

6. FULL APPLICATION – DEMOLITION OF FORMER RISING SUN HOTEL AND ERECTION OF HOTEL (CLASS C1) INCORPORATING GROUND FLOOR FLOORSPACE WITH FLEXIBILITY TO BE USED FOR RESTAURANT/BAR (CLASS A3/A4 USES) AND FUNCTION FACILITIES, ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING SITE ACCESS, CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS AT THE RISING SUN, HOPE ROAD, BAMFORD (NP/HPK/0719/0820, JK)

APPLICANT: GiGi Developments Limited

1. Summary

2. This is a revised scheme for a replacement 60 bed hotel following the Planning Committee's refusal of a larger 72 bed hotel scheme earlier this year. It constitutes 'Major Development' in the Park and whilst members previously accepted the principle of the development they concluded the previous scale, height and massing of the scheme was over large and harmful to the landscape and therefore no exceptional circumstances to justify accepting major development. This revised scheme seeks to address those concerns by reducing the overall scale and height and as a consequence the number of rooms has reduced. The key changes are the gable ridges are now lower by 2m and the central section by 1.7m. The building has also been set back just behind the existing hotel building line and angled from the road and moved further away from the neighbour's boundary. The number of parking spaces has also been reduced from 114 to 98 and more landscaping incorporated. Overall it retains the same design approach as the previous scheme but is now considered to address the previous reasons for refusal. It is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement which is necessary to secure funding for travel plan monitoring and a safe road crossing for pedestrians.

3. Site and Surroundings

4. The Rising Sun Hotel is located on the north side of Hope Road (A6187) which forms the main road through the Hope Valley. It sits on the valley floor in open countryside between Bamford village (1.5 km to the north east) and Hope village (2.4kms to the west) with the smaller hamlet of Thornhill some 0.75km to the north. The Hope Road runs broadly parallel with the river Noe which lies a short distance farther to the south across open fields. To the north of the hotel, across an open field, lies the Hope Valley railway line running east/west linking the Hope Valley to Sheffield and Manchester, the nearest station to the site being at Bamford. There is an each way bus stop outside the hotel with services running between Castleton to Sheffield and Baslow. For planning policy application purposes the site therefore lies in 'open countryside' being well outside of a town or village.
5. The current hotel building sits around 15m back from the main road within a roughly rectangular plot bounded by mature trees and hedging which extends to approximately 0.62 Ha. The building is two storey and has a strong linear form as a result of its long frontage of over 50m which is broken up by projecting gables and entrance porches. Whilst the front of the building has a reasonably unified two storey form the rear elevation presents a cluttered mass of two and single storey extensions, most of which are flat roofed.
6. There is car parking to the front and east side of the building with 60 spaces accessed via two separate vehicular entrances located at the east and west ends of the site. There is a large lawned garden area to the rear of the hotel which backs onto fields and affords views up towards Win Hill to the north. The western boundary has a 4m high conifer hedge screening the hotel from the neighbouring detached house, Rowan Lodge. This has an extensive garden area which abuts the site with the dwelling sitting some 40m to

the North West of the hotel. Beyond Rowan Lodge is a further bungalow, Icarus Close, and beyond that open fields. The east side of the site is bounded by a hedgerow and trees and the northern boundary by further planting. Immediately to the east of the site is a paddock and beyond that a group of 5 houses the nearest of which is approximately 120m from the hotel.

7. The hotel accommodation comprised 12 bedrooms with a bar and restaurant providing 65 covers, together with a separate function room capable of accommodating 200 covers. It ceased trading in 2017 after the applicants explained it became unviable in its current condition. The site is fenced off to the public and the building is now in a very poor condition. It has been stripped out internally of all fixtures and fittings and is essentially now a brownfield site in need of redevelopment/regeneration. The applicants have developed a business plan since closure based on demolition of the current building and the construction of new, purpose-built premises to provide the standard of facilities customers now demand and level of accommodation necessary to secure a viable long-term future for the site.
8. A major constraint to redevelopment of the site is the presence of a pressurised mains sewer pipe which runs in an east-west direction under the lawn area across the back of the hotel.

9. Proposal

10. The amended scheme now comprises the following;
11. Demolition of the existing hotel followed by the erection of a new 60 bed hotel (down from 72 in the refused scheme), six of which would be accessible rooms, with public restaurant and bar as well as function facilities. Outside would be a car park with 98 spaces (114 previously) which includes 2 dedicated electric vehicle charging spaces, 7 dedicated accessible and 4 staff spaces, together with a detached flat, green roofed 24 space secure cycle storage/wash/workshop building. The rear car parking area would be a permeable 'Grassgrid' surface to enhance the drainage and provide a softer green appearance. The other parking spaces would be concrete setts with the access roads and circulation areas in tarmac. There would also be a dedicated drop off area next to reception and a separate service vehicle delivery bay.
12. The new hotel building would sit behind the building line of the existing hotel instead of being much closer to the road in the previous refused scheme. It would have a wide 'H' shaped plan form comprised of a 2 ½ storey high central block flanked by 3 storey blocks with road and rear facing gable ends, with a further east facing gable on the east 'wing'.
13. The 60 bedrooms would be accommodated on part of the ground floor of the eastern wing and all of the first and second floors. The central block with its lower roof would have the third floor rooms in the roof space lit with box profile dormers set back behind a flat roofed parapet. This central block would be 11.4m high which is 1.7m lower than the 13.1m high refused scheme but still 3.8m taller than the existing buildings main ridge height. Either side of this central section the 3 storey conventional pitched roof blocks would have wide gable ends facing the road and project out in front of the central section. These gable ends would be 11.8m high which is 2m lower than the refused scheme and which would be 4.2m higher than the existing hotel ridge.
14. The main entrance would be sited within a recessed area cut out from the front corner of the eastern gable. The predominant walling material would be coursed natural gritstone with ashlar gritstone used for the central main vertical parapet wall and some accent areas on the gables. On the rear elevation a limited use of render would be

employed in addition to natural stone. The roof would be clad with natural blue slate and have a 30degree pitch, down from 35 in the refused scheme. Windows and doors would be aluminium frames.

15. The main vehicular and pedestrian entrance would be at the eastern end of the site. This would lead first to drop off parking and accessible parking spaces next to the building before leading back into the main car park at the rear where there would also be a green flat roofed cycle store. This driveway would then circle around the back of the hotel building past the service area to an exit only egress point at the south-western corner of the site. Outside the application site and within the public highway opposite the proposed hotel, a central pedestrian crossing refuge is also proposed to help cross over to the opposite bus stop.
16. The footprint of the proposed Hotel building would now be 876.2m² which represents a 21.7% reduction from the refused scheme at 1119.5m². This would now be just smaller than the footprint of the existing building (911.8m²). In its amended form it would now have a gross internal area of 2574m²; 611m² less than 3,185m² refused scheme.
17. The ground floor would house the kitchen and service/staff facilities along with the public, front of house areas with hotel reception, a 140m² 100cover restaurant and public/hotel bar area, as well as function and potentially conference facilities (previously a 215m², 150 cover restaurant/bar area) Landscaped external areas to the immediate front and rear of the building would be mainly lawned with a modest area of natural stone paving to the front for outside seating and dining with a similar area at the rear in tarmacadam.
18. Documentation submitted in support of the application includes:
 - a. A planning Statement
 - b. Architectural plans
 - c. Design and Access Statement
 - d. Heritage Impact Assessment & Historic Buildings Appraisal
 - e. Landscape Character and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)
 - f. Ecology Report and Bat Mitigation and Compensation Strategy
 - g. Arboricultural Impact Assessment
 - h. Transport Assessment & Travel Plan
 - i. A Viability report
 - j. Sewer location plan

19. RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following;

- A. The prior entry into a Section 106 agreement covering highway requirements for i) the funding of the 40mph highway speed limit extension and the monitoring of the Travel Plan. ii) The submission and agreement of a scheme for the provision of a pedestrian refuge/safe crossing point for bus passengers (including revised kerbing and tactile paving/precise bus stop location) on Hope Road outside but adjacent to the site, and**

B the following planning conditions;-

- 1. Commence development within 3 years.**

- 2. Carry out in accordance with specified amended plans and supporting information.**
- 3. Define and limit approved use to be as an Hotel (Class C1) with ancillary restaurant and bar open to non-residents (Class A3/4) with function capability only and for no other purpose within use Class C1.**
- 4. No development shall take place including any works of demolition until a construction management plan or construction method statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan/statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The statement shall provide for:**
 - **Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors**
 - **Routes for construction traffic, including abnormal loads/cranes etc.**
 - **Hours of operation**
 - **Method of prevention of debris being carried onto highway**
 - **Pedestrian and cyclist protection**
 - **Proposed temporary traffic restrictions**
 - **Arrangements for turning vehicles**
- 5. The premises the subject of the application shall not be taken into use until the existing accesses to Hope Road A6187 have been modified in accordance with the application drawings, laid out, constructed and provided with 2.4m x 145m (to the west) and 2.4m x 122m (to the east) visibility splays in accordance with Drawing no 1707404c, the area in advance of the sightlines being maintained clear of any object greater than 1m in height (0.6m in the case of vegetation) relative to the adjoining nearside carriageway channel level.**
- 6. The premises the subject of the application shall not be taken into use until a scheme for the provision of a safe crossing point and improved public transport facilities has been fully implemented on site, in accordance with a scheme first submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.**
- 7. Notwithstanding the submitted plans an amended car parking layout for the parking of 84 vehicles shall be submitted for written approval. Once agreed the premises the subject of the application shall not be taken into use until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with drawing No 1707405A for vehicles to be parked and for the loading and unloading of vehicles and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear.**
- 8. The premises the subject of the application shall not be occupied until the cycle parking facilities shown on the approved drawing No PA-PL-005 Rev B have been implemented and made available for use. The cycle parking facilities shall thereafter be retained for use by the occupants of, and visitors to, the development at all times.**
- 9. There shall be no gates or other barriers within 10m of the nearside highway boundary and any gates shall open inwards only, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

- 10. The Approved Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timescales specified therein, to include those parts identified as being implemented prior to occupation and following occupation, unless alternative timescales are agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Approved Travel Plan shall be monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan targets.**
- 11. Submit and agree details of the proposed signage for the internal one way system.**
- 12. Submit for written agreement full details of the landscaping scheme comprising both hard and soft external works together with implementation timetable. Scheme to provide for additional planting to the rear boundaries of the car park and for a hedge backing the frontage stone walling. Thereafter complete and maintain in full accordance with approved scheme.**
- 13. Submit for written agreement full details of an amended external lighting scheme which omits tall lighting poles and thereafter complete in full accordance with agreed scheme.**
- 14. East facing gable end to be clad with natural gritstone.**
- 15. Agreement over sample panels of stone, render, external paving, grasscrete and roofing materials.**
- 16. Agreement over door and window details/finishes.**
- 17. Specify minor detailed design matters e.g. Rain water goods, other joinery details.**
- 18. Carry out the development in full accordance with the recommendations set out in the submitted Final Ecology Report ref 9537_R_APPR_20117.**
- 19. No development shall take place until a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site (in accordance with the principles outlined within DEFRA Non-statutory Technical Standards for sustainable drainage systems (March 2015)), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Authority. The approved drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved detailed design prior to the use of the building commencing.**
- 20. Suggested conditions awaited from DCC as Local Lead Flood Authority on the assessment to demonstrate that the proposed destination for surface water accords with the hierarchy in paragraph 80 of the planning practice guidance.**
- 21. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until drainage plans for the disposal of surface water and foul sewage have been submitted to and approved by The Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first brought into use.'**

- 22. No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for a scheme of archaeological monitoring and recording has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.**
- 23. Submit and agree in writing a detailed scheme of environmental management of the building and site with specific measures to meet the aims of PDNPA Climate change policy together with an implementation programme. Provision shall be made for the cabling to the proposed 2 EV charging spaces to be extended to 2 more spaces in readiness to accommodate a potential upgrade of those spaces to EV Charging spaces should demand require. Once agreed carry out in full accordance with approved scheme.**
- 24. Submit and agree precise details of an acoustic fence along the boundary of the car parking with the neighbouring residential garden together. Thereafter install in accordance with agreed details and maintain.**

Footnotes / Informatives covering the following:-

- i. No works within the limits of the public highway without the formal Agreement of the Highway Authority. Public transport services in the vicinity of the site must not be adversely affected by the works.**
- ii. Prevention of mud or other extraneous material being carried out of the site and deposited on the public highway.**
- iii. Effective monitoring of the Travel Plan recommended by the Highway Authority using the STARSFor Travel plan toolkit: <https://www.starsfor.org>**
- iv. Drainage footnotes covering such matters as the need for relevant consents regarding sustainable drainage and surface water disposal.**
- v. Suggest the inclusion of warning signs at the exit of the car park, making drivers aware of the presence of walkers and cyclists when exiting the development.**
- vi. Severn Trent Water advises that there is a protected public sewer located within the application site and you may not build close to, directly over or divert a public sewer without consent. Advised to contact Severn Trent Water to discuss proposals.**

Key Issues

20. The principle of a replacement hotel of a scale that would represent 'major development' (General Development Order definition) and whether, having regard to local and national policy, the material considerations in this case would amount to the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify such major development in the Peak District National Park, with particular reference to: the impact of the scale of development and the effect on the character and appearance of the landscape.
21. The design, scale, massing and overall height of the proposed hotel and its impact upon the street scene and wider landscape.
22. The highway impacts of the proposed development
23. The impact of the proposed hotel upon the amenity of neighbouring properties.
24. The impacts upon any archaeological interest in site.

25. The impacts upon any ecological interest on the site

The site's Planning History (relevant summary)

26. The site has a long history of extensions and alterations, including unimplemented consents in the 1980's and 1990's for additional letting/staff and conference accommodation.
27. 2018 – Planning enquiry from the applicants regarding demolition and erection of a replacement hotel. Officers responded positively regarding the principle of a replacement building but expressed strong concerns over the scale with particular regard to the overall height and massing of proposed building. Applicant responds by reducing height a little and engages with officers over the design details. These do not overcome scale issue with agent citing the size is the minimum necessary for viability of the project and that the height is closely linked to the location of the pressurised sewer which prevents any development any further back into the site. Applicant also confirms their business plan prevents consideration of a separate accommodation block to the rear of the site as a means to reduce the scale and massing of development to the front of the site.
28. 2019 – Refusal of planning permission for replacement hotel on grounds that the scale, massing and height resulted in an hotel which would harm the landscape and not therefore represent acceptable development to warrant an exception to allow major development within the National Park.
29. 2019 – Post refusal constructive further pre-application discussions with the agent and architect over the revisions to reduce the overall scale of the proposal to try and address the reasons for refusal. Officer support results in the current revised application.

