

6. FULL APPLICATION – DEMOLITION OF FARMHOUSE AND ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING; CONVERSION OF FARM BUILDING TO DWELLING AND ERECTION OF SEPARATE DOUBLE GARAGE, PINEAPPLE HOUSE FARM, BASLOW ROAD, BAKEWELL (NP/DDD/1114/1205, P.4827, 422017/369876, 1/6/2015/KW/CF)

APPLICANT: MR MARK HOLMES

Introduction

A decision on this application was deferred at the meeting of the Authority's Planning Committee in May 2015. Members resolved to defer this item to allow for a site visit and further consultation with the Authority's Built Environment Team. Although Pineapple House Farm is not listed or within a Conservation Area, these issues were raised as the application proposes re-development of a prominent roadside site at one of the main entrances to Bakewell. This report has been updated to include and address the full consultation response from the Authority's Built Environment Team.

Site and Surroundings

Pineapple House Farm is a traditional farmhouse with a complex of traditional and modern farm buildings situated in a prominent roadside position on the south-eastern side of the A619 Bakewell-Baslow road, on the northern edge of Bakewell and about 50m north-east of the former railway bridge over the Monsal Trail.

This is now a redundant farmstead and comprises a traditional farmhouse with nearby detached traditional outbuildings to the north. There are further detached modern farm buildings further to the north of the traditional outbuildings, which are constructed mainly of corrugated sheeting painted black. The property has a fairly extensive garden area to the south-west of the farmhouse.

Vehicular access is via an existing access at the northern end of the farm complex immediately to the north of the traditional detached outbuilding. In addition to the footpath which passes alongside the roadside frontage of the farm complex, there is a further public footpath, which passes through the nearby fields on the higher ground 185m to the east.

The existing farmhouse is presently vacant, is in a poor structural condition, and has a neglected appearance. It has been the subject of inappropriate additions and alterations in the past. The farmhouse is set back 13m from the roadside boundary and its main south-west facing elevation is situated at right-angles to the road. It is constructed of natural random-coursed limestone with smooth-rendered walls on the prominent roadside elevations under a modern concrete tile roof. There is an untraditional two-storey flat-roofed, rendered extension attached to the rear and the original window frames and doors have been replaced with inappropriate pvc window frames.

There is a detached traditional single-storey farm outbuilding situated 4.5m to the north of the farmhouse, which is constructed of natural random-coursed limestone under a natural blue slate roof. The north-west facing gable of this outbuilding abuts the roadside boundary and its main frontage is situated at right-angles to the road. Attached to the external corner of the outbuilding is a smaller stone outbuilding. There are also some small corrugated/brick structures situated within the external corner between the two traditional outbuildings and also a modern concrete structure situated within the internal corner between the two buildings.

These traditional outbuildings are in a reasonable structural condition, however demolition and rebuilding works of the south-west and south-east walls are required. The traditional outbuildings are considered to be 'valued vernacular' in terms of the Authority's Core Strategy policy HC1 C I, however, their appearance is currently marred by the unsympathetic alterations and additions. About 15m north of the traditional outbuildings is an untraditional two-storey farm building

constructed of black-painted corrugated sheeting. There is another smaller single-storey corrugated sheet building attached to its north-west, roadside-facing gable.

Proposals

The submitted application proposes a package of proposals which comprise three elements, namely:

1. Demolition of the existing farmhouse and erection of a replacement dwelling.

The replacement dwelling is to be repositioned towards the centre of the site curtilage about 11.5m to the south of the traditional outbuilding and re-orientated at right-angles to the original dwelling position so that its main frontage faces the main road. The dwelling is to be linked to the corner of the outbuilding with a 1.8m high limestone boundary wall to visually reinforce and maintain the relationship between the two buildings.

The scheme proposes a traditional double-fronted dwelling design flanked by a 1½-storey side extension on its southern side and a single-storey double garage on its northern side. A lean-to conservatory is proposed on the screened rear elevation. The dwelling is to be clad with natural random-coursed limestone with natural gritstone quoinwork and window door surrounds. The roof is to be clad with natural gritstone slates.

The gable width of the main central dwelling is 6.65m and the ridge height is 7.4m. This is slightly larger than the existing dwelling, which has a gable width of 6.65m and a ridge height of 7.05m. The frontage length of the main central dwelling (10.1m) is also slightly larger than that of the original dwelling (9.6m).

In respect of the external footprint of the main two-storey element of the proposed dwelling (excluding the double garage), the footprint of the proposed dwelling (14.4m x 6.65m) is only marginally bigger than the original farmhouse (14.4m x 5.7m) if the south-eastern single-storey addition, which appears on earlier maps is included, but has since been demolished. If the garage and conservatory elements are included in the total external footprint is 164m². The external footprint of the existing dwelling, including The later rear extension, porch and the now demolished lean-to building is 95m². This represents an increase of 72%. If the garage element is omitted the increase in external footprint size is 28%.

In terms of volume, the replacement dwelling is 74% bigger than the original dwelling (including the double garage). If the double garage element is omitted the replacement dwelling is 36% bigger than the original dwelling.

Vehicular parking/manoeuvring for the proposed replacement dwelling is proposed in a screened courtyard area behind the 1.8m high link wall proposed between the house and the converted barn.

2. Conversion of the detached traditional outbuilding to a separate open-market dwelling

This proposal relates to the existing detached traditional single-storey farm outbuilding and the smaller outbuilding attached to its external corner. Proposed are the removal of all the later inappropriate structures and the erection of a contemporary extension linking the main building to the smaller outbuilding. The contemporary linking extension is designed to retain the separate roof forms of the two buildings thus maintaining their individual character and architectural integrity.

