

8. FULL APPLICATION: CONVERSION AND REINSTATEMENT OF BUILDING TO FORM ONE DWELLING AT BIRCH CROFT, BARROWSTONES LANE, THE RAKE, MONYASH (NP/DDD/1120/1063, TS)

APPLICANT: MR AND MRS HOTCHIN

Summary

The application proposes a similar development that was refused in March 2019 and June 2019. The current application seeks to reuse the limited remaining historic fabric and to build a new structure inside it. However, as is discussed below, this does not address the fundamental issues with creating a new house in an isolated location in the open countryside. The application should be refused again.

Site and Surroundings

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

Proposal

5. The application seeks full planning permission for the reinstatement of the ruinous former barn and conversion of it to form an open market dwelling.
6. The previously refused applications involved the demolition of almost all of the remaining walls of the existing building. A new building that replicates the appearance of the former barn was then proposed to be constructed.
7. The current scheme differs in that it is now proposed to retain the remaining historic fabric, which would be stabilised, and then build a new structure inside the historic walls. The walls of the new structure would be clad in timber and a new clay tiled roof would be constructed.
8. The proposed new dwelling would be a very similar size to the previous refused schemes. It would have a living room, dining room and kitchen to the ground floor and three bedrooms and a bathroom to the first floor. The dwelling would be accessed using Barrowstone Lane which would be improved and resurfaced in order to make it suitable for use by a family car. Domestic curtilage would be created to the west and south of the

host building with two parking spaces immediately to the western side. The submitted plans also show a package treatment plant to the eastern side of the site.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Key Issues

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

History

12. Planning application NP/DDD/0419/0428 was refused by Planning Committee in June 2019. This was a resubmission for application NP/DDD/0119/0042 which has been refused in March 2019. The application was refused for the same reasons as the previous one.
13. Planning application NP/DDD/0119/0042 for an identical development to that proposed in application NP/DDD/0419/0428 was refused by Planning Committee on 12 March 2019. The application was refused for the following reasons:
 - The proposed development would create an isolated new build dwelling in the open countryside that would not deliver conservation or enhancement of a valued vernacular building. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy HC1 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to avoid isolated homes in the countryside.
 - The proposed development would result in the almost total demolition of the existing field barn which is a non-designated heritage asset, resulting in almost complete loss of the non-designated heritage asset, and would harm the character of the agricultural strip

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

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

Consultations

Monyash Parish Council: *“Monyash PC strongly support this application however they request that consideration be given to replacing the larch cladding with natural stonework in keeping with the village and that access is through the adjoining field as Barrowstone Lane is a formers Drovers path and vehicles up and down this narrow lane would upset the ecology and another drovers path would be lost forever.”*

District Council: No response to date.

Highway Authority: No objections.

PDNPA Senior Archaeologist:

“This application appears to be set of revised proposals for a ruined field barn located to the south west of Monyash within the fossilised medieval strip field system, previously submitted as applications NP/DDD/0119/0042 and NP/DDD/0419/0428.

Supporting Information

This application is support by a heritage statement that has consulted the Historic Environment Record and describes the significance of the affected heritage assets, this meets the requirements of para 189 of the NPPF.

Archaeological sensitivity and significance of the site

The site of the proposed development is a non-designated heritage asset. The ruined barn that is the subject of this application is a non-designated heritage asset in its own right, and it is located within an area of fossilised medieval strip fields.

The ruined barn is recorded in the County Historic Environment Record and the Peak District National Park Historic Building Sites and Monuments Record (MPD13325), as an former outfarm. Outfarms are multi-purposes farm buildings located within an outlying area of farm. The barn that is the subject of this application can more accurately be considered a field barn due to its form, a single building with no associated yard and its location within the well preserved fossilised medieval strip field system of Monyash. It was likely used for sheltering livestock (cattle or sheep), for storage hay, fodder and other crops, or a combination of these activities.

The ruined field barn has **historic, architectural and archaeological interest**, due to its traditional agricultural character that demonstrates its agricultural origin and function, the traditional materials from which it is constructed, surviving historic features and fabric and the form and location of the openings, which provides legibility of the historic function of the barn. I agree with the conclusion of the heritage statement that in terms of level of significance the ruined barn itself is **of local interest**.

