

**10. FULL APPLICATION - FULL REFURBISHMENT AND REMODELLING OF THE BRUNTS BARN CENTRE, INCLUSIVE OF INSTALLATION OF ADDITIONAL WINDOW FOR AN ACCESSIBLE BEDROOM; INSTALLATION OF AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP AND RECONFIGURING THE ROOF LIGHTS. THIS APPLICATION IS ESSENTIAL TO IMPROVE ACCESSIBILITY AND SAFEGUARDING IN THE CENTRE AND OPTIMISE USE OF THE EXISTING SPACE AT BRUNTS BARN CENTRE, UNNAMED ROAD FROM STATION ROAD WESTWARDS TO TRACK LEADING TO A6187, UPPER PADLEY, GRINDLEFORD (NP/DDD/1220/1199 SPW)**

**APPLICANT: Peak District National Park Authority**

**Summary**

1. A range of internal and external works are proposed to Brunts Barn to improve the accessibility and safeguarding available at the centre. There have been both heritage and ecological issues arise during the course of the application which have been resolved via submission of amended plans, suggested conditions and via submission of further survey work for protected species as well as issues around whether the proposal is an intensification of the use and could therefore increase the need for parking and traffic to the site. The scheme is now considered to accord with both local and national planning policies.

**Site and Surroundings**

2. Brunts Barn Centre is located in Upper Padley within the designated Conservation Area, the building is not listed and there are not any listed buildings on the site. The building is constructed of natural gritstone, its roof is clad with a mix of natural blue slate and corrugated sheets. The section with the corrugated sheets is the eastern section, providing the workshop. The south east facing roofslope is peppered with rooflights the north west facing roofslope only has one.
3. Immediately to the north of the site there is Padley Chapel which is a Grade 1 listed building. To the east there is another listed building, Padley Manor Farm, this is a Grade 2 listed building.
4. Padley Chapel also sits within an area designated as a scheduled monument, this relates to Padley Hall a medieval great house.
5. The application site is open to public view from the adjacent track, which has a public right of way. It is also open to view in the wider landscape.

**Proposal**

6. This proposal is for the external alterations to the building, there is no change of use proposed and as submitted there was also a bin store however no detailed plans of this were submitted until after the consultation periods so the bin store has been omitted from the scheme.
7. Internal works are also shown and these facilitate the separation of the accommodation from the meeting rooms for safeguarding reasons and also provide some accessible accommodation. These however are not considered to be development.
8. The internal works show that there would be 1 accessible single bedroom on the ground floor and 11 beds on the first floor dispersed over 6 bedrooms.

9. Specifically the external alterations include –

- Removing all the external rooflights and replacing them with three rooflights to the Southeast facing elevation and two rooflights to the Northwest elevation.
- A new window opening to the Northwest elevation
- Three replacement windows to the southwest facing elevation, providing double glazing.
- Alterations of the external level to grade the tarmac surface so that it provides a level access into the doorway on the northwest facing elevation.
- Positioning two air source heat pumps in the existing bin store enclosure and reducing the height of the rear wall including rebuilding that rear wall.
- The proposed bin store is now omitted as set out in the applicant's email of the 22/03/2021.

**10. Interior works include –**

- Stud partitions
- Inner glazing to dovecotes
- Alterations to doorway positions
- New doorway into meeting room
- Reinstating some original openings
- Widening of internal doorway
- Suspended floor in meeting room.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

11. That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions -

1. **Standard time limit**
2. **Development in complete accordance with the amended plans which were received by the Authority on the 19 March 2021 and amended planning statement received on the 19 March 2021 including plans 'P6187\_2020\_R\_05', 'P6187\_2020\_R\_02 RevA', 'P6187\_2020\_R\_02.1 REV A', 'P6187\_2020\_R\_04 REV A', '21001/SK 02', 'P6187\_2020\_R\_08', 'P6187\_2020\_R\_07', 'P6187\_2020\_R\_10', 'P6187\_2020\_R\_09', 'P6187\_2020R\_11 REV A', 'P6187\_2020\_R\_06 REV A', 'P6187\_2020\_R\_12' and specifications subject to the following conditions or modifications.**
3. **Prior to installing any new external windows full details of all new external windows and doors, including the inner glazing to the ventilation slots ('dovecote'), shall be submitted to the Authority for approval in writing. Once approved the development shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with the approved details.**

