A subsequent appeal was dismissed.

January 2017 – Application for an amended scheme for the replacement dwelling approved.

October 2017 – Application approved for a variation to the approved plans for the replacement dwelling. This approval has been implemented.

Several applications to make non-material amendments to the approved scheme and to discharge conditions have also been approved.

### **Consultations**

1. Rowland Parish Meeting – Object to the proposal because of the impact on access

and traffic levels in the village. Note that Rowland comprises a single-track road (no passing places) with no safe pedestrian pavement or verge. There are two blind bends that make the road unsuitable for increased traffic use. Also raise concerns that the size of the property has increased considerably since the replacement farm house was first approved. Concerns also remain regarding light pollution and increased noise.

2. Great Longstone Parish Council – no objections.
3. Derbyshire County Council Highways – no objections, stating the following “As you will be aware, the application site is remote and the roads surrounding the site are in a poor constructional state, as well as being narrow with limited passing places.

However, in accordance with current government guidance the Highway Authority can only object to a planning application if the proposals are likely to lead to severe highway safety concerns. Given the extremely low vehicle volumes and speeds on the surrounding roads, it's not considered the additional traffic from the 3 letting rooms will lead to any severe highway safety concerns. Also, it's likely some reduction in agricultural traffic will occur as the building in question has an existing agricultural use. Therefore the traffic increase (if any) is likely to be minimal.

Therefore, the Highway Authority does not consider there to be sufficient grounds to object to the proposal from a highway safety viewpoint. Should your Authority be minded to permit the application, it's recommended the 3 proposed parking spaces are provided prior to the letting rooms being taken into use and retained throughout the life of the development designated to the letting rooms only.”

4. Authority's Archaeologist – No objections. Notes that the building has historic interest due to its agricultural character and use of traditional materials. Internal features relating to agricultural use appear to have already been lost.

### **Representations**

5. Six letters of objection have been received which raise the following concerns:
  - The application represents 'scope creep',
  - The access to the site and through the village is not adequate and cannot accommodate the additional traffic.
  - Light Pollution.
  - Increased noise.
  - Increase size of the property since the original approval would lead to a significant increase in vehicle movements.
  - There are no farming activities at Bleaklow so the holiday accommodation isn't farm diversification.
  - Contrary to the policies which states that the conversion of entire farmsteads to holiday accommodation will not be permitted.

### **Main policies**

11. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L2, L3, and RT2.
12. Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMT8.

### **National planning policy framework**



13. 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.
14. 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. In particular Paragraph 172 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
15. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Adopted Development Management Policies. 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 government guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.

#### Development plan

16. Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2 and GSP3 together say that all development in the National Park must be consistent with the National Park's legal purposes and duty and that the Sandford Principle will be applied where there is conflict. Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon and development which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted. Particular attention will be paid to impact on the character and setting of buildings, siting, landscaping and building materials, design in accordance with the Design Guide and the impact upon living conditions of local communities. Core Strategy policy GSP4 highlights that the National Park Authority will consider using planning conditions or obligations to secure the achievement of its spatial outcomes.
17. Core Strategy policy DS1 outlines the Authority's Development Strategy, and in principle permits the conversion of buildings to provide visitor accommodation.
18. Core Strategy policy RT2 says that proposals for hotels, bed and breakfast and self-catering accommodation must conform to the following principles:
  - A. The change of use of a traditional building of historic or vernacular merit to serviced or self-catering holiday accommodation will be permitted, except where it would create unacceptable landscape impact in open countryside. The change of use of entire farmsteads to holiday accommodation will not be permitted.
  - B. Appropriate minor developments which extend or make quality improvements to existing holiday accommodation will be permitted.
  - C. New build holiday accommodation will not be permitted, except for a new hotel in Bakewell.
19. Core Strategy policy L2 states that development must conserve and enhance any sites,

20. Core Strategy policy L3 requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal significance of archaeological, artistic or historic asset and their setting, including statutory designation and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest.
21. Development Management Policy DMC3 requires development to be 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. It also provides further detailed criteria to assess design and landscaping, as well as requiring development to conserve the amenity of other properties.
22. Development Management Policy DMC5 provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals. It also requires development to avoid harm to the significance, character, and appearance of heritage assets and details the exceptional circumstances in which development resulting in such harm may be supported.
23. Development Management Policy DMC10 addresses conversion of heritage assets, permitting this where the new use would conserve its character and significance, and where the new use and associated infrastructure conserve the asset, its setting, and valued landscape character. It also notes that new uses or curtilages should not be visually intrusive in the landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquility, dark skies, or other valued characteristics.
24. Development Management Policy DMT8 states that off-street parking for residential development should be provided unless it can be demonstrated that on-street parking meets highways standards and does not negatively impact on the visual and other amenity of the local community. It notes that the design and number of parking spaces must respect the valued characteristics of the area, particularly in conservation areas.