Wider Planning History

30. Members will no doubt mostly be aware of the stalled redevelopment of the former Marquis Hotel site at Sicklehorne to the east. The Authority granted planning permission for 'major development' in respect of a large replacement hotel on the site several years ago and work commenced with the full demolition of the hotel and a start to site service provision. Work then stopped and the site owner has stated that hotel scheme will not now go ahead in the current economic climate facing the hotel industry and he has engaged in discussions with officers regarding potential alternative uses.

Consultations

DCC - Highway Authority (HA)

31. In summary – Raise no objections in principle and recommend conditions and advisory note in the event of an approval. Initially the HA made the following summarised comments;
32. A revised travel should be sought that takes into account the previous comments of the Council.
33. In the event that a S106 Agreement is secured this authority would seek monitoring fees of £500 pa x 5 years - total £2500.
34. To encourage access to the hotel, or more likely the restaurant or bar, by public transport, the current facilities will need to be upgraded - the provision of a bus shelter can be funded by the applicant but its future maintenance will need to be taken on by

either the District or Parish council.

35. It is noted the application makes reference to ;
- i) The provision of a pedestrian crossing with dropped kerbs and tactile paving to aid crossing at the access points.
 - ii) Improved bus stop provision on Hope Road.
 - iii) Provision of a pedestrian refuge and dropped kerbing and tactile paving to assist pedestrians crossing to footway and the bus stop.
 - iv) Provision of funding to enable DCC to progress a TRO to facilitate a speed reduction from 50 to 40.
36. All of the above will be required as previously and secured via appropriate conditions and notes in any consent.
37. Regarding the internal layout;
- i) Parking spaces 1-11 should be minimum length of 5.6m.
 - ii) The Authority has reservations reading the access and egress from the electric vehicle changing spaces.
 - lii) Spaces 17-25 and those opposite appear a little short and should be a minimum of 5.5m and the distance between should be 6m.
 - iii) The distance to the rear of the staff spaces is restricted for manoeuvring.
 - iv) The applicants should provide details of the signage for the one way system but the HA is happy for this to be a condition.
38. Either a revised plan or swept path plans should be submitted to demonstrate the layout will accommodate the vehicle movements.

Response to amended plans

39. No amended Travel Plan has yet been submitted although amended drawings addressing the HA initial concerns have. The following is the summarised HA Response to the amended drawings;
40. Lengths 5.6m (for angled spaces) and 5.5m (for straight spaces) have been taken from the guidance document Delivering Streets and Places.
41. Swept Path 1 demonstrates that there is sufficient space to enable vehicles to both park and manoeuvre.
42. Concerning the EV spaces, whilst access and egress is demonstrated on Swept Path plans 2 and 3 these still show parking spaces measuring 4.8m in length. However in practice it is considered EV drivers will be able to access such spaces.
43. Setting the staff parking at an angle should enable easier access and egress.
44. The main issue from a traffic safety point of view is lane width. Ideally a pedestrian refuge should not be narrower than 1.5 metres but this would leave sub-standard lane widths if the cycle lane widths were kept as existing. 3 metre running lanes would leave space for 1 metre cycle lanes.
45. Accordingly there are no further highway comments. Please include the following conditions on any consent granted:
46. No development shall take place including any works of demolition until a construction

management plan or construction method statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

47. The premises the subject of the application shall not be taken into use until the existing accesses to Hope Road A6187 have been modified in accordance with the application drawings, laid out, constructed and provided with visibility splays.
48. The premises shall not be taken into use until a scheme for the provision of a safe crossing point and improved public transport facilities has been fully implemented on site.
49. The premises the subject of the application shall not be taken into use until space has been laid out within the site for vehicles to be parked and for the loading and unloading of vehicles and for vehicles to turn.
50. The premises the subject of the application shall not be occupied until the cycle parking facilities have been implemented and made available for use.
51. There shall be no gates or other barriers within 10m of the nearside highway boundary and any gates shall open inwards only.
52. The Approved Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timescales specified therein. The Approved Travel Plan shall be monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan targets.
53. Please also include the following advisory notes for the applicant's information:
 - a. no works may commence within the limits of the public highway without the formal written Agreement of the County Council as Highway Authority.
 - b. steps shall be taken to ensure that mud or other extraneous material is not carried out of the site and deposited on the public highway.
 - c. Effective monitoring of the Travel Plan.
 - d. Whilst relocation of the speed limit is something that can be considered, this process is likely to take some time.
 - e. Evidence will need to be submitted that either High Peak Borough Council or Thornhill Parish Council will be responsible for the future maintenance of any bus shelters.

54. Section 106 Contributions: Travel Plan monitoring £2500, Speed limit extension £5000

55. DCC - Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA)

56. Require further details of the site and how surface water would be treated before commenting or suggesting conditions. Those details have been provided and an update from the LLFA is expected in time for the Committee.

Environment Agency –

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

Natural England

58. The development will not have significant adverse impacts on protected landscapes and has no objection. Further advice on designated sites/landscapes and advice on other natural environment issues is set out below;

59. Do not consider that the proposed development would compromise the purposes of designation or special qualities of the National Park. Advise that the proposal is determined in line with relevant NPPF and development plan policies, landscape and visual impacts are minimised as far as possible and landscape advice is obtained from the National Park landscape advisor.
60. Where available, a local Landscape Character Assessment can also be a helpful guide to the landscape's sensitivity to this type of development and its capacity to accommodate the proposed development.
61. The statutory purposes of the National Park are to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the park; and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the park by the public. You should assess the application carefully as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm those statutory purposes. Relevant to this is the duty on public bodies to 'have regard' for those statutory purposes in carrying out their functions (section 11 A (2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended)). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.
62. High Peak Borough Council – No response
63. Severn Trent Water Ltd – No objection subject to following condition and summarised comments: i) Submit for agreement details of drainage plans for the disposal of surface water and foul sewage.
64. Severn Trent Water also advise that there is a public sewer located within the application site which has statutory protection and advise a footnote to contact Severn Trent Water for advice.
65. Parish Council
66. The Council recognises the need for the site to be redeveloped, rather than left derelict, and is broadly supportive of the proposal as it now stands. The Council is pleased to note the reduction in the hotel's size compared to the previous application for this site.
67. However, the Council continues to have concerns about the road-safety implications of the proposal, especially as the hotel entrance will be close to a bend which restricts sightlines. We note that the applicant is willing to fund a TRO to reduce the speed to 40mph past the hotel (and for some distance either side), but we contend that this reduction should instead be to 30mph. (This is part of a wider ongoing concern about road safety on Hope Rd.)
68. Furthermore, we believe that the Travel Plan could and should be more ambitious in reducing vehicular traffic to/from the hotel, on what is already a constantly busy road (Hope Rd). As the Plan currently stands, it is unlikely to have much real effect beyond just "warm words". Therefore we ask please that the Travel Plan author be remitted to work with the Parish Council to develop it into a Plan with more substance and more 'teeth'.
69. Given the need to move towards electric vehicles across the UK generally, the plan to have only 2 vehicle charging points seems unreasonably meagre - we believe there should be at least 4.
70. We are concerned about the lorry deliveries location on the west side of the hotel,

given the proximity of the next-door house. There needs to be a night-hours ban on the loading/unloading of vehicles, to prevent unreasonable disruption to neighbours.