- 4. Prior to installing any external lighting full details of all external lighting, including exact position for each light, and details of the units to be installed, including finish, shall be submitted to the Authority for approval in writing. Once approved the development shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with the approved details.**
  
- 5. 1. No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for historic building recording and archaeological monitoring has been submitted to and approved by the National Park Authority in writing, and until any pre-start element of the approved scheme has been completed to the written satisfaction of the National Park Authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and**
  - a. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;**
  - b. The programme for post investigation assessment;**
  - c. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;**
  - d. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;**
  - e. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;**

**6) Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.**

**b) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a).**

**c) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a) and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.**
  
- 6. The proposed new bin store shall be omitted from the scheme.**
  
- 7. Rooflights shall be conservation type and fitted flush with the existing roofslope.**

- 8. As shown on the approved plans the new rooflights hereby approved shall not be installed unless all existing rooflights have been removed in accordance with the approved plans.**
- 9. External works shall be timed to avoid the period May – September.**
- 10. The development shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with the mitigation measures detailed at section 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 of the report ('Bat and Bird Presence / Absence Survey Report by Evolution Ecology Ltd May 2021 version 2), including pre-construction tool box talks and supervision of any works by a licensed ecologist in vicinity of roosts, to include any placement of scaffolding.**
- 11. There shall be no external lighting of the south western gable and north western elevation. Prior to installing any other external lighting full details shall be submitted to the Authority for approval in writing. This shall need to reduce the impacts on wildlife as outlines appendix C, pg37 of the submitted report ('Bat and Bird Presence / Absence Survey Report by Evolution Ecology Ltd May 2021 version 2).**
- 12. Prior to carrying out any repointing associated with the development a method statement shall be agreed. This shall identify areas of the building where supervision is needed by a bat ecologist as well as identifying suitable gaps that can be retained for potential future use by bats. Once agreed the development shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with the agreed details.**
- 13. The bat box, 1FQ Schwegler Bat Roost shall be installed as shown at section 5.1.5 of the submitted bat report ('Bat and Bird Presence / Absence Survey Report by Evolution Ecology Ltd May 2021 version 2), and shall be permanently so maintained.**
- 14. Prior to commencing any works during the breeding bird period (Mid Feb- August inclusive) the affected areas shall be checked for active bird nesting activity by a suitably experienced ecologist. Where active bird nests are present, works in that area shall be postponed until birds fledge. Checks shall be undertaken immediately prior to works.**
- 15. Prior to the development commencing, specific measures shall be agreed with the Authority to provide future nesting opportunities for birds. Once agreed the development shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with the agreed details.**

16. **Grasslands that are part of a regular mowing regime shall continue to be mown and kept short during development. Building materials shall be stored on existing hard surfaces on pallets or similar structures which lifts materials from direct storage on the ground.**
17. **Some rougher grassland/taller herb areas abut the southern and south eastern margins of the property. Where works would be required that affect these areas (including access points) a precautionary method statement shall be submitted to the Authority for approval in writing in advance of such works to mitigate any impacts on slow worms. Once agreed the development shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with the method statement.**

#### **Advisory footnote**

**Works should be timed to avoid the main breeding bird season (mid-February to August inclusive). Note: Swallows have nested in the workshop in the past and can have late broods that extend beyond the end of August.**

#### **Key Issues**

12. The key issues are:
13. Design, impact on the character and appearance of the building and its setting including the designated Conservation Area, the nearby listed buildings and the Scheduled Monument. Does the proposal affect the significance of these heritage assets?
14. Potential traffic and parking issues from any potential intensification of the site.