The ruined barn is located within an area of known Ancient Enclosure in the form of a fossilised medieval strip field system, as identified in the PDNP Historic Landscape Character Assessment. These are fossilised medieval strip fields that relate to the medieval open field system of Monyash, evidenced by map and field shape evidence (characterised by the enclosed narrow strips with a characteristic s-shaped curve) The fossilised medieval strip fields are a rare and precious landscape character type and important to the Peak District National Park. **They are a non-designated heritage asset of archaeological interest and have intrinsic landscape value, providing the area a distinct character, a time depth to the landscape. They are the most important, and rarest, historic landscape feature type within the National Park.** The field system also formed parts of the setting of Monyash Conservation Area. **As heritage assets the field system is of at least regional interest.**

The barn sits within a field adjacent to Barrowstones Lane. This is not part of the road network from the village but a green lane, and likely formed part of the route system that gave access, initially on foot, across the medieval open field system.

The Peak District National Park Historic Farmstead Character Statement identifies that field barns are an important part of the Peak District's landscape, they are highly characteristic and strongly contribute to local distinctiveness, even more so when combined with the distinctive pattern of dry stone wall enclosure reflecting the development of the historic landscape. They are located in areas where such as this, around villages and within former open field systems, where the irregular ancient enclosure meant that farmland remained intermixed, and field barns allowed such land to be managed remotely without the need to move stock and produce to the main farmstead. Such small isolated field barns and outfarms are characteristic of later agricultural development in the areas of former medieval strip fields systems and are illustrative of agricultural management practices and their changes overtime.

The Peak District National Park Historic Farmstead Character Statement also identifies that farm buildings that are detached and remote from a main farmsteads (both outfarms and field barns) have been subject to high levels of change both with the Peak District and nationally, with a 57% loss of such features from the Peak District landscape. This makes those that survive all the more precious.

The Heritage Statement suggests that the building may have historically had a residential function, because it is colour pink/red on an extract of the 1848 Monyash Tithe Map, suggesting it may have been used partially as a cottage. **This evidence is weak and at best inconclusive. The surviving fabric and structure of the building indicates this is a ruined field barn comprising housing for cattle and storage loft above.**

Archaeological Impact of the development

The revised proposals for the site have taken on board previous comments and concerns about the impact to the ruined structure. The previous proposals intended to retain only the base courses of the ruin, rebuilding from this base. As such it represented almost the complete loss of a non-designated heritage asset, and its historic and archaeological interest and significance.

The revised proposals are for a new build structure within the shell of the ruin, retaining the ruin to its current extent, i.e. a development that retains the surviving historic fabric. I have reviewed the proposed new structure, and whilst it works to retaining the historic fabric of the ruined field barn, **so little of the historic structure survives along the north elevation and the design of the new building is so completely at odds with the traditional form of a field barn (form, materials, glazing, architectural features), that the proposed development would compromise the character of the ruined building, particularly its north elevation.**

I remain concerned, as highlighted on the previous applications (NP/DDD/0119/0042 and NP/DDD/0419/0428), with the **impact of the proposed development upon the fossilised medieval field system and the historic landscape character.** The development of the ruined barn into a permanently occupied dwelling house will harm both the agricultural setting of the barn, which positively contributes to its significance, and will harm the historic landscape within which the ruined barn is located.

With respect to the historic landscape, currently as unoccupied, ruinous buildings the site is integrated within its surrounding agricultural landscape, and it owes its existence and position to the way this landscape, enclosure and farming practice has developed from the medieval period onwards. **The introduction of a residential and domestic use into this location within this historical landscape, with everything this entails (domestic curtilage and paraphernalia, parking, provision of services, light pollution, movement of vehicles, provision of a bin store etc.) would introduce elements that are out of place, incongruous and are harmful to this important heritage asset.**

Recommendation

In accordance with NPPF para.197 the harm identified above needs to be taken into account when determining the application, with a balanced judgement that has regard to the scale of the harm and the significance of the heritage assets affected.

From a Cultural Heritage perspective, I remain concerned about the level of the harm these proposals represent and harm to the core significance of the heritage assets (field barn and medieval field system). This harm would weigh heavily in any planning balance, and for that reason would not support the positive determination of this application.”

PDNPA Public Rights of Way: Barrowstones Lane carries the route of Public Footpath No5 – Monyash across its whole width and along the whole length that is detailed in the application. The line of this public right of way must not be obstructed in any way. Any proposals to install gates or other restrictions to restrict the free movement of the public on foot must be discussed with the Highway Authority Rights of Way Team (Derbyshire County Council), the applicant should also discuss any proposed works that may impede or

endanger the public's use of the footpath with the Highway Authority as they may require a temporary closure during significant construction works.