71. PDNPA Tree Conservation officer

72. Comments that the development will result in the loss of 19 low quality, Category C trees. This will be mitigated with sufficient re-planting as outlined in 'Planting Plan Strategy 531-1003 Rev-H 31-07-2019'. It is proposed that where construction and hard-surfacing will occur within the root protection areas of trees of significant value, these trees will be protected with the use of no-dig solutions and Cellweb.

73. Suggested Conditions/Mitigation

i) All works to be undertaken in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement found in Section 6 of 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment' (dated 2nd July 2019).

ii) The Tree Protection Measures (Section 5), Tree Protection Plan (Appendix I), and Arboricultural Method Statement Plan (Appendix J) of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (dated 2nd July 2019) submitted in support of the application, shall be adhered to in full.

iii) Re-planting to be undertaken in accordance with 'Planting Plan Strategy 531-1003 Rev-H 31-07-2019'.

74. PDNPA Landscape Architect

75. The revised plans look to be an improvement from the previous application (in terms of scale of the building and set-backs). Notes that they are still proposing a crack willow in the north east corner of the car park, which would not be appropriate due to its tendency to 'crack' branches off.

PDNPA Transport Officer

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

77. Overall, both documents meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the Peak District National Park Core Strategy (2011) to produce a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan on a development of this scale. Therefore, the comments provided are in the main in relation to details within the document. The comments generally deal with possible errors, areas where further clarity may be required, or areas of concern for the Authority.

78. One area where there is some concern is in relation to the suggested levels of parking provision, which exceed the maximum standards contained within the Peak District National Park Parking Standards. The size of the proposed parking bays is also less than that set out within the Parking Standards. It is hoped that the proposed compromise given below will lead to a reduced number of parking bays whilst allowing those that are provide to meet the dimensions set out within the Peak District National Park Parking Standards.

Transport Assessment – July 2019

79. The design incorporates landscaping features, retained trees and hedgerows, which will help to screen the car park from the surrounding area. The incorporation of a greened area for overspill parking will reduce the visual intrusion, when this area is

unoccupied. This area will also offer sustainable drainage. The Design and Access Statement indicates that the proposed scheme meets this part of Policy T3.

80. 4.4 Parking Provision - Page 15, Paragraph 4.4.1 to 4.4.3 – refers to the Peak District National Park Authority Parking Standards and provides the maximum standards set out for dining/bar/lounge and public area for staff and customers; and hotels and guesthouses. Based on the figures provided, the parking provision should be 66 spaces for the hotel (1 customer space per bedroom and 1 staff space for every 10 bedrooms). The parking standard for restaurants comprises 1 space per 4m², but this is halved when in combination with hotel accommodation. In this case, the area is 140m², which would equate to an additional 18 parking spaces. The total number of spaces, based on the parking standards would therefore be 84 spaces.
81. Paragraph 4.4.3 states that 98 parking spaces will be provided. This figure is 14 spaces higher than the maximum suggested within the Peak District National Park Parking Standards. Given the reduction in covers by one-third (50 covers), the number of proposed parking spaces is excessive.
82. The size of the parking bays should be in keeping with the Peak District National Park Parking Standards, with standard bays of 5.0m x 2.5m and with bays for disabled users of the same dimensions, but with 1.2m hatched access/safety zone to the side and rear, as per the existing design layout.
83. Page 20, Paragraph 5.3.5 – provides a justification for the proposed number of 98 parking spaces, based on the maximum levels for a separate hotel and bar restaurant. The Peak District National Park Parking Standards is quite clear that where a hotel and bar / restaurant are combined within one site, that the parking provision allocated to the bar / restaurant should be half of that allocated to a stand-alone bar / restaurant.
84. Paragraph 5.3.5 is also quite clear in acknowledging that the provision of 98 spaces is 23 spaces in excess of the required number (84), which would in itself offer 9 spaces in excess of the calculated number required.
85. The Authority recognises the relatively remote location of the Rising Sun, as well as the impact that overspill parking would have on local amenity and the safety of road users of the A6187. Therefore, the requirement for a reasonable level of comfort margin is acknowledged. However, the margin is considered excessive. It would be more appropriate to limit the size of the car park to a maximum of 90 spaces, including those for disabled users (7 spaces) and incorporating two spaces with electric vehicle charging points.

Travel Plan – July 2019

86. The Travel Plan is generally well written and takes a pragmatic and sensible approach to encouraging sustainable travel by users and employees of the hotel and bar / restaurant.
87. The guaranteed ride home in the event of an emergency for staff who walk, cycle or use the bus to travel to work should be provided for car sharers as for others attempting to travel by more sustainable modes of transport.

PDNPA Ecologist

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

PDNPA Archaeologist

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

PDNPA Conservation Officer

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

Representations

94. There have been 17 representations at the time of drafting the report. There are 15 in support of the proposals although one, from The Friends of the Peak District, whilst supporting in principle still object to the transport arrangements and two make general comments.

The supporters make the following summarised points:

- Concerned with increased traffic and would ideally like to see speed limit reduced to 30mph.
- Important development goes ahead to prevent further deterioration of the buildings and site in general which is an eyesore.
- Majority of issues raised at last Planning Committee have been addressed.
- Building is 20% smaller.
- Scheme accords with PDNPA policies.
- New hotel will bring benefits for tourism, support the local economy and bring

- employment/training opportunities.
- It will encourage visitors to stay longer.
 - Carefully thought out building will be a vast improvement over current derelict site.
 - Would encourage increased size for added pool and spa but recognise may not be viable unless no of rooms sufficient.
 - A quality design, appropriate to the site.
 - Readdresses closure of hotels and restaurants in the locality.
 - Meets a desperate need for larger hotel facilities/ will accommodate large functions and family gatherings.
 - Failure of previous business does not suggest a new hotel will be superfluous – better facilities needed than previous offering.
 - Site is well located where there is a lack of hotels of this scale.
 - Design may not be entirely in keeping but neither was previous building. New design makes a bold confident statement with its contemporary modern treatment.

The letters raising general comments make the following summarised points;

- Existing concerns about traffic along Hope road will be made worse by the new hotel.
- Concern for the safety of young people visiting the nearby Glenbrook facilities.
- The speed limit reduction is welcomed by one writer but the others consider should be reduced to 30mph.
- The pavement continued on one side all the way from the site to the Glenbrook Centre.
- A dedicated separate cycle path is needed from the site, not just a white line down the side of the road.
- Concern that a central pedestrian refuge in Hope Road will restrict space for vehicles and cyclist to pass making it more dangerous for cyclists.
- Cycling needs to be encouraged if PDNPA is to meet its climate change obligations, currently road is busy but if made more cycle friendly it would attract more sustainable visits and if perceived danger removed/lessened would encourage journeys between villages by cycle; suggest S106 to extend cycle path currently between Hathersage and Sickleholme, to Hope which would be a better use of money than an ineffective travel plan. It would also slow vehicles speeds by making road narrower and benefit horse riders and walkers as well as stopping pedestrians having to cross and re-cross the road between Bamford and Hope. It would also provide a safe link to the secondary school at Hope. All this was to be put in by DCC under Pedal Peak Project but has been quietly shelved despite support.