#### **History**

15. In 1979 planning permission was granted for change of use of a barn to Ranger Briefing Centre and Base for Conservation Volunteers. Officer note that at this time the eastern section of the barn already had corrugated sheet roofing.
16. 2018 planning permission was granted to replace the corrugated sheets with corrugated fibre cement sheets, the subsequent discharge of conditions application agreed that this was a Marley Eternit 'profile 6' fibre cement sheet in 'Farmscape Anthracite'.
17. 2019 Pre application discussions have been carried out with the applicant, both PDNPA archaeologists and conservation officers were consulted on the proposals. The planning advice was as follows –
18. The use of the premises is currently a base for the Authority's ranger service and for volunteer accommodation, along with ancillary storage and workshop facility. The planning use of the premises is therefore what we call a 'Sui Generis' use being a use of the premises which does not fall into any of the other specified use classes in the

planning use class order. This therefore means a change to any other use would be a material change requiring planning permission. However although there is a mass of information in the enquiry it appears to my reading of it that the works largely relate to internal reorganisation and improvement for the same use and do not involve any change in the use.

19. The site is within the Conservation Area and close to the listed Chapel and farmhouse and the remains of the former manor house which are a scheduled monument.
20. There are no objections in principle to the use of the end space of the barn which is currently an unheated storage area ancillary to the principle use. Its change to a meeting room that is open all the way up to the roof is not a planning issue but does raise potential concerns about impact on below ground archaeology and the fabric of the building. The barn may actually be a listed building by virtue of being a curtilage building to the listed farmhouse or less likely? the former manor house/chapel. Determining this status is not easy and requires a detailed understanding of the buildings history. I have little detail of the history of the building and its association or otherwise with the listed building(s) nearby so I am unable to make that judgement. The Heritage assessment you are commissioning would need to consider this aspect and inform a decision on the curtilage listed status or not.
21. We note the proposed suspended timber floor for the meeting room but this description didn't fully tally with the plans. On the plans it showed a floor supported on new cross walls and strip foundations which is a concern from a heritage perspective as the new foundations could adversely impact upon the interest of any existing (original?) floor in the barn and any below ground interest. Whilst a floor supported on non-invasive pads overlaid onto the existing floor would preserve any in-situ floor and any archaeological interests, this may not be necessary depending on what is actually there in terms of the floor/below ground interest. At this stage however, we can't say until the full building appraisal and heritage impact assessment has been carried out to inform what might be in or under the floor, what its significance is and how it might be affected by the proposed work. Clearly the detail of your scheme will be informed by the report when it is published so until then we cannot comment further on but I hope you can understand the concern on this aspect so far. If the building is listed then Listed building Consent would be required for the floor alterations.
22. Another concern, again from a heritage perspective is the proposed infilling of the 'ventilation slots' in the gable end of the proposed meeting room. We note the louvered style vents proposed but these are quite intrusive. Normally such openings are glazed with a simple small frame inset into the reveal quite deeply so from both sides the opening looks like an unaltered vent 'slot'. I would prefer to see these dealt with this way rather than the vents grills approach on the plans. Again the heritage expert report will advise on this and if it is listed then Listed Building Consent will be required for the vents as an alteration to the building.
23. Given most of the internal barn work relates to new/altered stud partitions or the removal of later blockwork to reorder the same accommodation we would have no objections, especially as the original fabric will remain unaltered. It appears that at least one original roof truss remains and so we are concerned to ensure that in any application this(se) remain unharmed, otherwise any alteration may require Listed Building Consent as explained above.
24. The work to the modern attached shed to reorder the internal layout raises no concerns or planning issues. None of the plans show any works to the external areas which would otherwise be a concern from an archaeological perspective. Please ensure if they are any external works for new paths or services perhaps are covered by the heritage report which should assess the impact of all works upon the significance of the

building and its environment including the setting of the listed chapel and the scheduled monument.