The link extension has a relatively small footprint (4.5m x 4.3m) and in order to emphasise that this is a later addition, it has a contemporary flat-roofed form clad in lead, with the walls clad with a combination of full-length glazing and ashlar limestone.

The scheme requires only one new opening in the main barn; however, some door openings are to be restored, back to their original form and appearance. Two conservation rooflights are proposed in the south-west facing roofslope of the main barn. The accompanying structural report has concluded that the south elevation of the main barn and the eastern elevation of the smaller outbuilding need to be demolished and re-built.

A small extension is proposed to the northern end of the smaller outbuilding on the footprint of a walled enclosure.

Demolition of the two modern farm buildings at the north-eastern end of the farm complex and replacement with a 1½-storey double garage building.

The existing modern barns are constructed of black-painted corrugated sheeting and the two buildings have an overall building footprint of 15.0m x 4.9m. The replacement garage building has a footprint of 11.35m x 6.65m. The overall eaves/ridge heights of the proposed garage building are slightly lower than the existing larger modern farm building. The garage building and first floor ancillary accommodation proposed within the roofspace is to be used in connection with the converted farm outbuilding.

It is to be constructed of natural limestone walling under a natural blue slate roof. The garage door openings are to be provided with natural gritstone segmented arches and the external corners and the first floor door opening proposed in the west (roadside-facing) elevation are to be provided with natural gritstone quoinwork.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- 1. 3 year implementation time limit**
- 2. The development shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with the submitted plans.**
- 3. Existing corrugated tin sheet buildings and later additions to the detached barn to be demolished and removed from the site prior to the commencement of the barn conversion works.**
- 4. Reposition window opening to the wc in East Elevation of the barn conversion**
- 5. Remove permitted development rights for extensions, alterations and outbuildings, porches, walls, fences, satellite dishes and solar panels.**
- 6. Submit and agree hard and soft landscaping scheme.**
- 7. Restrict domestic curtilage to be limited to area edged red on original submitted 1:500 scale block plan.**
- 8. Submit and agree any details of spoil removal arising from the demolition works.**
- 9. Replacement dwelling to be set into the sloping ground levels. Submit and agree plans showing the proposed ground levels.**
- 10. Development to be built to a minimum of Code Level for Sustainable Homes required of RSLs.**

11. **Design Stage Assessment and Interim Code certificate to be submitted and agreed before work commences**
12. **Prior to first occupation copy of summary score sheet and Post Construction Review Certificate to be submitted.**
13. **All stonework to be in random-coursed natural limestone. Sample panel to be agreed.**
14. **Roofs to replacement dwelling to be clad in natural local gritstone slates laid in diminishing courses towards the ridge. Sample to be submitted and agreed.**
15. **Roofs to the converted barn (except for the contemporary flat-roofed extension) and the new garage building serving the converted barn to be clad in natural blue slate.**
16. **Submit and agree sample of roof cladding and fascia for the contemporary extension to the converted barn.**
17. **Dressed natural gritstone voussoirs, quoinwork, lintels, sill and surrounds to window and door openings where shown on the approved plans.**
18. **Timber vertical sliding sash window frames to all window openings in the rebuilt dwelling.**
19. **Timber doors and timber window and door frames (including conservatory).**
20. **Prior the occupation of either of the two dwellings, the existing access to be modified in accordance with the submitted plan and provided with a 2.4m x 63m visibility splay in the north-eastern direction and a 2.4m x 61m visibility splay in the south-western direction with these splays maintained in perpetuity.**
21. **Parking and manoeuvring spaces (including garaging) to be provided and maintained.**
22. **Any new service lines to the property to be underground.**
23. **Foul water to be dealt with by a package treatment plant in the location shown on approved plans. Submit and agree details of disposal of foul and surface waters.**
24. **Minor Design Details.**
25. **Retain existing trees.**
26. **Submit and agree details of appropriate Environment Management measures, including details of the ‘built-in’ solar slate/panels on the new garage building for the barn conversion.**
27. **Submit and agree details of external lighting.**
28. **Ecological mitigation and enhancement conditions.**

Key Issues

Two key issues arising from the deferral of this application are (i) to what extent the existing house and associated group of buildings at Pineapple House Farm should be regarded as non-

designated heritage assets and (ii) to what extent the current development proposals would conserve or enhance the significance of the existing buildings. A full assessment of these issues are contained within the analysis of the following key issues in the subsequent sections of this report:

1. Whether the principle, physical design aspects and landscape impacts of the proposed replacement dwelling comply with Local Plan policy LH5.
2. Whether the principle of the open-market barn conversion complies with Core strategy policy HC1 C I.
3. Landscape and visual impact and design issues.
4. Environmental Management.
5. Ecological Issues.
6. Access and Parking.

History

July 1949 – Detailed consent granted for the erection of a two-storey rear flat-roofed extension.

October 1953 – Detailed consent granted for a concrete extension within the internal corner of the two traditional farm outbuildings.

October 2014 – Pre-application discussions with the applicant who was advised by officers that the principle of the replacement of the existing dwelling was acceptable, given its poor structural condition and the unfortunate alterations and additions that had compromised its character and integrity. The applicant was also advised that the re-orientation and repositioning of the dwelling was also considered to be acceptable.