The Friends of the Peak District

95. Support the need for an appropriate redevelopment of the site and acknowledge the applicant's efforts to satisfy concerns about the massing and scale of the building. They consider hotel re-use would be appropriate and support the application in principle. However, they maintain their previous objection to the transport arrangements making the following summarised points;
96. The existing Rising Sun is 2-storey with a height of 7.71m to the ridge; the proposed 3-storey building with a footprint 4% less than the existing hotel, would be 11.83m to the ridge on the gables and 11.44m to the central ridge connecting the gables, or about a 53% increase in height.
97. Although the proposed building appears prominent when viewed from the A6187 and from Thornhill to the north its impact on the landscape is acceptable. Much of the road facing façade would be concealed behind trees. However the exterior lighting has not been addressed.

Major development test

98. Against the three criteria of the test in the NPPF paragraph 172 it performs as follows:
- There is a need to redevelop this brownfield site, rather than leave it derelict, as it has been for several years. Recent closure of Hassop Hall, the Maynard Arms and the Derwent means there has been recent loss of hotel facilities within the Park.
 - Meeting the need in some other way is not possible as the application is location specific; if not progressed, an unsightly neglected building would remain.
 - Environmental impacts – Opportunities for additional landscaping could be taken e.g. in bulking up the treeline along field boundaries to the north. However, main and serious concern is the excessive and damaging scale of the car parking provision. This occupies a very large footprint and would be the dominant characteristic of the site. In addition to the visual impact of the parked cars, locating a significant generator of car-based journeys within the Park is directly and starkly in contravention of Core Strategy policies CC1A&D (Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation); T1 (Reducing the General Need to Travel and Encouraging Sustainable Transport); and T7B&C (Minimising the Adverse Impact of Motor Vehicles and Managing the Demand for Car and Coach Parks).
99. Thus core strategy policies GSP1 and GSP2B are only partially fulfilled. There are exceptional circumstances for proceeding with this development but the full significant benefit would not be realised. For this to occur our concerns regarding transport must be addressed.

Transport and Travel

100. The site is well-located for both Hope and Bamford railway stations, and enjoys a direct bus service. There is therefore strong potential for car-free journeys but that cannot be achieved if the default means of access to the site is by car. In that context there is too much car parking, insufficient EV charging points, the infrastructure for various modes in the vicinity requires improvement, road safety has not been fully addressed, and the travel plan is inadequate.

Car parking

101. The proposal for 98 car parking spaces takes up the rear and sides of the site, and does not meet with the PDNPA car parking standards (DMP 2019). The total requirement for this 60 bed hotel with a restaurant would therefore be 84 spaces. The applicant has adopted the worst case scenario, which is unacceptable given the need to reduce travel by private car. The parking provision should be reduced by at least 14 spaces, from 98 spaces to 84 spaces and would enable more landscaping with trees and improve the amenity of the neighbours with respect to noise.

EV charging

102. Two electric charging points for 60 cars in a relatively remote location is inadequate. As charging can take up to 8hours, and in anticipation of the shift to EV, there should be 6 points. Such points would provide an income to the hotel.

Infrastructure for alternative modes & road safety

103. The provision for 24 secure covered cycling storage spaces is welcome.
104. The highways improvements proposed as part of this application include relocation of the bus stop with new poles and timetable cases to both sides of the road; a new pedestrian refuge to assist crossing the road and support for the reduction in the speed limit from 50 to 40mph.

105. These improvements are inadequate. The bus stops require shelters. The perception of road danger along the A6187 is high and a pedestrian refuge would be wholly inadequate. Instead there should be a pedestrian crossing, and the speed limit should be reduced from 50mph to 30mph between the Bamford lights and the Glenbrook Outdoor Activity Centre to the west of the development. The off-road cycleway between Bamford and Hathersage should be continued between Bamford and Hope, and the footways on both sides of the road should be made continuous and in good repair. These improvements should be achieved through a s106 agreement.

Travel plan measures

106. It is difficult to plan for travel when the habits of the clientele have yet to be surveyed but there are several areas of opportunity that have been missed. The only target that has been set is to reduce single car occupancy by 2% year on year. SMART targets for all modes will need to be set, including reducing car parking as sustainable travel modes take effect. Local maps with isochrones for each sustainable mode would provide a realistic assessment of what is on offer/possible for each mode. Sustainable travel information should be provided in each room. The hotel should provide a shuttle service for those guests arriving by train – the final mile is a considerable disincentive to arriving by public transport with heavy suitcases. Finally, with 40 staff travelling it should be possible to team up with other local businesses to provide more sustainable travel for other staff in the Hope Valley.

107. With all the above additions PDNPA Core Strategy Policies CC1, T1, T2F (Reducing and redirecting traffic) and T7C would be met.

Main Policies

National Planning Policy Framework

108. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government policy in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.

109. Paragraph 172 states that "Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited.

138. Paragraph 172 goes on to state that "*Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:*

- a) *The need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;*
- b) *The cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and*
- c) *Any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated".*

139. As this application proposal seeks permission for a new hotel with a new floor area of more than 1,000 m², the proposal amounts to ‘major development’ in accordance with the definition set out in the Town and Country Planning Development Management Procedure Order.
140. GSP1 (D) in the Authority’s Core Strategy says in securing National Park purposes major development should not take place within the Peak District National Park. Major development will only be permitted following rigorous consideration of the criteria in national policy.
141. Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should enable sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

142. Policy DS1: Development Strategy - sets out the principles that must be considered in determining new development proposals in order to the strategy to deliver sustainable distribution and level of growth and support effective conservation and enhancement of the Park. To achieve this it states in B that the majority of new development should be directed to within named settlements although development for recreation or tourism development will be acceptable in principle in the open countryside outside the Natural Zone.
143. Policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park’s objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GPS1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.
144. Policy GSP2 builds upon this by stating that opportunities should be taken to enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park and, (in part D) specific opportunities should be taken to remove undesirable features or buildings. This is expanded in policy L1 which relates directly to enhancement of landscape character, and policy L3 relating to the conservation and enhancement of features of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance.
145. Policy GSP3 refers to development management principles. Relevant criteria listed in this policy relate to appropriate scale of development in relation to the character and appearance of the National Park, impact on access and traffic, and impact on living conditions of communities. Policy GSP4 recommends the use of conditions and legal agreements to ensure that benefits and enhancement are achieved.
146. Policy L1 states that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics. L3 seeks to conserve cultural heritage assets.
147. Policy RT2 states that proposals for hotels must conform to the following principles (relevant to this case) B; Appropriate minor developments which extend or make quality improvements to existing holiday accommodation will be permitted and C; new-build holiday accommodation will not be permitted, except for a new hotel in Bakewell.
148. Other relevant policies include policy CC1: Climate change mitigation and adaptation which is backed up by the Supplementary Planning Document; Climate Change and

Sustainable Building.

149. In order to build in resilience to and mitigate the causes of climate change all development must:

- Make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.
- Take account of the energy hierarchy by:
 - I reducing the need for energy;
 - II. using energy more efficiently;
 - III. supplying energy efficiently; and
 - IV. Using low carbon and renewable energy.
- 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.
- Achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions.
- Achieve the highest possible standards of water efficiency

150. CC5 relates to flood risk and the presumption against development which increases flood risk, and policy T1 which aims to reduce the need to travel by unsustainable means.