25. In summary therefore as the use appears to be the same as existing with only a slight change to layout and bed numbers it would appear that no change of use would be involved. Planning permission would however be required for the new rooflights which would be an external alteration to the barns appearance but with the use of more appropriate replica conservation rooflights (NOT Velux conservation style ones) this should be beneficial and capable of being an enhancement. Listed Building Consent may be required for the physical alterations to the building (both inside and the rooflights) IF it were considered to be a curtilage listed building.
26. Finally the end of the barn would be a likely home to protected species such as bats so an ecological assessment should be obtained before any work and would be a requirement in any case to accompany any planning application affecting the roof or walling fabric of the building.
27. I hope the above advice is useful and would be happy to discuss further, most likely once the heritage report I am aware you have commissioned is received as then we can conclude on the key issue of whether it is a curtilage listed building and the consequent need for any requirement for Listed Building Consent.

### **Consultations**

#### **28. Amended plans have been received so in some cases there are two responses.**

29. **Derbyshire County Council Highways** – No highway safety objections in principle in view of the existing use and scale. No doubt you will ensure that an adequate level of off-street parking is provided, in line with your Authority's standards.

23 April 2021 I refer to the above-mentioned planning application, details of which were referred to this Authority on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2021 for further consideration, following additional information being submitted after the Highway Authority's initial comments.

From the application form it is noted that the site has a mixed extant use consisting of a base for Peak District National Park Authority Rangers and volunteers, an activity centre with dormitories (12 beds) and workshop for the rangers equipment and vehicles.

It is noted in the Planning Statement that there is no significant change to the property use. However, it is noted that a meeting room is proposed, that 'would provide opportunities for collaborations with the Dioceses of Sheffield and Hallam'. There are concerns that the above has the potential to result in an intensification in use of the site.

Access to the site is via an existing narrow track that is limited to single width which also carries a public right of way (Footpath 51 in the Parish of Grindleford). The Highway Authority would not wish to see a material increase in traffic generation associated with the site, given the limited width and potential conflict between vehicles and pedestrians.

It should be noted that the applicant has not shown the site connecting to the public highway and it is assumed that you are satisfied that the applicant has control/ownership over the track from the publicly maintainable highway to the site. Should this not be the case please inform me.

In terms of parking, it is not proposed to increase parking provision over the 6 existing spaces within the site. It should be noted that such spaces have not been demonstrated as part of the submission. I trust you will satisfy yourself that the level of parking provision is acceptable, with the nearest public parking being approximately 600m, south of Grindleford Station.

Clarification is sought regarding the intended use of the meeting room. Whilst its scale is relatively modest, its use has the potential to generate an increase in vehicular activity associated with site.

Subject to the above and on the basis that use of the residential institution, office space and workshop will not change in terms of their extant use as part of the refurbishment and remodelling, it is considered unlikely that the Highway Authority would be in a position to sustain an objection to the application, in view of the sites existing scale and use.

30. **Grindleford Parish Council** – Concern was expressed that the plans indicate a significant intensification of use, and with the partnership with Hallam Diocese there will be a greater number of people using Brunt's Barn. This could result in the existing parking provision for 6 vehicles being inadequate. The only alternative parking is more than 600 metres away at Grindleford Station pay and display.

A further concern is that the development will lead to a deterioration in the condition of the unmade track which serves as access to Brunt's Barn. The cost of maintaining this track is paid for by the residents of Upper Padley. A condition of any consent should be that the applicant makes a significant annual contribution (financial or in kind) to the ongoing maintenance of the track.

2<sup>nd</sup> response 02/05/2021 Grindleford Parish Council would like to make clear that there are important issues to be addressed before any planning permission approval is given to this project.