Representations

14. Sixteen letters of support have been received. The letters support the application on the following grounds:
- Would provide housing for a local family.
 - More houses are needed in the area and house prices are too high to allow local people to remain in the village.
 - Would make use of an existing building.
 - Would fit into the landscape / the barn can't be seen from the surrounding countryside/
 - Important to keep young families in their local communities to support local facilities.
 - Would benefit the local community and support community facilities like the school and church
 - Would restore a historic field barn / the scheme is sympathetic.
 - Important to keep field barns standing.
 - The building will be left to decay and create an eyesore if not used.
 - Evidence has been provided that the barn used to be a dwelling so the proposal would restore its former use.
 - The scheme would use natural materials.

Main Policies

15. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3, CC1, CC5 and HC1
16. Development Management Policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMC11, DMT3.

National Planning Policy Framework

17. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies document 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and the NPPF.
18. Para 172 of the NPPF states that 'great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.'
19. The NPPF directly refers to the National Parks Circular which makes clear that the Government considers it inappropriate to set housing targets within the National Parks and instead that policies should seek to deliver affordable housing to meet the needs of local communities.
20. Paragraph 78 and 79 of the NPPF re-inforce this approach together saying that planning authorities should seek to promote sustainable affordable housing in rural areas and that permission for isolated new housing in the countryside should only be granted where there are special circumstances.

21. Para 190 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
22. Para 197 of the NPPF states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Development Plan policies

23. 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). GSP1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed. GSP2 sets out that opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon.
24. Policies GSP3 and LC4 set out development management principles and state that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.
25. Policy L1 identifies that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.
26. The approach to housing and conservation in the NPPF is consistent with the Authority's development strategy (Policy DS1) which says new residential development within the National Park should normally be sited within named settlements, and Policy HC1. C which sets out very similar criteria to the NPPF in terms of the exceptional circumstances in which a new house can be granted planning permission in the National Park.
27. Policy HC1. C I and II states that exceptionally new housing will be permitted in accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2 if it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings or where it is required in order to achieve conservation or enhancement within designated settlements.
28. Policy L2 states that development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate their setting. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to have an adverse impact on any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance or their setting that have statutory designation or are of international or national importance for their biodiversity.

29. Policy DMC11 provides more detailed criteria to assess development that may affect protected sites, species or habitats.
30. Policy L3 states that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings, including statutory designations and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to the significance of any cultural heritage asset of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance or its setting, including statutory designations or other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest.
31. Policy DMC3 states that where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place.
32. Policy DMC5 states that Development of a designated or non-designated heritage asset will not be permitted if it would result in any harm to, or loss of, the significance, character and appearance of a heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), unless:
 - (i) for designated heritage assets, clear and convincing justification is provided, to the satisfaction of the Authority, that the:
 - a) substantial harm or loss of significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; or
 - b) in the case of less than substantial harm to its significance, the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
 - (ii) for non-designated heritage assets, the development is considered by the Authority to be acceptable following a balanced judgement that takes into account the significance of the heritage asset.
33. Policy DMC10 sets out that the conversion of a heritage asset will only be acceptable when the building can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character, such as major rebuilding. The building must be capable of conversion. The changes brought about by the new use must conserve or enhance the heritage significance of the asset, its setting and landscape character. In all cases attention will be paid to the impact of domestication and urbanisation brought about by the use on landscape character and the built environment.
34. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources, taking into account the energy hierarchy and achieving the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency. CC1. B says that development must be directed away from flood risk areas, and seek to reduce overall risk from flooding within the National Park and areas outside it, upstream and downstream.
35. Policy DMT3 requires that a safe access is provided in a way which does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality and where possible enhances it.
36. Further detailed policy on appropriate design for new housing is provided in the Authority's supplementary planning documents: the Design Guide (2007) and its technical supplements.

37. It is considered the Authority's adopted design guidance and the wider range of design and conservation policies in the Development Plan are consistent with national policies in the NPPF, which emphasise the great weight that should be attached to the conservation and enhancement of the National Park landscape, its wildlife and cultural heritage in any planning decision, and also promote high standards of design that would be sensitive to the valued characteristics of the National Park.