Peak District National Park Development Management Policies

Supplementary Planning Documents

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

Assessment

The principle of the development

152. GSP1 (D) in the Authority's Core Strategy says in securing National Park purposes, major development should not take place within the Peak District National Park other than in exceptional circumstances, and that Major development will only be permitted following rigorous consideration of the three criteria in the NPPF. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF adds a requirement to the exceptional test that it also be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of whether exceptional circumstances exist in this case and whether such development is in the public interest is discussed below with reference to the three assessment criteria in the NPPF.

a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;

153. This revised application again explains that the last business operating from the current hotel building proved unviable and the latest business closure followed a history of other failed business attempts over a number of years to develop and maintain a viable hotel at the site. The explanation given is that the current level of accommodation, the nature of the hotel and the particular food/beverage offered was not a viable proposition in the current market in the Peak District. Furthermore the agent cited the poor quality of the building itself as another factor, the condition of which has, since closure, further deteriorated.

154. The now empty and fenced off building is prominently sited on the major thoroughfare running through and serving the Hope Valley. Its dilapidated and decaying condition detracts considerably from the valued character and appearance of the local area. The

loss of the business has resulted in the loss of local employment opportunities and visitor accommodation, both of which will have impacted adversely upon the wider local economy. Closure also constitutes the loss of a local community facility in strict planning policy terms, albeit the site lies outside of the nearest village and the previous hotel was therefore more of a 'destination business' than a local community pub/facility.

155. The existing building has clearly reached the end of its useful life and having been extended and altered many times, mostly in a very poor manner, any vernacular interest it may once have had has been lost. The building is therefore no longer considered to be of any local heritage merit and there is therefore no heritage or any other overriding reason to retain it. Consequently, given the business history and the current state of the building, redevelopment with a replacement high quality hotel building is welcomed in principle as it would continue the long established use of the site, have the potential to bring considerable enhancement as well as long term benefits to the local economy. In this regard the supporting statement suggests the new business based on this revised scheme would provide for around 42 (full time equivalent) new employment opportunities on the site, as well as benefitting local suppliers and other businesses through increased visitor spend within the local economy. Redevelopment for a hotel is therefore considered to be in the public interest to pass the NPPF test in paragraph 172.

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

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

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

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

The scale and design of development

158. In comparison with the existing Hotel building and the previous refused scheme (figs in brackets) the new building would be:

Existing hotel - Two storey form maximum 7.71m to ridge.
Footprint 912m²

Proposed hotel - Three storey form - gables maximum 11.8m (13.83m) to ridge.
Central 2 ½ section 11.4m ridge height (13.14m to ridge).
Footprint 876m² (1119m²)

Gross internal area 2574m² (3185m²)

Whilst the footprint would now be smaller than existing the volume of the new building is much greater due to the additional floor. The footprint of the proposed hotel building represents a 21.7% reduction from the refused scheme and would now be just smaller than the footprint of the existing building.

159. The existing hotel is largely a two storey building with some single storey elements with its 50m long frontage giving it a linear form. It has been extended and altered many times and no longer reflects the local building tradition, other than in its traditional two storey form and modest gable widths. It sits on the valley floor and beside the main road in open countryside away from the nearest settlement. The 0.62ha plot is bounded by tall hedging and tree planting which screens the site from the pair of low two storey and single storey dwellings lying immediately to the west of the site.
160. The predominant building style in the locality and the wider park is for two storey buildings with a simple rectangular plan forms and relatively narrow gable widths. There are occasional three storey buildings, mainly confined to larger dwellings and commercial buildings located within the core of larger settlements. In the open countryside, buildings are almost exclusively two storey with the only tall buildings being the occasional former mill building or larger country house/hall.
161. The application site is neither a country house nor a mill and therefore at two and a half and three storeys, the height of the proposed hotel would be out of keeping with the established local building tradition. Coupled with the prominence of the wide gabled wings either side of the central 2 1/2 storey block, this means that the overall scale of the replacement hotel, even though it has been reduced more in height, nevertheless would still be considerably larger both in height (4.2m higher ridge height on the gables), and massing than the existing building. This greater massing would inevitably translate into a significantly more obvious building in the street scene.
162. The Planning Committee found the height of the previous proposed building along with its scale and siting some 5m closer to the road would be unacceptably dominant on the landscape and the street scene. In contrast this revised submission puts a smaller scale, lower building back almost on the same line and angle from the road as the existing hotel. This would represent a significant reduction in the overall visual impact and presence of the building in the available local street views as well as in the wider landscape. This revised scale and siting is therefore now considered to address the key scale and height objection raised by members in the last refusal.
163. In public views along the Hope Road, the wide gables of the relatively complicated H shaped plan form (compared to the existing building and simpler local building tradition) would now be 1.5m narrower and 2m lower. They would now be much less dominant features, especially in the approach from the east where the existing boundary landscaping and proposed additional planting would now more effectively break up/screen the lower building. Views from the west would be almost completely screened in the approach by the existing tall boundary hedge and mature trees on the west corner of the site.
164. Built development of this scale and in this location would still not normally be acceptable and in the previous refused scheme officers established that it was not possible to reduce the building to two storeys with the additional massing pushed out at the rear instead of to the front due to the presence of the high pressure sewer. A separate accommodation block was also ruled out to reduce the bulk of the frontage building as such an arrangement would not be viable or indeed acceptable given the applicants business plan/preferred hotel operator.

165. Although the applicant argued in the last application that the 72 bed scheme was the minimum necessary to achieve viability they are confident that the reduced costs of the revised smaller 60 bed hotel building coupled with the lowered floor heights in the upper floors rather than the critical public areas has achieved the lowest possible height and scale whilst maintaining viability. Supporting evidence concludes that the viability would now be “at the lower end of industry standard expectations” and that “any lower level of development would not be viable”.
166. This revised scheme also retains the same overall design theme for the hotel which breaks up the visual impact of the buildings large frontage by arranging the overall massing into three distinct blocks in an H shaped plan form. This gives a recessed central block (now 4.5m shorter) flanked by gabled ‘wings’ to each end. This approach better reflects local forms, although the scale of the gables in particular remain wider than would normally be appropriate. The roof pitch has also been reduced from 35 degrees down to 30 to help reduce the overall height alongside the floor height reductions. The scheme would employ high quality materials with traditional local gritstone walling and a blue slate roof which will help blend the new building with the local building tradition. Whilst each gable presents an over-wide form, each is now narrower and lower than the refused scheme and are given vertical emphasis by the chimney line. The long return ‘wing’ on the eastern gable which would also be the most prominent element in the public approaches to the site from the east has now also been broken up by the addition of a feature gable. This is shown to be clad in render, however as the main east facing gable this would need to be in natural stone and suitable condition would need to be added to secure this in any approval.
167. Between the two gables the recessed central element is also shorter and lower now and has a strong horizontal emphasis created by the ashlar gritstone panelled façade which projects in front of the link block. This wall panel is visually separated from the flanking gabled blocks at each side by glazed panels and sits above the heavily glazed ground floor frontage to the principal public rooms. Above the central panel façade, rooms in the second floor are set back and located partially in the roof space with four flat roofed box type dormers formed with dark coloured profiled zinc cladding to help the dormers recede visually into the roof colour behind.
168. All the windows and doors would be aluminium framed units with the window openings framed by narrow sectioned full surrounds in natural gritstone which would project beyond the wall. The scale of windows, although large in some cases nevertheless retain a vertical emphasis through the opening size or, where openings are square, through the frame division. The previous full height glazed ‘slot’ feature opening proposed in the prominent eastern ‘wing’ has now been replaced by a central projecting gable, flanked by three storey tall ‘staircase’ style window runs. This creates a much stronger visual break in this side and now changes what was a large mass into visually shorter elements. Overall the openings retain a reasonably high solid to void ratio reflecting the local tradition.
169. The rear elevation is sheltered from public view due to the high hedges and boundary planting as well as planting in the neighbours field. In this context the rear external cladding would change to a mixture of stone and coloured render. The area between the projecting gables has a similar ‘floating’ horizontal façade to the frontage but here there is an additional projecting canopy (dark grey PVC coating) over part of the external seating area. Overall therefore, despite some misgivings over the retention of the dormers (necessary to keep the central block as low as possible), the design, detailing and use of materials are of an acceptable and appropriate high quality.
170. The reduction in overall height of the proposed building and its repositioning back in the