Cllrs and Grindleford residents very much appreciate that they live in a National Park which should be shared by all, and in that respect fully support the idea of making better use of Brunt's Barn for visitors, especially when it is for educational purposes.

The key issue in question is the access road to the Barn. It is a private road and bridge maintained by residents, and is already a difficult and expensive overhead as it services a number of houses and there is considerable wear and tear. It is only a single-track lane and has no passing places, its principal purpose is to allow access for the residents and of course emergency vehicles, Brunt's Barn is secondary to that.

The current limited parking is already filled to capacity by residents' own vehicles. Therefore, before we can support this application, we need to see answers to some of the concerns raised by the local residents.

What is the anticipated increase in traffic levels as a result of opening up the Barn to additional users?

Where are these additional vehicles going to be accommodated?

Are Brunt's Barn willing to enter into discussions about paying for the maintenance of the lane?

31. **Derbyshire Dales District Council** – No response to date

32. **Natural England** – No objection; 9<sup>th</sup> April No Objection.



33. **Peak District National Park Authority Archaeology** – 26/02/2021 -Object- Detailed comments are available on the electronic file. But the recommendation as submitted was that -

**The proposed development must conserve and sustain the significance and heritage values of the heritage assets.**

NPPF para 190 requires Local Planning Authorities to avoid or minimise any conflict between the conservation of a heritage asset and any aspect of a development proposal. **Therefore, in the first instance I recommend that these concerns are addressed, and the scheme revised in order to minimise conflict between the conservation of the heritage assets and aspects of the proposed development. I would welcome the opportunity to provide further comments on any revised proposals.**

Following meeting with the applicants amended plans were submitted. Detailed comment on the amended plans were received on the 23/03/2021 and are available in full on the electronic file, the recommendation was a follows –

Should the planning balance be favourable I recommend that the minor harm identified is mitigated by a conditioned scheme of building recording and archaeological monitoring. This should build on and not duplicate the information in the Heritage Statement. It needs to include:

- i. A photographic and descriptive record of the historic fabric at the location of the new window and doorway.
- ii. Photographic and descriptive record of the currently unconverted storage bay.
- iii. Archaeological monitoring of the ground disturbance required for the installation of the new floor.

I also recommend that it includes additional recording where the removal of fixtures, fittings, floor and wall finishes from the existing converted areas of the barn allow. These changes themselves will not result in harm to the significance of the building but may reveal currently concealed evidence for the barn's date and function and this presents the National Park Authority, as the responsible owner of a heritage asset, with an opportunity to investigate and record such remains and features to better understand the history and development of the building.

This work needs to be carried out by a suitably qualified and experienced heritage/archaeological contractor in accordance with the nationally agreed standards of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, and to a written scheme of investigation approved by the Senior Conservation Archaeologist. These recommendations are in accordance with NPPF para 199, and a suitable condition to achieve this is suggested below.

34. **Peak District National Park Authority Built Environment** – 02/03/2021 (full detailed comments are available on the electronic file) comments on scheme as submitted in summary - At present, insufficient information has been provided, some proposed alterations have not been addressed with the Heritage Statement and some proposals are unacceptable. At this stage, therefore, I would not support an approval.

Following meeting with the applicant comments on the amended plans are that provided as suggested the bin store is now omitted then The revised Planning Supporting Statement and the amended plans received on 19/03/2021 are acceptable, subject to conditions.

35. **PDNPA Ecology** – 22/01/2021 Further survey work is required as set out in the

submitted protected species survey.

2<sup>nd</sup> response 29/06/2021 Full response is on the electronic file a summary is below.

A common pipistrelle roost associated with the 'dove cotes' was identified during a survey undertaken at the end of the survey season in 2020. Further activity surveys have been undertaken confirming the original roost site as well as an additional roost located along the wall plate of the north western elevation.