The applicant was also advised that the existing traditional farm outbuildings were of vernacular merit and their setting and appearance were currently marred by later additions and the adjacent black tin hay barn. Consequently, the applicant was advised that the principle of the conversion of the traditional outbuildings to an open-market dwelling met the terms of Core Strategy policy HC1 C I as it comprised the conservation and enhancement of a valued vernacular building. The removal of the inappropriate modern black tin buildings and replacement with the proposed stone garage building was also considered by officers to represent a significant enhancement of the existing traditional building complex and site.

Consultations:

Highway Authority – no highway objections, subject to conditions requiring modification of the existing access; provision and maintenance of visibility splays and provision and maintenance vehicle parking and manoeuvring facilities prior to the occupation of the dwellings.

District Council – No reply to date.

Town Council – recommend acceptance of the proposal on grounds that the design and appearance along with the layout and density of the buildings appears appropriate.

Natural England – No objections in respect of any impacts upon statutory nature conservation sites within the vicinity of the application site. In respect of protected species the proposal should be determined in accordance with Natural England's Standing Advice. The application may also provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife. The

application may also provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding and natural and built environment and use natural resources more sustainably.

National Park Authority's Historic Buildings Officer – In the first instance says that although the property is not in Bakewell Conservation Area and not listable, the existing house and outbuildings form a very visible feature on leaving the town in the Baslow direction, providing in effect the final piece of built environment on this side of the town. For that reason alone it is an important site. The first edition ordinance survey map shows the house and outbuilding (named Pineapple House) largely as they are now (apart from the metal barn to the north).

Consequently, a more thorough assessment of the site history and potential historical significance of the buildings are required. This should have been submitted with the application and in the absence of such information, the application should not be determined.

The Historic Buildings Officer goes on to say that the proposal raises several design concerns as follows:

- The existing house is of traditional, vernacular character. It has suffered badly through inappropriate extensions and alterations (and structural problems) but not to the extent that it justifies demolition. The stone outbuilding (former byre) also retains historic character and interest despite poor alterations and extensions. Both buildings relate well to each other and to the site.
- The proposed replacement house is a poor pastiche design whose plan form bears no relation to the local tradition – e.g. rooms on the main architectural front are service rooms rather than main living spaces. The elevations are also poor pastiche with a confusion in massing terms where the side extensions and the conservatory attach themselves to the main building.
- In terms of detailing, improvement is needed generally. The main concerns at present are the NE elevation with its two garage doors beneath a ridged gable is very untraditional in appearance – there is virtually no solid walling in this side of the extension. The conservatory has an unfortunate shallower roof pitch than the house roofs (a consequence of its over-deep plan) and the duality of its two sets of entrance doors either side of a central flue makes for a weak design.
- The new house faces north west, rather than the more traditional south west aspect it presently has. On a site where it can assume any orientation this is perverse. In reality the new house is presenting a rear elevation to the road but it hasn't been detailed as such. Instead we have what looks like a main elevation facing a direction where traditionally few openings would have been present.
- Its separation from the outbuilding is also regrettable in terms of maintaining a farmstead character, as is the formation of a separate garden area for the outbuilding conversion. The proposed 1.8m walls visually reinforce that separation.
- Several aspects of the proposed conversion of the outbuilding are unfortunate. Primarily the flat-roofed, corner extension with its extremely poor detailing and the visually unresolved relationship of large areas of glazing with solid walls alongside. Secondly, the extension of the presently independent, small single-bay building northwards compromising its original character. Thirdly the poor detailing generally of the new openings and rooflights. Just one example: the placing of the new wc window in the northern extension of the single bay outbuilding is far too close to the corner rather than central in its wall.

- Setting aside the unfortunate proposed duplication of double garages on the site, the proposed new garage north of the outbuilding is visually unfortunate. It will be higher than the original outbuilding and therefore more dominant. The arched openings do not relate to anything else on site. Retaining and repairing the black Dutch barn and adapting that for garage use would retain very much more of the farmstead character and the site's distinctiveness, and also not confuse the historic development of the site with a new stone building.

The alternative approach of restoring/repairing the farmhouse, replacing the rear extension with a more appropriate single storey extension which could also provide a link to the outbuilding for use as a further extension or ancillary space would offer much better conservation of both the character of the existing buildings and the site generally. If approved as proposed, the site will not be worth looking at. The development will detract from rather than enhance the site, and the exit to the town.

National Park Authority's Ecologist – Initially raised concerns that the further emergency/re-entry surveys for bats recommended in the accompanying bat survey report had not been carried out. The application should not, therefore be determined until these surveys have been carried out and suitable mitigation/compensation measures have been submitted and agreed. These emergency/re-entry surveys have to be carried out during the active breeding season i.e. between May – September.

Main Policies

Relevant Core Strategy policies include: DS1, HC1, GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, L1, L2, L3, CC1 and T7

Relevant Local Plan policies include: LC4, LC8, LC17, LH5, LT11 and LT18

The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered to be a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date.

In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies in the Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001. Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, HC1, L1 and L3 in the Authority's Core Strategy (CS) and saved Local Plan policy LC4 provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is also considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the Framework with regard to the issues that are raised.

Of particular note is the fact that the Framework says local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as where such development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting, for example, which are essentially the same criteria that are set out in CS Policy HC1.

Along with the need to give great weight to considerations for the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage, paragraph 115 of the Framework also confirms the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty, reflecting primary legislation. It points out (footnote 25) that further guidance and information, including explanation of statutory purposes, is provided in the English National Parks and the Broads Vision and Circular 2010".

The provisions of paragraph 115 of the Framework is consistent with the wider range of design and conservation policies including CS Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1 and L3 and saved Local Plan policy LC4. The policies are also consistent with the core planning principles set out in the Framework that require high standards of design sensitive to local distinctiveness.