site to behind the existing building line means it would now be much less prominent. Whilst it would still be a large replacement building this positioning coupled with the filtered views from the proposed tree planting and hedging in the frontage mean that it would not now dominate the street as previously proposed.

171. In respect of the cycle store this would be a flat, green roofed building clad with timber with metal reinforced doors. There are no objections in design terms to this design approach which is appropriate for the use and location being a simple low key building.
172. In conclusion, this amended scale, siting and design of the building on the plot is considered to be much improved and therefore acceptable. At three storey high it would still of course be a large building in the open countryside compared with the existing hotel building it would replace and appear out of keeping with the simple massing of the local two storey building tradition. However this landscape impact must be considered in the context of development viability and the site constraints and be weighed against the potential benefits arising from the redevelopment. These benefits comprise the considerable level of enhancement to the site and the impacts upon the local economy. For the new hotel to be accepted therefore, the treatment of the external areas must be of an equally high standard to the design of the building if the development is to be properly integrated into the site and not to appear unacceptably imposing in its landscape setting. Impact on landscape, traffic and neighbours is therefore considered in the following paragraphs.

Landscape Considerations

173. The application site is located in the Derwent Valley Landscape Character Area and the 'Valley Farmlands with Villages' Landscape Character Type (LCT). Key landscape guidance priorities for this LCT are to protect historic hedgerows, manage and enhance linear tree cover and amenity trees and manage the built environment to enhance landscape character.
174. The revised Landscape and Visual Impact assessment concludes that there are no significant adverse effects to the landscape character, views or amenity. It considers there will be a negligible adverse impact in the short term, to a neutral effect in the long term to the National Park Landscape Assessment Character type 'Valley Farmlands with Villages' in which the site falls. The impact on the adjacent character area 'Riverside Meadows' would be neutral. The minor adverse impact they identify in the approach from the east along Hope Road is stated would be mitigated by the maturing of the proposed tree planting and hedgerow to the east and south boundary over the long term and the use of natural materials within the built form. (Officer Note – as stated above the suggested condition to secure the use of natural stone instead of light coloured render for the new east facing gable is supported by this finding and would further mitigate the minor adverse impact). The impact on other viewpoints was considered to be neutral and therefore the overall conclusion of the assessment was that the development would result in a neutral effect on the landscape character and visual amenity.
175. The assessment went on to consider the night time environment and concluded the proposed development would result in a neutral effect through the use of sensitive light sources and locations within the development to minimise light spillage. Officers identified external lighting as a strong concern in the previous scheme for its potential polluting impact on both the local landscape setting as well as the Park's dark skies. A condition to submit and agree an appropriately detailed scheme was conditioned last time and is again recommended in this application.
176. Officers consider that the revised external landscape works and additional planting, will

ensure that in long distance views the visual mass of the building would blend with the landscape due to the use of appropriate natural local materials and coloration. However, from close views along the main road, which will be the main viewpoint for the majority, the revised building would still be a prominent introduction into the street scene which would have an adverse impact due to its greater massing and particularly its increased height over the existing building. This impact is lessened by the setting back into the site and would be softened to a larger extent in the revised scheme by the proposed walling and tree planting in the frontage and through the use of natural materials and varied building forms which break up the massing.

177. The reduction in the footprint of the revised building and the lower number of rooms has reduced the associated car parking which in the last scheme left little room for additional planting. Although car parking inevitably still dominates the rear of the site, being to the rear it will be largely be screened from public view. The amended scheme has enabled space for a small increase in the amount of planting and along with trees to the frontage, further tree planting would now help break up and screen the rear car park. A further key difference at the rear is that the lower overall numbers has meant that spaces have now been moved farther away from the neighbour's boundary hedge, helping to reduce the amenity impact. Furthermore the main block of 59 car parking spaces at the rear are proposed to be formed with a ground reinforcing system so they can be fully permeable whilst maintain a grassed appearance to soften and reduce the visual impact of the car park.
178. Whilst the proposed natural drystone boundary walling across the site frontage would match the general Peak District tradition, this immediate area is not generally characterised by boundary walls, especially to the street. Here the boundaries are mainly mixed thorn hedging to all but the largest properties. In the revised scheme the agents have picked up the previous reports suggestion and the amended plans now show the planting of a further hedge behind the boundary wall. Along with the proposed tree planting this landscape treatment to the public frontage would be appropriate and acceptable as it will soften the landscape impact and help the site blend with the local landscape character.
179. The detailed landscape proposals also include protection measures for the existing site boundary which is characterised by generally native hedgerow habitat to the east and rear. To the west the 4m tall evergreen hedge is retained to continue the essential visual screening needed between the hotel grounds and the adjacent neighbour's garden. With some minor amendments the submitted landscaping scheme is generally considered acceptable and therefore a condition requiring submission of full details is suggested for any approval.
180. In conclusion, subject to the aforementioned conditions to control and agree precise details, the visual impact of the smaller and lower hotel building in local views along Hope Road and in the wider landscape especially from key vantage points to the North West and east would now be acceptable. From the southern side and especially along the public road the overall scale and impact of the height upon the street scene would remain clearly visible but would be seen behind and amongst an equally high quality scheme of landscaping. The residual harm to landscape would therefore on balance be small and in any case outweighed by the enhancement and wider economic benefits to the local economy.

Parking and Highway Considerations

181. Plans show that 98 parking spaces will be provided. This figure is 14 spaces higher than the maximum suggested within the Peak District National Park Parking Standards and considered excessive given the reduction in covers by one-third (50 covers). The

amended plans now show the size of the parking bays match the Peak District National Park Parking Standards, with standard bays of 5.0m x 2.5m (rather than the 4.8m x 2.4m previously shown) and with bays for disabled users of the same dimensions, but with 1.2m hatched access/safety zone to the side and rear, as per the existing design layout. A reduction in spaces to 84 in line with PDNPA Transport Officer recommendations would also enable more space for improved planting to further ameliorate the impact of the large majority of the external area being dominated by car parking and can be secured by a condition seeking an amended plan for 84 spaces.