Both roosts are considered to be satellites to suspected pipistrelle maternity roosts located in the adjacent chapel. The number of bats associated with satellite roosts can fluctuate at different times of the year. The proposed works need to consider impacts associated with Brunts Barn itself as well as on suspected maternity roosts in the adjacent Chapel. For example disturbance impacts during construction works and any lighting proposals.

Bats are sensitive to light pollution and the roosts at the development site are connected with maternity roosts at the adjacent chapel. The proximity of the chapel roosts can be seen below. Any new lighting needs to be carefully considered. There is also an opportunity to review existing lighting to minimise and reduce light disturbance impacts.

Conditions and advisory notes have been suggested to ensure no harm and provide adequate mitigation and some enhancement this includes bats, birds and slow worms. Subject to these conditions there is no objection.

### **Representations**

36. Representations from 11 parties have been received 10 are in objection 1 is in support.

### **Objection is raised on the following grounds –**

- Concern there may be a change of use.
- Concern there could be an increase in pedestrian and vehicular traffic eg if classes of children were brought to the barn.
- What about the upkeep of the access road.
- All parking of visitor's vehicles should be restricted to the area within the boundary of Brunts Barn's land to avoid parking on the approach road or other peoples land. There has already been nuisance parking.
- Concern over increase in traffic over the bridge and what construction traffic there will be.
- Parking at the Barn is often already fully taken up.
- Concern over the noise from the air source heat pumps as they will likely be running most of the time.
- Concern over the land shown in ownership of the applicant not being correct.
- Collaborating with Padley Chapel and its diocese will greatly increase traffic.
- Erosion to the track.
- Concern over the behaviour of overnight residents to the barn.
- Will spoil a quite hamlet.

- State a legal agreement is required to ensure the applicant makes regular payments towards the upkeep of the private access road.
- Application should not have been validated as it does not include in the site area the land upto the nearest publically maintainable highway.
- The lighting plan shows external lights, which are a problem in national parks. Concern over the colour and brightness of the lights as well as control requesting they are controlled by PIR sensors.
- Not sensitive to the historical significance of the setting of the Grade 1 listed Padley Martyr's Chapel in in the heart of the Conservation Area.
- Double glazing should not be installed on the barn as a replacement for the current single glazing.
- Far too many rooflights proposed and the description eludes that there would only be 1.
- A caged bin and recycling facility next to the footpath does not seem appropriate as it would be visible in the setting of the barn and the grade 1 listed chapel.
- Intensification would affect the tranquillity and quite enjoyment of the area.

**Support is raised on the following grounds –**

- Will enable the continuation of hosting small groups of volunteers to experience an enjoy conservation working the peak district.

37. *Officer's comment that most of these issues are dealt with in the body of the report. Issues of right of access and responsibility for maintenance of the track are legal matters rather than ones directly associated to the planning application. Planning conditions have been suggested which require the external lighting to be agreed including to ensure there is no adverse impact on bats and the applicants have confirmed that the lighting shown is on PIRs and pointing downwards so this should address the concerns raised over light pollution. Concerns raised about a potential change of use are relevant but no change of use has been applied for in this application just operational development, and this also links to any concerns about parking provision as the internal works alone are not development in their own right and there is no extension to the existing facilities just reconfiguration and improvement. If at some point a change of use does occur then planning permission would be required for such a change of use, but as submitted the applicants intentions are to work within the scope of the existing permissions as a base for the Authority's ranger service and for volunteer accommodation, along with ancillary storage and workshop facility. Similarly any extensions would also require planning permission.*

**Main Policies**

38. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, L1, L2, L3, CC1, CC2.
39. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC4, DMC5, DMC6, DMC7, DMC8, DMC11, DMC12, DMC14.

### National Planning Policy Framework

40. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect, the revised version was published in July 2021. 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 the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and Government guidance in the NPPF.
41. Para 176 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.'
42. Para 194 In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation
43. Para 197 In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
  - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
  - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
  - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
44. Para 199 When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
45. Para 202 Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
46. Para 203 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 directly or indirectly affect 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.