Assessment

Justification for proposed dwelling house

38. The relevant housing policy is Core Strategy policy HC1. This policy continues the Authority's long standing policy position that housing will not be permitted solely to meet open market demand. This approach is consistent with the National Park Circular and the NPPF.
39. Policy HC1 therefore sets out the exceptional circumstances in which new housing will be permitted within the National Park. The approach of allowing affordable housing and workers housing where there is an established need, and, of allowing market housing where it is required to achieve significant conservation and enhancement in accordance with policies GSP1 and GSP2 is considered to be a sustainable approach for providing housing within the National Park without undermining the landscape and valued characteristics.
40. As was the case with the applications that were refused in 2019, this application is not for an affordable house to meet an identified local need, it is for an open market dwelling. A lot of weight has clearly been given by the Parish Council and third parties who have supported the application due to the applicants' local connections. The supporting information states that the applicants are from Monyash, now live in Bakewell and would like to return to the village. Even if the application was proposing a new affordable dwelling to meet an identified local need, this site is a wholly unsuitable location for new affordable housing. The Authority's housing policies are clear that new affordable local needs housing should be located within named settlements, not in isolated locations in the open countryside such as this. If a housing need and local occupancy qualification were to be demonstrated then the Authority would work to identify suitable sites within the village in which new housing could be delivered in a sustainable manner. The approach of addressing housing provision by constructing new dwellings in isolated locations in the open countryside (both inside or outside National Parks) is wholly contrary to national and local policy and is highly unsustainable. Whilst the comments of the Parish and third party supporters of the application in respect of the applicants' local connections are noted, this should be given no weight in the decision making process for an application for a new build dwelling in the open countryside that would not be affordable.
41. In refusing both the previous applications, the Authority gave a very clear view that this is an inappropriate location for a new dwelling. Whilst there is some change to the design of the proposed dwelling, which is discussed further below, there are no material changes that should lead to a different view being taken now.
42. The creation of a new dwelling in the open countryside would only be acceptable if it was required to deliver significant conservation or enhancement of a listed or valued vernacular building, and where its introduction would not harm the wider landscape.
43. The existing barn is not listed but the Authority's Senior Archaeologist has appraised the building and is of the view that the former barn is a non-designated heritage asset. It is therefore considered to be a valued vernacular building for the purposes of policy HC1.

44. Consideration should therefore be given to whether or not the proposed development would deliver significant conservation or enhancement of the ruined barn.

Impact of development on the Heritage Asset and the Historic Landscape

45. The Parish Council and letters of support have referred to the development conserving the existing building and preventing the loss of the historic field barn. These comments are noted, however it is not considered that this is a supportable conclusion.
46. The previous applications proposed to take down the remaining walls of the barn and build a new structure that would have replicated the field barn. A structural report was submitted with the later of the refused applications that confirmed that the remains of the existing building cannot be saved and reused. All three of the remaining walls are inherently unstable. Even if the walls were underpinned they would not be stable enough to bear the weight of a new roof. There is therefore no possibility of integrating the remains of the building into a scheme that would save what little historic fabric is left.
47. A new structural report has been provided with the current application. This sets out that the remaining historic walls can be retained and tied to a new inner structure. The proposal is therefore now to essentially build a new dwelling inside the ruinous barn walls and tie the historic walls to the new structure in order to support them.
48. It is therefore acknowledged that there is a change from the previous schemes in that the existing historic fabric would be retained, rather than completely lost as was the case with the previously refused schemes.
49. Consideration has therefore been given to whether the new approach of retaining the existing walls and constructing a new building within them would achieve any positive conservation benefits.
50. The proposed new building within the historic walls involves the construction of a structural frame that would then be clad in larch timber boarding. The scheme includes large openings, roof lights and lead cladding. The supporting information sets out that the intention is to create a clear distinction between the historic barn and the new building.
51. Whilst the approach works to retaining the historic fabric of the ruined field barn, so little of the historic structure survives along the north elevation and the design of the new building is so completely at odds with the traditional form of a field barn (form, materials, glazing, architectural features), that the proposed development would compromise the character of the ruined building, particularly its north elevation. The result is a building that is of an inappropriate design and appearance that forms an uncomfortable hybrid of a traditional field barn, a modern agricultural building and a domestic dwelling.
52. The ruined barn is recorded in the County Historic Environment Record and the Peak District National Park Historic Building Sites and Monuments Record (MPD13325), as a former out farm. Out farms are multi-purposes farm buildings located within an outlying area of farm. The barn that is the subject of this application can more accurately be considered a field barn due to its form, a single building with no associated yard and its location within the well preserved fossilised medieval strip field system of Monyash. It was likely used for sheltering livestock (cattle or sheep), for storage hay, fodder and other crops, or a combination of these activities. The building has historic and archaeological interest, due to its traditional agricultural character that demonstrates its agricultural origin and function, the traditional materials from which it is constructed, surviving historic features and fabric

and the form and location of the openings, which provides legibility of the historic function of the barn.