182. The proposal would increase traffic generation to and from the site onto a 50mph section of highway where representation from local residents have continued to highlight concerns about highway safety with some preferring a 30mph limit. The proposal is not sited in a sustainable location and cannot be relocated so is accompanied by a travel plan which has been amended in line with consultation responses to minimise as far as possible dependence upon car access. The proposal includes improvements to pedestrian access from/to the hotel and the bus stop across the road via a new pedestrian refuge in the highway and the in and out arrangements for the access. Officers note however the concern/safety reservation for cyclists expressed in the local representations from the introduction of the proposed refuge and the consequent reduction on the carriageway width which they consider will introduce new safety concerns.
183. The last response from the HA state that the main issue (with the refuge) from a traffic safety point of view is lane width. They go on to say that ideally a pedestrian refuge should not be narrower than 1.5 metres but this would leave sub-standard lane widths if the cycle lane widths were kept as existing and that 3 metre running lanes would leave space for 1 metre cycle lanes. Officers consider that width to be inadequate from a safety point of view and concur with the safety concern expressed in the representations especially as scaling from the plans appears to show even less space available. Further information and comment is being sought from the Highway Authority before Planning Committee to confirm whether officers can confirm support for the refuge. However, given the Highway Authority overall raise no objections provided funding is secured from the developer to pay for the refuge and ensure effective monitoring and review of the travel plan and the extension of the 40mph speed restriction, these remain in the recommendation to be secured via a Section 106 legal agreement.
184. Subject to this legal agreement and suggested conditions covering provision and maintenance of adequate visibility sight lines and prior provision of parking before occupation the development is considered to be acceptable from a traffic and highways perspective.

Environmental Management

The Planning and Design and Access Statements state that the proposed energy efficiency strategy for the hotel will begin with “a “Fabric-First” approach to construction, with responsibly sourced materials specified with low embodied energy, super-insulated beyond the minimum requirements of current Building Regulations and methods incorporated to reduce base demand. Furthermore, highest possible standards of water efficiency will also be sought in line with criteria (E) of Policy CC1. Facilities are to be incorporated into the scheme to encourage recycling and re-use, therefore minimising waste. The energy that is required for heating, cooling and ventilation will be provided by high-efficiency appliances, incorporating renewable and low/zero carbon technologies with controlled emissions and noise outputs”. It goes on to say that “a detailed Low and Zero Carbon Report will be produced prior to construction to assess the most appropriate and economical solutions and which will inform a detailed suite of firm proposals”. This is welcomed and of course the detailed

proposal would need to be submitted and agreed in writing with the Authority via a suitably worded condition along with implementation provisions and verification in order to demonstrate compliance with adopted climate change policy.

185. The DAS goes on to say that the use of public transport and cycles will be encouraged, through provision of the 24 covered cycle parking spaces with workshop and wash-down facilities and the adoption of a travel plan which has been amended to take account of officer comments. These also would need in any approval to be secured by suitably worded conditions suggested above.
186. The DAS goes on to say that water management and conservation strategies would include smart meters and leak detection, flow and temperature restricted efficient sanitary ware within bathrooms and fitted equipment within laundry, kitchen, housekeeping and landscaped areas. Sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) measures are proposed including a proportion of the car park (52 of the 98 spaces) surfaced in permeable “Grasscrete” to reduce the impact visually and on the sewer system. The agents state the area of SUDs drainage ensures there is no increase in drained hard-surfaced area within the site.
187. The agent’s supporting documentation concludes that the above measures will target a reduction in Energy consumption and carbon emissions by 10% compared to the Building Regulations Part L2A, to the economic benefit of the Hotel Operator and benefit of hotel guests, the local, and wider environment. Consequently such measures would meet adopted policy and are acceptable subject to the aforementioned condition.

Archaeological Considerations

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

Ecological Considerations

190. In the previous refused application the PDNPA ecologist raised no objections subject to the inclusion of a condition in any approval to ensure the works are carried out in complete accordance with the recommendations of the submitted ecology report and the Bat Mitigation and Compensation strategy. These identified three trees on the east site boundary as having bat roosting potential and are recommended to be retained. The main Rising Sun building was assessed to have moderate bat roosting potential and two common pipistrelle bat roosts, of single common pipistrelle bats were recorded in the building during the survey work. In order for the work to proceed a European Protected Species Licence will need to be secured. Precautionary measures with respect to nesting birds and reptiles are also recommended.

Neighbour Amenity Considerations

191. Given the relationship to neighbouring properties and the existing lawful use as an hotel, there are no concerns about amenity to the eastern dwellings which lie across a paddock some 120m away with intervening planting on the boundaries. The main likely impacts will be in respect of the immediate neighbour to the west, Rowan Lodge whose garden abuts the site and is separated from it by a mature 4m high coniferous hedge. The dwelling itself is part two storey and single storey. It is set back within the plot to the north west of the existing hotel building and angled so that it is facing SW away from the hotel, some 40m away from the nearest point.
192. The gable end of the current Rising Sun building almost abuts the neighbours hedge but due to its two storey height and 4m high hedge only the roof is visible giving an acceptable minor impact on outlook for the neighbour. In the previous scheme the second floor was clearly visible above the hedge long with certain windows. There would have been some overlooking but at an oblique angle and some distance between windows. In this revised scheme, although the building will still be taller than the existing hotel building the reduced height (from the last refusal) and the fact that it has been moved away from the boundary has significantly reduced the visual impact for the neighbour who would just see the roof and be subject to no overlooking from second floor windows which would impact adversely on his amenity
193. The revised proposal brings with it a larger car park which extends closer to the neighbour as it replaces what was previously a large lawn. The revisions in the amended scheme now rearrange the alignment of the closest spaces in the refused scheme away from the boundary to create a small but better buffer between cars and the boundary hedge. The hedge will prevent any indivisibility but it would not make a significant impact upon noise transmission and in the amended plans and supporting information confirm that a 2m high close boarded fence would be erected along the closest section of boundary to further cut down on noise and screen car headlights to improve amenity. In the last scheme officer's judgment that to mitigate against this potentially harmful noise impact, it would be appropriate for this to be an acoustic fence. A condition requiring submission and agreement of suitable design and detail was suggested then and is still considered necessary for this revised scheme given the proximity of the car park and the potential for disturbance late into the evening. With these changes to the layout the scheme is considered to adequately mitigate against the impact of the development upon the neighbours amenity.
194. With the above mentioned condition, the proposed development would accord with adopted policy and guidance in terms of amenity.

Conclusion

195. There are no objections in principle to a replacement hotel on the site. The revised scheme is a significant improvement in terms of its reduced scale and massing as well as its positioning further back into the site. It would still however be a 3 storey building of a scale and a height that is out of keeping with the established local building tradition and although new landscaping helps, a building like this cannot be accommodated on the site without some harm to the valued characteristics of the Park.
196. The revised building and external landscape works have been designed to a high standard and subject to detailed conditions would now better mitigate against the adverse impacts of the massing and height, in both local and more distant views. Its three storey form would inevitably remain a visually dominant form in the immediate street scene but these views are limited to a short stretch of road. In wider views the overall height would be clearly out of keeping with the scale of traditional buildings in

the locality and wider area but the use of materials and landscaping will mitigate the impact to an acceptable level. Any impact must be judged against the benefits arising from the proposals which can only be achieved with a viable business on the site. On balance, the benefits arising from the redevelopment of the site already discussed above, in terms of enhancement of a derelict site coupled with the benefits to the local communities and economy from the proposal would outweigh the visual harm, given the particular circumstances and site constraints in this scheme.

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

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

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