

7. PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL BUILDING TO HOUSE AND FEED LIVESTOCK AND STORE FODDER – SOUTH VIEW FARM, WASHHOUSE BOTTOM, LITTLE HUCKLOW (NP/DDD/0321/0260), EG

APPLICANT: MR R ELLIOTT

Summary

1. This application is seeking permission for the development of a new agricultural building in association with the established agricultural operations at South View Farm.
2. The proposal is considered to pose significant harm to the landscape due to its siting in a field in open countryside which disrupts the building line leading north from Little Hucklow. The application is recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

3. South View Farm is a traditional rubble limestone built farmhouse situated in close proximity to the village of Little Hucklow. The dwelling is built in an L-shaped formation with access to a range of agricultural buildings south of the house. These buildings are used to keep sheep and cattle. The farm also utilizes a plot of land to the west of the farm on the opposite side of the highway which is used for silage storage.
4. The application site is to the east of the existing farmstead in open countryside. The field is currently undeveloped and bound by limestone drystone walling. The field can be accessed from South View Farm through a gate via the existing agricultural buildings.
5. The property and its associated land sits just outside of the Little Hucklow Conservation Area meaning that it is not affected by conservation area policies but it does sit within the setting and impacts important views into the Conservation Area. It also holds a prominent position in the open countryside and White Peak landscape character area.

Proposal

6. The application proposes to erect a steel portal framed agricultural building in the field immediately east of the agricultural operations at South View Farm.

7. RECOMMENDATION:-

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **The siting of the proposed building will pose substantial harm to the open landscape character and the wider conservation area setting which is contrary to policies L1 and DMC5.**
2. **Insufficient information has been submitted regarding the established mature tree situated north of the agricultural buildings. This information is required by policy DMC13 to assess the potential for harm and extent of tree protection required.**

Key Issues

8. The impact of the building upon the valued landscape character of the National Park (and

particularly the White Peak landscape area) in terms of siting and design.

9. The impact upon the wider setting of the Little Hucklow conservation area.
10. New buildings in open countryside.
11. Suitability of design.
12. Lack of screening or soft landscaping included in the scheme.
13. Potential impact to mature tree.

History

14. The site has been subject of multiple planning applications – the relevant ones are outlined below.
15. 1996: DDD0196004 – Erection of agricultural building - Refused
16. 1997: DDD0297054 – Erection of agricultural storage building – Granted conditionally
17. 2001: DDD0101031 - Erection of agricultural workers dwelling – Granted conditionally
18. 2021: NP/DDD/0221/0222 - Extension to create ancillary accommodation for relative – awaiting decision.

Consultations

19. Derbyshire County Council Highway Authority -
20. Derbyshire District Council – No response.
21. Great Hucklow, Grindlow, Windmill, Little Hucklow and Coplowdale Parish Council - Comments in support:
22. “Although it is, a prominent site looking up from the heart of the village it is in keeping with the other existing farm buildings, both in size and style. 2. The Parish Council supports any move to improve the welfare of livestock wherever possible. The Parish Council therefore supports this proposal but would like to see a condition regarding the planting of trees as screening placed on any approval.”
23. PDNPA Archaeology – No archaeology comments to make.

Representations

24. No written representations have been received in regards to this application.

Main Policies

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, DS1, E2, L1, L2, L3, CC1

Relevant Local Plan policies: DM1, DMC1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMC11, DMC13, DME1

National Planning Policy Framework

25. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been revised (2019). This replaces the previous document (2012) with immediate effect. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In particular Paragraph 172 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
26. Paragraph 83 states that planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of business in rural areas through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings. Planning policies and decisions should enable the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based agriculture businesses.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

27. Policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits. GPS1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.
28. GSP2 adds that proposals will need to demonstrate that they offer significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area. Where appropriate, landscaping and planting schemes will be sought. Opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings.
29. Policy GSP3 sets out development management principles and states 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.
30. Policy GSP4 allows for the use of planning conditions as necessary.
31. Policy DS1 outlines that extensions and alterations are acceptable in principle within named settlements, including Castleton.
32. Policy E2 states that business development in the countryside should be located in existing traditional buildings, in smaller settlements, on farmsteads and in groups of buildings in sustainable locations. On farmsteads, small scale business development will be permitted provided that it supports an existing agricultural business provided that the primary business retains ownership and control to ensure appropriate management of the landscape. Proposals to accommodate growth and intensification of existing business will be considered carefully in terms of their impact on the appearance and character of landscapes.

33. 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.
34. Policy L2 adds that Development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate their setting.
35. Policy L3 specifies that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings. Development that may cause harm to any asset or setting, including special designations, will not be permitted.
36. In line with Policy CC1, any development should make efforts to mitigate climate change, making the most efficient and sustainable use possible of land, resources and energy.