47. Para 180 When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.

### Core Strategy

48. 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.

49. Policy GSP2 says that 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.

50. 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.

51. 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.

52. L3 deals with heritage assets including Conservation Areas, the setting of listed buildings and Scheduled Monuments and requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of the heritage assets and their settings. Other than in exceptional circumstances development is not permitted that is likely harm the significance of a heritage asset.

### Development Management Policies

53. In summary the development management policies require a high standard of design in accordance with the SPD 'the Design Guide' including ensuing amenity is not harmed (DMC3), they require a heritage assets significance to be identified and conserved or enhanced (DMC5), development that harmed the setting of a listed building would not be permitted (DMC7), and development needs to conserve and enhance the character and appearance and setting of a Conservation Area (DMC8).

## **Assessment**

54. Brunts Barn is not a listed building but is a non-designated heritage asset of historic and vernacular merit and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and also the setting of the adjacent Grade 1 listed building Padley Chapel and the Scheduled Monument.
55. No change of use has been proposed in this application and the plans and design and access statement show that the use will remain the same, a mixed use, providing a rangers station with workshop and accommodation for volunteers.
56. As submitted there were some issues with the scheme. On the external works the main issues were the insertion of numerous rooflights. Whilst the existing ones clearly provide an opportunity for enhancement officers didn't consider that the submitted scheme achieved that in a way which is appropriate to its significance as a non-designated heritage asset in the Conservation Area and within the setting of listed building and a scheduled monument. Officers considered it was also harmful to the northwest facing elevation which is open to public view from in front of the Grade 1 listed Padley Chapel. Following a meeting with the applicant the PDNPA Heritage Team (including Conservation Officers and Archaeologists) have been able to agree a scheme which will achieve an appropriate enhancement and won't harm the character and appearance of the building or its setting.
57. Externally there is also the insertion of a new window to provide natural light into an accessible bedroom. We consider that whilst there is some impact on the significance of the building by inserting a new opening this is one that is outweighed by the public benefit of providing an accessible bedroom that will be available to volunteers with such needs. Three replacement windows are also proposed. Our conservation officers have sought planning conditions to agree the details of all new windows and with such a condition we can ensure that the detail is appropriate. And the harm from inserting the new window can be mitigated via an archaeological condition which records this and other archaeological interest in the building via agreeing a Written Scheme of Investigation.
58. The changes to the levels to provide a level access into the building is just some minor regrading of an existing tarmac surface and is acceptable and won't have any impact on significance.
59. The bin store has been omitted as the details have not been included in the public consultation and those that were received were not considered to be acceptable to PDNPA Planning, Conservation or Archaeology Officers.
60. The air source heat pumps (ASHP) will be well hidden from immediate public view by utilising the existing stone built bin stores. The reduction in the height of those walls will not have a significant impact on character appearance or significance of the building. The site is some significant distance from the nearest dwelling and there is also a significant change in levels between the proposed air source heat pumps and the nearest dwelling, therefore any noise from the air source heat pumps will not be significant.
61. These units are generally comparable to the noise generated by standard air conditioning units. The installer has explained that the specific unit proposed the noise they generate is 61db but it reduces over distance as follows at 2m it is 47db, at 6m 37.5db and at 10m 33db. These figures are based on there being a single unit, and two are proposed here so this will increase the impact and Officers have requested details of this from the installer. They have explained that for each of the figures quoted to add 3db, for example at 10m it would be 36db.