CS policy GSP1 states, amongst other things, where national park purposes can be secured, opportunities must be taken to contribute to the sustainable development of the area. Policy GSP2 states opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon and opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings.

CS policy GSP2 also states that, when development is permitted, a design will be sought that respects the character of the area, and where appropriate, landscaping and planting schemes will be sought that are consistent with local landscape characteristics and their setting, complimenting the locality and helping to achieve biodiversity objectives.

CS policy GSP3 states amongst other things that development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings that are subject to the development proposal. Particular attention will be paid to, amongst other things, impact on the character and setting of buildings; scale of development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park; design in accordance with the National park authority design guide; form and intensity of proposed use or activity; impact on living conditions of communities; impact on access and traffic levels, use of sustainable modes of transport.

CS policy L1 states that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan and other valued characteristics. CS policy L3 requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or other historic assets and their settings.

Saved Local Plan policy LC4 states that where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, conserves and where possible it enhances the landscape, built environment and other valued characteristics of the area. Particular attention will be paid to, amongst other things, the amenity, privacy and security of the development and of nearby properties.

Assessment

Introduction

This submitted scheme comprises a package of proposals designed to conserve and enhance the Pineapple House Farm complex and its setting. The traditional buildings within the complex, including the farmhouse, are presently in a neglected state and in a poor structural condition and have been subjected to a series of unfortunate alterations and additions that have severely compromised the character, setting and architectural integrity of the original traditional building group.

The submitted scheme comprised three elements, namely:

1. Demolition of the traditional farmhouse and erection of a replacement dwelling;
2. Conversion and extension of the adjacent detached traditional outbuildings to an open-market dwelling and;
3. Demolition of the modern black tin farm buildings and replacement with a 1½ - storey garage building with ancillary residential accommodation on the first floor.

Whilst the some of the Core Strategy and Local Plan policies are applicable to the principle of all the elements of the proposed scheme, some aspects of the proposals involve the application of

specific Core Strategy and Local Plan policies. The three elements of the scheme are therefore assessed separately in the following sections of this report.

Issue 1 - Whether the principle, physical design aspects and landscape impacts of the proposed replacement dwelling comply with Local Plan policy LH5.

In accordance with CS policies GSP1 and GSP2, Local Plan policy LH5 specifically permits the replacement of unlisted dwellings, provided that the proposals meet all the policy's five criteria, which are as follows:

- i. the replacement contributes to the character or appearance of the area;
- ii. it is not preferable to repair the existing dwelling;
- iii. the proposed dwelling will be a similar size to the dwelling it will replace;
- iv. it will not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties;
- v. it will not be more intrusive in the landscape, either through increased building mass or the greater activity created.

Policy LH5 also sets out clearly that a replacement dwelling will only be permitted where it is not preferable to repair the existing dwelling.

In this case, the original farmhouse has been the subject of an inappropriate rear extensions and unfortunate alterations, which detract from its character and appearance. The original farmhouse now has an unkempt appearance and, together with the attached extension, is in need of significant repair and refurbishment. An accompanying structural report has also concluded that substantial repairs will be required to the dwelling structure, including significant underpinning works to the foundations and strengthening works to the floors and roof. The existing porch requires complete demolition and several of the stone lintels are in need of replacement.

The overall effect is of a farmhouse which has a 'tired' and unkempt appearance that would require significant repair and refurbishment. The attached extension to the rear of the farmhouse is of an inappropriate design, form and materials that detract from the original character of the farm group. Officers consider, therefore, that it would clearly not be preferable to repair and retain the existing dwelling due to its present appearance, its poor structural condition and the unsympathetic additions. In its current condition, it is difficult to recognise the existing farm house has such significance that it would be preferable to keep the existing building.

Notwithstanding this view, the Authority's Historic Buildings Officer has been consulted since the last meeting of the Authority's Planning Committee and he has strong concerns about the proposal (see Consultations section above). He considers that no proper assessment of the historical significance of the buildings has been carried and there is insufficient justification for the demolition of the existing farmhouse. Officers have carefully considered the concerns raised by the Historic Buildings Officer, but remain satisfied with their initial view that the present farmhouse is in such a poor state of repair and appearance that it would not be preferable to repair and retain the existing dwelling. Based on this premise your officers consider it reasonable to accept an alternative dwelling design approach and redevelopment of the site.

It is therefore considered that the site represents an opportunity for enhancement both in building and landscape terms, by an appropriate redevelopment of the site. The principle of a replacement dwelling is therefore considered to meet criterion (ii) of saved Local Plan policy LH5 and the strategic objectives of CS policies GSP1 and GSP2 that require opportunities to be taken to conserve and enhance the National Park.

In terms of an appropriate redevelopment of the original farmhouse, criterion (iii) of policy LH5 requires that the replacement dwelling is of a similar size to the dwelling it will replace. This aspect of the policy uses the phrase 'similar size' as a parameter to control the size of replacement dwellings to protect the landscape, instead of a simple like for like floor space or volume calculation. This enables a degree of flexibility necessary to both achieve enhancement of the National Park and to allow the scale of a replacement dwelling to respond to what is appropriate for any particular site and its setting.

Whilst this consideration cannot be divorced from landscape impact it does need to be satisfied if the scheme is to be judged as policy compliant. The existing dwelling (as extended) has a footprint of 95.5sqm, if a south-eastern building addition, now demolished, is included. The main two-storey element of the replacement dwelling (excluding the proposed garage) has a footprint area of 118.7sqm. In footprint terms, therefore, the replacement dwelling only slightly exceeds the original dwelling footprint (as subsequently extended) by 23.2sqm, that is, around a 24% increase. There is also a small amount of additional floorspace proposed within the first floor of the attached double garage building; however, as the garage itself does not count as habitable floorspace it has been excluded from the dwelling footprint floorspace comparisons.