Peak District National Park Development Management Plan

37. Policy DM1 outlines that development proposals will be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Peak Districts purpose to conserve the valued characteristics of the National Park. Applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan will be approved without unnecessary delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
38. Policy DMC1 adds that any proposals must take into account the respective landscape strategy and action plans for each character area in the Peak District (which includes the White Peak).
39. Policy DMC3 requires that proposals are mindful of siting, design, layout and landscaping. Particular attention will be paid to the scale, form and orientation to existing buildings, including impact on open spaces and the wider landscape setting. Impacts to flood risk, water conservation and sustainable drainage are incorporated into this.
40. Policy DMC5 specifies that planning applications affecting heritage assets and their settings (affecting Conservation Areas) must provide adequate information to show the impact of development. Permission will not be granted if it would result in harm to the character and appearance of its heritage.
41. Policy DMC8 indicates that development in Conservation Areas must preserve and enhance the Conservation Area setting, taking account of the effects of development to its setting and character. Applicants should be mindful of the appearance and materials chosen. Tree felling will not be permitted without agreement.
42. Policy DMC11 outlines that proposals should aim to achieve net gains to biodiversity or geodiversity as a result of development. In considering whether a proposal conserves and enhances sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance all reasonable measures must be taken to avoid net loss by demonstrating enhancement, mitigation or compensation measures.
43. Policy DMC13 requires that applications should provide sufficient information to enable their impact on trees and other landscape features to be properly considered. Trees should be protected during the course of development.
44. Policy DME1 specifies that new agricultural buildings and structures will be permitted provided that it is demonstrated that (i) demonstrated that the building at the scale proposed is functionally required for that purpose from information provided by the applicant on all the relevant criteria: location and size of farm or forestry holding; (ii) type

of agriculture or forestry practiced on the farm or forestry holding; (iii) intended use and size of proposed building; (iv) intended location and appearance of proposed building; (v) stocking type, numbers and density per hectare; (vi) area covered by crops, including any timber crop; (vii) existing buildings, uses and why these are unable to cope with existing or perceived demand; (viii) dimensions and layout; (ix) predicted building requirements by type of stock/crop/other usage; and (x) contribution to the Authority's objectives, e.g. conservation of valued landscape character as established in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan, including winter housing to protect landscape.

Assessment

45. Principle of the Development

46. The principle of development is established at this property by policy DME1 which allows for new agricultural buildings provided that the applicant demonstrates the criteria above, proving a need for the expansion.

47. The application is supported by a statement which indicates that the building will be used to house sheep and cattle and store fodder, allowing all of their livestock access to a fresh water supply. Currently, the farm has approximately 210 beef cattle and 800 sheep and the supply is expected to increase. The application argues that the existing buildings do not allow sufficient space for housing and storage associated with the livestock. Supporting evidence is included from DEFRA which outlines that agricultural businesses are required to provide a dry lying area for hygiene and comfort of animals. Standard space requirements per animals are included which can be used to ascertain density and the floorspace required for expansion.

48. The evidence goes on to report that there is no land capacity within the existing arrangement of farm buildings to create sufficient increases to floor space by extension or alteration hence why the building has been positioned in the adjacent field. Though separate, it is situated as close as possible to the existing farm holding and will utilize the same access from Washhouse Bottom into the farm and through an additional gate to the proposed field.

49. As such this will allow an established agricultural business to continue to operate viably.

50. The above supports that there is a principle of development for an agricultural building at this site in line with DME1, however to be accepted it must be concluded that the design and impact to the wider setting is acceptable.

51. Landscape Impact

52. The field in which the building will be sited is currently an undeveloped field with a sloping gradient that descends to the east. The field is bound by limestone drystone walls and there are sparse clusters of trees amongst the landscape.

53. All of the properties on Washhouse Bottom on the stretch north of Little Hucklow Village do not have development beyond their established eastern boundary, with any fields adjoining remaining undeveloped. This creates a hard building line east of the properties on Washhouse Bottom which are defined by a drystone boundary wall.

54. Views of the hard boundary and the adjoining open fields are prominent on the landscape from the south at Little Hucklow and to the north and east. As such it is felt that these views of the landscape are important to the conservation area setting and White Peak landscape area.

55. To allow a new agricultural building in the field east of South View Farm would breach this established landscape character and disrupt the established hard building line. In this case the applicant has not committed to any planting but it is felt that this harm cannot be overcome by soft landscaping commitments due to the prominent position that the building will maintain. For this reason the chosen location for this building would pose harm to the landscape. As the National Park Authority operates a 'landscape first' approach, this would be grounds for refusal in line with policy L1.

56. Design

57. PDNPA planning policy requires great care to be paid to the massing, size and colour of agricultural buildings due to their prominence in the landscape. The building is proposed to be a steel portal framed single pitch building painted blue with treated Yorkshire boarding and concrete panel base which is typical of agricultural buildings in the National Park and the established buildings at South View Farm.

58. The building is proposed to be approximately 22.86 metres x 18.23 metres x 4.9 metres (to eaves). Officer comment during the planning process led to review of the roof form to have a lower pitch to reduce the overall height of the building. Preference would be to have a twin span roof to reduce the appearance of the building but a single lower pitch is generally acceptable. Overall the design is in conformity with PDNPA guidance provided that the concrete base is rendered with a limestone dash as drawn.

59. Drawings have been revised to include a hard standing to the front of the building which would be constructed of concrete. This would allow access from the existing range of agricultural buildings.

60. Environmental Impacts

61. A mature tree is situated north of the existing range of agricultural buildings beside what would be the access to the proposed building. The canopy of the tree projects over the access which infers that the roots will have a similar span. Damage could potentially be incurred to the roots during the construction period yet no tree survey or protection plan has been submitted with the application. When queried with the agent it was assured that a perimeter fence could be erected which would benefit the scheme but there is still lacking evidence to assess the impact to the tree.

62. Amenity Impacts

63. There are no amenity concerns in regards to the proposed development.

64. Highways Impacts

65. There are no highways concerns in regards to the proposed development as the building will be used for agricultural purposes. This use is already established at this site.

66. Conclusion

67. There is an acceptable principle of development to expand agricultural operations at South View Farm in line with policy DME1. However, the Authority operates a landscape first approach and on weight the harm posed to the landscape setting as a result of developing would outweigh the need for development. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

68. Human Rights

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

70. List of Background Papers (not previously published)

71. Nil

Report Author – Ellie Grant