## **Assessment**

### **Principle and impact on the character of the building**

25. Policy RT2 supports the conversion of buildings to holiday accommodation where they are traditional buildings of historic or vernacular merit.
26. The existing barn is a traditional building of historic and vernacular merit. It is the last surviving part of the historic farmstead and is built out of traditional materials in the local vernacular. Some of the significance of the building has been lost through the addition of windows and the removal of internal features. However, it does still possess a degree of significance in heritage terms. The building is therefore considered to be a heritage asset.
27. Policy DMC10 makes it clear that conversions of heritage assets will only be permitted when the conversion would not adversely affect its character, such as when major rebuilding is required.
28. The building would be converted within its existing shell without the need for any rebuilding. The only external alterations are the replacement of the existing windows and doors with new timber windows and doors. The proposed conversion would conserve the character and appearance of the exterior of the building.

29. Internally, subdivision of the existing open space is proposed to create individual rooms. Subdivision of historic agricultural buildings can often cause harm to the significance of the building as open spaces are often an important historic feature. However, in this case the interior of the building lacks any historic interest and any historic agricultural features have already been lost. As such, in this instance, the internal subdivision would have very little impact on the overall significance and character of the building.
30. Subject to such a condition, conversion of the building to holiday accommodation would therefore comply with policy RT2 and policy DMC10.
31. Letters of objection have raised concerns that the proposal is contrary to policy RT2 as it would result in the entire former farm stead becoming holiday accommodation. However, the rest of the site already benefits from residential use. This is not a working farm and there is no agricultural restriction on the approved main farm house. That requirement of policy RT2 is not relevant to this situation.
32. Letters of objection have also raised concerns about the increase in the scale of the property since the original application was approved. However, it is essential to consider the current application on its own merits. Whilst there have been amendments to the previously approved scheme, these have all been considered and deemed to be acceptable.

#### Impacts on the character and appearance of the landscape

33. The building lies within the defined curtilage of Bleaklow Farm and is positioned in very close proximity to other buildings. The site has existing parking and outdoor areas. Parking for the proposed letting rooms can be accommodated within the existing yard. The holiday let does not require any additional outdoor amenity space beyond the existing defined area. As such, the proposed change of use would have a minimal impact on the character of the site as a whole and would have no impact on the character of the wider landscape.
34. Letters of objection have raised concerns about light pollution. However, the small scale of the site is unlikely to generate any significant additional light pollution over and above that generated by the main host dwelling.
35. The development would conserve the landscape character of the area as required by policies L1, DMC3, and DMC10.

#### Ecological impacts

36. The site has previously been surveyed for protected species on 2016, 2015 and 2013 as part of the previous applications. No evidence of nesting bird or bat activity around the barn was found during these surveys. Since 2013 the roof of the barn has been replaced, it has been repointed and all openings have been secured. The building has been used as a builder's rest area during the redevelopment of the wider site so has been in regular active use. Given this, the potential for the building to be used by roosting bats or nesting birds is very low.
37. The development would not be harmful to protected species or ecological interests and accords with policy LC2.

#### Archaeological impacts

38. The Authority's archaeologist has advised that whilst the building is of some historic

significance, its archaeological interest has been reduced by recent alterations. As such, no further archaeological investigation or building recording is required in this instance.

### Amenity impacts

39. Letters of objection have raised concerns about noise. However, due to the position of the building away from any other residential property the proposed development would not result in any loss of privacy, any additional disturbance, or otherwise affect the amenity of any other residential property, complying with policy DMC3. It is however important that the letting rooms remain under the control of the wider Bleaklow Farm site. If the letting rooms were in separate ownership to the main house then amenity issues could arise because of the close relationship between the two. A condition requiring the site to remain as a single planning unit is therefore reasonable and necessary.

### Highway impacts

40. The objections from the Parish Meeting and local residents are fully acknowledged.
41. The objections raise concerns that the proposed use would increase traffic and that the single width road through Rowland is unsuitable to accommodate it. These concerns are appreciated.
42. However, the Highway Authority has raised no objections to the scheme, noting that the traffic generated from three letting rooms would not cause severe highways impacts. The Highway Authority have noted the low vehicle volumes and speeds on surrounding roads.
43. Given the assessment of the Highway Authority, it would not be possible to sustain a reason for refusal on highways grounds because the extra traffic generated by the letting rooms is unlikely to cause harmful highways impacts. The development accords with policy DMT8.

### Conclusion

44. The proposal will conserve character and appearance of the building and those of the landscape, and would conserve the ecological interests of the site in accordance with policies L2, L3, DMC3, DMC5, and DMC10.
45. There are no other policy or material considerations that would indicate that planning permission should be refused.
46. We therefore recommend the application for conditional approval.

### Human Rights

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

### List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

Report Author: Tom Shiels, Area Team Manager