Footprint must also be considered alongside other measures of size such as volumes, and volume is a particularly useful measure as this more closely represents the scale and massing of a proposal and is therefore more indicative of how these relate to the local building traditional and potential impact on the surroundings.

In this case the original dwelling, including the now demolished lean-to addition and the later flat-roofed addition has a volume of around 462 cubic metres. The replacement house (excluding double garage) has an above ground volume of 630 cubic metres which equates to a 36% increase in the size of the existing dwelling accommodation. This would therefore exceed the normally accepted allowance of 25% on top of the original dwelling which is the guideline volume given in the Local Plan for domestic extensions.

However, some of this volume increase is taken up by the increase in gable widths from 5.6m to 6.5m, together with the resultant increases in the volumes of the roofs. Notwithstanding these footprint and volume increases, it is considered that the overall massing and form of the rebuilt dwelling follows closely enough the character and form of the original dwelling as extended.

In this case, it is considered that the form, proportions and appearance of the main two-storey dwelling has been improved and enhanced by the use of natural limestone walling throughout and the use of natural gritstone roofing slates. The side extension is set 2.25m back from the main house frontage and has a significantly lower eaves height such that, together with the proposed double garage attached to the other gable, they read as subsidiary buildings to the main farmhouse, when viewed from the main roadside viewpoint. It is therefore considered that the replacement dwelling size, as proposed is within acceptable parameters.

Moreover, it is considered, that the phrase 'similar size' in this part of policy LH5 enables a degree of flexibility necessary to both achieve enhancement of the Park and to allow the scale of a replacement dwelling to respond to what is appropriate for any particular site and its setting. So in this case, whilst the replacement dwelling would be larger than the existing, it is considered that its acceptability depends upon whether the proposals would contribute to the character of the area or offer up other planning gain that would outweigh any concerns about the increase in size.

Clause (i) in policy LH5 requires that the replacement dwelling must contribute to the character and appearance of the area and clause (v) states that it should not be more intrusive in the landscape either through increased building mass or the greater activity created. In this case, given the flexibility offered up in clause (iii) in terms of the dwelling being of a 'similar' rather than

the same size as the dwelling to be replaced, officers consider that a slightly larger dwelling could be accommodated on this site without necessarily causing harm to the landscape.

The main change in respect of the replacement dwelling is its repositioning further southwards along the site than the present dwelling and also its reorientation through 90°, so that its main frontage elevation faces towards the road, rather than facing southwards down the site. Officers were initially concerned about the degree of separation of the house from the adjacent traditional farm outbuildings. Following pre-application discussions the proposed replacement dwelling has been re-sited closer to the traditional outbuildings and the nearest double garage element is now 11m away from the outbuildings.

The relationship between the buildings is to be further strengthened through the erection of a 1.8m high link wall. The reorientation of the dwelling through 90° will make the main dwelling frontage and footprint more visible from the adjacent road; however, the dwelling is set within a fairly extensive residential curtilage and will be of a much improved design and appearance. Consequently it is considered that the repositioning and reorientation of the dwelling are acceptable and the proposed dwelling is sufficiently close to the adjacent traditional outbuildings for them to still 'read' as a coherent building complex.

The Authority's Historic Building Officer disagrees with this approach; however, officers still maintain that the provision of the link wall will visually strengthen the relationship between the two buildings. In these respects, it is considered that the form, character and integrity of the original courtyard complex will be retained and enhanced through the use of traditional materials and improvements to the proportions and detailing, particularly in respect of the original farmhouse and its inappropriate additions.

In respect of the design concept of the dwelling, this is based on the double-fronted form of the existing building, but with a subsidiary side extension attached to its south gable. A double garage building is to be attached to the northern gable and there is also a lean-to conservatory situated in a fairly screened position to the rear of the main dwelling. The erection of the replacement dwelling enables an improved design and detailing and the use of natural roofing/walling material throughout, together with the introduction of full natural gritstone surrounds to the majority of the door and window openings and natural gritstone quoinwork to all external corners. A further significant enhancement is the use of natural gritstone roofing slates on all roofs of the proposed replacement dwelling, including the double garage building.

The Authority's Historic Building officer raises concerns about the positioning of the garage doors within the gable elevation of the garage building. Officers acknowledge that it is more appropriate to position the garage doors beneath the eaves of the building. In this case, the dwelling design approach is to have all the roofs of the subsidiary building elements, including the garage following the ridge line of the main dwelling. Given that the gable elevation of the garage building is adjacent the vehicle parking area and is largely screened by the 1.8m high link wall it is considered that the provision of the garage doors within the gable wall is appropriate in this case.

Overall, and notwithstanding the strong concerns raised by the Authority's Historic Buildings Officer, officers still consider that the replacement dwelling scheme is appropriate in terms of its repositioning and reorientation within the site. The proposed design, massing and detailing and also represents a significant enhancement of the site and the landscape. It should also be noted that the scheme has evolved through detailed pre-application discussions with the Authority's officers and closely follows a 'design brief' agreed by officers prior to submission.