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

59. The supporting information for the new application attempts to provide evidence that the barn may have historically been used as a dwelling house for a time, and that the proposal therefore seeks to return it to its historic purpose.
60. We wholly disagree with this argument. The evidence put forward in support of the claim that the barn has previously been used as a dwelling is weak and, at best, inconclusive. The evidence comprises of an 1848 map extract that shows the building coloured pink. However, the surviving fabric and structure of the building indicates this is a ruined field barn comprising housing for cattle and storage loft above.
61. Even if the building had been used as some kind for dwelling in the 1840s (and there is no conclusive evidence that it was), then that does not mean that it is any more acceptable to create a new residential dwelling that would have harmful landscape impacts now. If the building was used in the 1840s as a dwelling then it would not have had any of the domestic paraphernalia that come with modern dwellings such as cars, electric lighting, garden furniture etc. Furthermore, if there was any domestic use in the 1840s, it is abundantly clear that it has long since been abandoned. The argument that historic use of the building as a dwelling justifies the creation of an isolated new dwelling is therefore wholly un-compelling.
62. The combined impact of the inappropriate appearance of the new building and the domestication of the site through the proposed change to residential use would seriously compromise the core characteristics of the building, the strip fields and the wider landscape character. Rather than conserving an existing building, the proposed development would result in significant harm to two non-designated heritage assets and the special qualities of this part of the National Park. It must be concluded therefore that there is no conservation or enhancement benefit arising from the proposal.
63. Letters of support have raised concerns about the building being an eye sore if it left undeveloped, or that it could be lost completely. The building is not an eye sore at present. It is well integrated into the landscape as set out above. The retention of the barn as a historic ruin is considered to be a positive contribution to the wider landscape, not a detracting one. It is acknowledged that the building has suffered partial collapse and there may be uncertainty about the retention of the building in the long term. The submitted structural report that was submitted with the previously refused applications raised concerns about the potential for further collapse. However, the total loss of the building would be much less harmful to the character of the National Park landscape compared to the significant harm to the landscape that would be caused by the wholly inappropriate introduction of a domestic dwelling at this site. As such, the possibility that the existing building could be lost at some point in the future provides no justification for a new development that would be harmful for the reasons set out above.
64. Policy DMC5 and the NPPF say that where development would harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, such as the barn and strip field system, the Authority should take a balanced judgement weighing the benefits of the development against the harm. In this case the public benefits of allowing the development are considered to be very limited because the proposal would not meet an established local need for affordable housing. The Authority's housing policies provide for meeting the housing needs of the National Park in a sustainable way by requiring new housing to be in settlements where the impacts on the landscape of the National Park are most limited and the community benefits are highest. Letters of support have suggested that the development would support local facilities such as the village school and church. However, these benefits would be best realised through sustainable new housing within the village, not by creating isolated homes in the open countryside.

65. Within the National Park great weight must be given to the landscape and cultural heritage. The benefits of the proposed development would not outweigh the harmful impact of the development upon the barn and therefore the proposal is considered to be contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3 and HC1, saved Local Plan policies LC4 and LC8 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways

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

Other considerations

68. Given the distance of the barn to the nearest neighbouring property and the orientation of proposed openings and location of the curtilage there are no concerns that the development would harm the amenity, privacy or security of any neighbouring property.
69. A protected species survey has not been carried out because the ruinous state of the building and the absence of a roof means that the building is highly unlikely to be suitable to provide habitat opportunities for birds or bats. As such the development would be unlikely to harm the conservation of any protected species or ecology interests.
70. Barrowstone Lane is a public right of way. The Authority's Rights of Ways team have not provided comments for the current application but raised no objections to the previous proposal, noting that measures would be required to ensure that the public footpath remains unobscured.
71. The applicant has provided a series of examples of field barns for which planning permission has been granted for conversion schemes. Each case must be considered on its own merits and none of the examples provided are the same as the current application in terms of the existing building, the nature of the conversion works and the landscape setting. There are also numerous applications for the conversion of field barns in the National Park that have been refused. This highlights the importance of assessing each one on its own individual merits and circumstances.

Conclusion

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

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Report prepared by Tom Shiels, Area Team Manager