62. A loudness comparison chart has been used to compare these stated levels of sound and at 10m a noise level of 36db is comparable to a whisper quite library, which is said to be approximately 30db. For reference normal conversation is a level of approximately 60-65db.
63. The nearest dwellings boundary is approximately 25m to the north of the site (Padley Chapel Bungalow) and there is a change in levels with the air source heat pumps being on lower ground. The next nearest is Padley Manor Farm, its boundary is approximately 45m to the north east of the site. It also needs to be considered that there will still be the stone wall of the bin store between these properties and ASHP. Considering these factors we do not consider that the impact of noise from the proposed air source heat pumps would be significant enough to harm the amenity of these nearby properties.
64. The nearby track which carries a public right of way is approximately 15m from the ASHP also with a change in levels it will not affect the tranquillity of this footpath for its users. Essentially we consider that if the noise is present off site it would not be intrusive and therefore no further measures are required to mitigate its impact. The Air Source Heat Pumps will comply with our core strategy policies CC1 and CC2 and the relevant SPD.
65. In general, externally the changes in the amended scheme offer an enhancement to the character and appearance of the building and its setting including the designated heritage assets, and should be accepted.
66. The internal changes have been scrutinised by our conservation and archaeological officers, as submitted there were issues but based on the amended scheme these are accepted subject to conditions. One of the conditions includes a pre-condition to submit and agree a programme of archaeological works via a Written Scheme of Investigation. Such pre conditions need the applicants to agree to them being imposed. The applicants have accepted the suggested pre condition.

#### Highways

67. The representations and consultation responses have expressed concern over a potential intensification of the site and the access and parking available to the site. The Highway Authority have sought some assurance on these matters but if satisfied raise no objections.
68. Therefore further information on these matters has been requested of the applicant who believe that there was no intensification suggested in the submitted statements, nor one intended, and therefore there is no additional parking shown. They explain the only capacity increase shown is 2 bedspaces. And that there is no intention to increase the numbers of people using the barn, only to increase the diversity of the groups that can visit. From a planning perspective given the existing use of the site this is not considered to be a material intensification nor one which would raise any concerns over access or parking.
69. The applicants have advised that the purpose of the application is to make the site fit for its existing purposes by bringing it up to current standards including fire safety and for safeguarding of various groups of volunteers for example ones where gender groups need to be accommodated separately and/or away from the other functions of the site. Or where for example group leads needs to be accommodated separately. And to increase the accessibility of the site with provision of accessible bedroom and washing facilities.

70. The applicant also believes they have right of access across the bridge and along the road to Brunts Barn for the permitted uses of the site as a volunteer and ranger base.
71. Therefore we consider that these matters are adequately addressed and the proposal will not intensify the use or increase the need for parking on the site.

### Protected Species

72. Core Strategy Policy L2, Development Management Policy DMC11 and DMC12 together require that development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphical importance. DMC11 amongst other things states that development will not be permitted unless adequate information is provided about its likely impact on the special interests of a site.
73. The submitted protected species survey found that further survey work would be required, our ecologists confirmed that this is needed, and this further survey has now been carried out whilst this application has been live.
74. Bats and birds have been found to be using the site and a range of mitigation measures are proposed in the report to ensure they would not be harmed, these include timing of the works, talkbox toolkit, ensuring that roost entrance are not obstructed by scaffold and not repointing the dove cote hole. There are recommendations in the report for mitigation. Our ecologists have scrutinised the report and agree with the mitigation but require further conditions to safeguard and mitigate the impact on bats, birds and slow worms. Therefore we consider that planning conditions and informative as set out in our ecologists final response of 29/06/2021 which combines the recommendation of the applicants submitted protected species survey and goes further, can ensure that protected species and the biodiversity of the site are not harmed and that the impact is appropriately mitigated. With these measures we consider that the proposal is in accordance with both local and national planning policy insofar as it relates to protected species and biodiversity.

### Conclusion

75. Subject to conditions the amended plans are acceptable and will enhance the building and its setting and make it more accessible and enable adequate safeguarding for groups of volunteers and also introduce low carbon and renewable energy use to the site. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the policies of the development plan and should therefore be approved.

### Human Rights

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

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

Nil

77. Planning Officer – Steven Wigglesworth, Planner