Consequently, it is considered that the proposed replacement dwelling would contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area and would not be more intrusive in the landscape and therefore the proposals, as amended comply with criteria (i) and (v) of LH5. It is otherwise considered that the proposal meets criteria (iv) of policy LH5 (and policy LC4) as, due

to the isolated position of the property, there will be no impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

It is therefore concluded that this proposal meets the specific criteria of LH5 and accords with the strategic objectives of CS policies GSP1 and GSP2 alongside the wider range of design and conservation policies in the Development Plan and national planning policies in the Framework. Accordingly, officers are recommending the proposed demolition and replacement of the original farmhouse at Pineapple House Farm for conditional approval.

In this case, if planning permission is granted, conditions securing compliance with the submitted plans and minor design details would be recommended to ensure that the proposal robustly complies with the detailed design requirements of policies LC4 and GSP3. It is also considered that as permission would be granted for a replacement dwelling to achieve the conservation and enhancement of the site and its surrounding, and taking into account the prominent roadside position of the development at an important gateway into Bakewell's town centre; exceptional circumstances exist that warrant imposing a condition removing permitted development rights for extensions, alterations, extensions, porches, walls, fences, satellite dishes and solar panels.

Issue 2 - Whether the principle of the open-market barn conversion complies with Core Strategy policy HC1 C I.

For the purposes of the Development Plan, the Pineapple House Farm complex is situated just outside the physical confines of Bakewell, but immediately on the northern edge of the town, which is clearly defined at this point by the former railway line (Monsal Trail), which passes underneath the Bakewell – Baslow road. The farm complex, including the traditional barns, occupies a prominent roadside position. Although the complex is situated on the edge of the town, it is classed as being within open countryside in policy terms.

In this case, the proposed dwelling house conversion is intended to meet general demand rather than any functional need or local need. Therefore, the special circumstances in which permission could be granted for the current application are set out in CS Policy HC1 which says that in accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2 of the Core Strategy, exceptionally, new housing (whether newly built or from re-use of an existing building) can be accepted where it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings.

Saved Local Plan policy LC8 otherwise sets out specific criteria to assess these proposals stating that the conversion of a building of historic or vernacular merit to a use other than for which it was designed will be permitted provided that it can accommodate the new use without changes that would adversely affect its character. Such changes include significant enlargement or other alteration to form and mass, inappropriate new window spacings or doorways, and major rebuilding. Policy LC8 also requires that such traditional building conversion schemes should not lead to changes to the building's curtilage or require new access or services that would adversely affect its character or have an adverse impact on its surroundings.

In this case, the existing traditional barns comprise the main barn, which is situated at right-angles to the main road and a smaller outbuilding at the eastern end attached to its external corner, forming an 'L' plan layout. These buildings are constructed of natural random-coursed limestone under a natural blue slate roof. The north-west facing gable of the main barn abuts the roadside boundary. There are also some small corrugated/brick structures situated within the external corner between the two traditional outbuildings and also a modern concrete structure situated within the internal corner between the two buildings.

These traditional outbuildings are in a reasonable structural condition, however demolition and rebuilding works of the south-west and south-east walls are required. The traditional outbuildings are considered to be 'valued vernacular' in terms of the Authority's Core Strategy policy HC1 C I, however, their appearance is currently marred by the unsympathetic alterations and additions.

Given their prominent position adjacent to one of the main road entrances into the town, it is considered that they require an appropriate use that will ensure their retention and future upkeep.

The submitted scheme relates to the existing detached traditional single-storey farm outbuilding and the smaller outbuilding attached to its external corner. Proposed are the removal of all the later inappropriate structures, a small extension to one of the existing buildings and the erection of a contemporary extension linking the main building to the smaller outbuilding. The contemporary link extension is designed to retain the separate roof forms of the two buildings thus maintaining their individual character and architectural integrity.

The link extension has a relatively small footprint (4.5m x 4.3m) and in order to emphasise that this is a later addition, it has a contemporary flat-roofed form clad in lead, with the walls clad with a combination of full-length glazing and ashlar limestone. A small extension is proposed to the northern end of the smaller outbuilding on the footprint of a walled enclosure.

The Authority's Historic Buildings Officer considers that the design of the contemporary corner extension is unfortunate in terms of visually unresolved relationship of large areas of glazing with solid walls alongside. He is also concerned about the extension of the small single-bay building northwards compromising its original character. The positioning of a window close to the external corner of this extension is also a cause for concern.

Notwithstanding the design concerns raised, the contemporary flat-roofed link building was suggested by the planning officer in order to retain the individual character of the two outbuildings, which would be lost if a conventional pitched roof was employed. The simple combinations of full-length stonework and glazing is designed to reflect the simple outbuilding character in a contemporary form and similar design approaches to this have been accepted elsewhere in the National Park, with at least one example shown in the Authority's design guide.

The additional small extension to the existing buildings is also considered to be acceptable and is to be built so that the vertical line indicating the present extent of the building can be 'read' in the stonework. The comments relating to the positioning of the new toilet window in the extended section are acknowledged and can be addressed through the attaching of a planning condition repositioning this more centrally within the extended section.

The scheme requires only one new opening in the main barn; however, some door openings in the demolished and rebuilt south-west wall are to be restored, back to their original form and appearance. Two conservation rooflights are proposed in the south-west facing roofslope of the main barn. The accompanying structural report has concluded that the south-western elevation of the main barn and the south-eastern elevation of the smaller outbuilding need to be demolished and re-built. Notwithstanding the views of the Authority's Historic Buildings officer it is considered that the window/door detailing and number and disposition of rooflights are acceptable.

Whilst the need for rebuilding of two of the walls of the traditional barns is unfortunate, it is considered that this amount of rebuilding is acceptable and provided that they are faithfully restored back to their original appearance, this will incorporate some enhancements to these elevations which have been the subject of later alterations.

Overall, it is therefore considered that the submitted scheme serves to conserve and enhance the original traditional buildings and their setting. The conversion of the traditional barns to a single open-market dwelling is, therefore, considered to be compliant with Core Strategy policy HC1 C I as it is a sympathetic scheme which facilitates the conservation and enhancement of a 'valued vernacular' building and its setting.

However, the submitted barn conversion scheme also includes the demolition of the two modern farm buildings at the north-eastern end of the farm complex and replacement with a 1½-storey

double garage building. The existing buildings are visible from the road and are constructed of corrugated tin sheeting painted black. Due to their proximity to the traditional barns these buildings detract from the character and setting of the traditional buildings.

The original submitted scheme proposed the demolition of these buildings and their replacement on a similar footprint with a stone-built, 1½-storey double garage building. The overall eaves/ridge heights of the proposed garage building are slightly lower than the existing larger modern farm building. First floor ancillary accommodation was proposed within the roofspace, which is to be used in connection with the converted barn.

The proposed garage building was to be constructed of natural limestone walling under a natural blue slate roof. The garage door openings are to be provided with natural gritstone segmented arches and the external corners and the first floor door opening proposed in the west (roadside-facing) elevation are to be provided with natural gritstone quoinwork. Officers consider that the proposed replacement garage building would enhance and compliment the setting of the adjacent traditional barns and reflects a similar approach to garaging recommended in both the Authority's Building Design Guide and the more recent Design Guide.

Following consultation with the Authority's Historic Buildings officer, however, he considers that the proposed new garage north of the outbuilding will be visually unfortunate. This is because it will be higher than the original outbuilding and therefore more dominant. Furthermore, the arched openings do not relate to anything else on site. The Authority's Historic Building Officer considers that retaining and repairing the black Dutch barn and adapting that for garage use would retain very much more of the farmstead character and the site's distinctiveness, and would not confuse the historic development of the site with a new stone building.

The applicant has considered the issues raised by the Authority's Historic Building Officer and has confirmed that he wishes to continue to seek approval of the proposed new garage. In common with the original report, officers remain of the view that the existing corrugated sheet buildings are not worthy of retention and the proposed garage would be an appropriate replacement that would serve to conserve and enhance the site and its setting. In these respects, officers consider the proposed barn conversion and the new garage meet the requirements of policy HC1 when taken together because the development proposals are required for enhancement purposes and accord with the strategic objectives of CS GSP1 and GSP2, which require opportunities to enhance the National Park to be taken. Accordingly, officers consider that a recommendation of conditional approval for these proposals is justified.

As with the replacement dwelling discussed earlier in this report, if planning permission is granted for the proposed conversion and garage, conditions securing compliance with the submitted plans and minor design details would be recommended to ensure that the proposals robustly comply with the detailed design requirements of policies LC4 and GSP3. It is also considered that as permission would be granted for a new dwelling to achieve the conservation and enhancement of the site and its surroundings, and again, taking into account the prominent roadside position of the development at an important gateway into Bakewell's town centre; exceptional circumstances exist that warrant imposing a condition removing permitted development rights from the converted barn for extensions, alterations, extensions, porches, walls, fences, satellite dishes and solar panels.

However, it is also acknowledged that whilst the three proposals are considered to be acceptable on their own individual planning merits the proposed conversion and new building garage along with the proposals for demolition and replacement of the original farmhouse constitute a substantial re-development of the site and it is important to consider the cumulative impacts of the three proposals and the extent to which the proposals would affect the significance of a non-designated heritage asset.

Issue 3 - Landscape and visual impact and design issues.

As noted throughout this report, the Pineapple House farm complex occupies a prominent roadside position adjacent to one of the main approach roads into Bakewell. The whole complex is presently in a neglected state and the character appearance and settings all the traditional buildings have been marred by later alterations, unfortunate additions and new detached modern farm buildings.

Notwithstanding that the existing farmhouse is in a poor structural condition, which justifies its demolition and replacement, it is considered that the erection of the replacement dwelling in its revised position, together with the retention and sympathetic conversion of the existing traditional barns will enable the comprehensive enhancement of the site and the locality in compliance with the wide range of design and conservation policies in the Development Plan and national planning policies that are relevant to this application and set out in the above sections of this report.

It is also considered that the significance of the group of buildings at Pineapple House Farm buildings may arise from the historic pattern of development of the site, but it is difficult to agree that the farmhouse in its current condition has such significant architectural merit that it may be described as a valued vernacular building. Repairing the original farmhouse may help it appear more traditional, and improve its character but it is difficult to see how this would be a preferred option not least in terms of viability if an appropriate replacement dwelling can be achieved that would contribute more positively to the landscape setting of Pineapple House Farm.

Equally, the stone-built buildings are hardly recognisable as non-designated heritage assets in their current condition and it is clear that the impetus of open market values arising from their conversion to a new open market dwelling is required to restore these buildings so they can be better appreciated. The impetus of open market values would also help to secure the replacement of the corrugated sheeted buildings at the rear of the site, which do not contribute positively to the site and its surroundings.

Moreover, it is considered that the layout of the site is not an especially fine example of a traditional farmstead that warrants retaining in its current form even though the relationship between the outbuildings and the farmhouse may have been long established. The corrugated sheeted buildings at the rear of the site are not otherwise of any significant historic or architectural interest in their own right.

It is therefore concluded that the proposed re-development would have a significant visual impact and the redevelopment of the site as proposed will not necessarily reflect the historic pattern of development at Pineapple House Farm but officers remain of the view that the current proposals are of an appropriate design and will therefore conserve and enhance the site and its landscape setting despite the Authority's Historic Building Officer's firmly stated views. This view is consistent with pre-application advice offered by officers but with the benefit of hindsight officers may agree that the Authority's Historic Building Officer's input would have been useful at a much earlier stage and there are some points made by the Authority's Historic Building Officer's that could further improve the design quality of the proposed development.

However, although he is considering some minor changes to the scheme, the applicant requires the application to be determined as submitted, and on this basis, officers are recommending conditional approval of the current application.

Issue 4 - Environmental Management.

Core Strategy policy CC1 states that all development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources, must take account of the energy hierarchy and must achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water

efficiency. A minimum sustainability standard equivalent to that required by the government of affordable housing shall be achieved unless it can be demonstrated that this is not viable.

As required by the SPD a condition requiring the development to be built to a minimum of Code Level 3 (the current level required of Registered Social Landlords) is considered to be necessary and reasonable.

The current submission proposes a range of environmental management measures in order to reduce carbon emissions, where these can be accommodated without compromising the architectural integrity of the scheme. These measures include the following:

- South-facing roofslope of the proposed garage building to be clad with ‘built-in’ solar slate/panels for the generation of ‘green’ electricity.
- Sustainable surface water drainage systems.
- The use of materials sourced locally.

These measures are all considered to be acceptable in principle, however, the cladding of the proposed garage building with solar slates or panels needs to be handled with care and officers do not consider that the standard solar panel would be appropriate for this building, given that this roofslope will be visible from the main road. For this reason, it is considered that a higher specification solar slate or panel needs to be used and accommodated within the lower part of the roofslope with margins of natural blue slate retained at the outer ends of the roof. It is considered that this detail can be adequately controlled through the attaching of a planning condition.

Subject to the attaching of appropriate planning conditions, therefore, it is considered that the proposed scheme complies fully with the requirements of SPD and Core Strategy policy CC1.

Issue 5 – Ecological Issues

Core Strategy policy L2 and saved Local Plan policy LC17 require that development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate to their setting. National planning policies place great weight on safeguarding biodiversity and the conservation and enhancement of protected species and their habitats.

The Authority’s Ecologist initially raised concerns that the further emergency/re-entry surveys for bats recommended in the accompanying bat survey report had not been carried out. Consequently, the Authority’s Ecologist advised that the application should be determined until these surveys have been carried out and suitable mitigation/compensation measures have been submitted and agreed. These emergency/re-entry surveys have to be carried out during the active breeding season i.e. between May – September.

Further surveys have now been carried out on the detached barn and no bats were found to be roosting. However, the Authority’s Ecologist considers that the building holds a number of features that could be used by bats and the bat report recommends that works are carried out under a method statement found in Appendix B of the report.

To enhance the site for bat use, two ridge tile access points should also be provided in the main barn. Bitumen felting should be used in areas where bat access has been created (e.g. placed over the ridgeboard and 75mm either side, or overlapping modern breathable felts).

Works should also avoid the main breeding bird period spanning March to September (inclusive). If works are undertaken during this period a check for breeding birds shall be undertaken. If breeding birds are subsequently discovered the young shall be allowed to fledge before works proceed. Alternative provision for swallows must also be provided and details of a scheme

should be submitted to the PDNPA Ecologist prior to starting any works.

It is considered, therefore, that the impact on protected species can be adequately mitigated for and further ecological enhancement can be achieved, subject to the attaching of appropriate ecological conditions. The scheme therefore complies with the terms and objectives of Core Strategy policy L2 and Local Plan policy LC17 and national planning policies in the Framework.

Issue 6 - Access and Parking

Core Strategy policy T7 states, amongst other things, that residential parking and operational parking for service and delivery vehicles will be the minimum required for operational purposes, taking into account environmental constraints and future requirements. Local Plan policy LT18 states that the highest standard of design and material should be used in transport infrastructure and the provision of safe access arrangement will be a prerequisite of any development. LT11 states that the design and number of parking spaces must respect the valued character of the area. National planning policies require development proposals to be provided with a safe and suitable access.

In respect of the vehicular access, the highway authority have confirmed that the achievable visibility splays of 2.4m x 63m in the northerly direction and 61.0m in the southerly direction are satisfactory. The entrance gate width is also to be widened from 2.5m to 3.6m to facilitate manoeuvring into and out of the entrance. Subject to a condition requiring the provision and maintenance of these visibility splays and the widening of the entrance, the joint vehicular access for the two proposed dwellings is considered to be acceptable. There is sufficient parking proposed for each dwelling and further courtyard parking available. The garaging and parking provision for the proposed replacement dwelling is in a well screened position screened by the proposed 1.8m high link wall.

It is considered; therefore that access and parking arrangements are acceptable and comply with the above-stated Development Plan policies and relevant policies in the Framework.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is considered that the erection of the replacement dwelling in its revised position, together with the retention and sympathetic conversion of the existing traditional barns will enable the comprehensive enhancement of the site and the locality in compliance with the relevant policies in the Development Plan and the Framework. The proposed enhancements and environmental benefits require the impetus of open market values and would be difficult to achieve in a scheme to retain and repair the existing dwelling. These factors weigh in favour of approval in this case and are considered to offset the Authority's Historic Building Officer's firmly stated views on these proposals.

Therefore, on the basis of the planning merits of the individual proposals and on the basis of the planning merits of current application when taken as a whole, the proposals are accordingly recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in the above report.

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