

**5. FULL APPLICATION – ERECTION OF A CATTLE SHED – WHITE PARK BARN
ALSOP ROAD PARWICH (NP/DDD/0521/0559, MN)**

APPLICANT: MR CHADFIELD

Summary

1. The proposal is to construct a new cattle shed in a field to the east of an existing group of farm buildings, in the countryside west of Parwich village.
2. The proposed development would extend the building group along the roadside, rather than being contained within the existing farm building group, giving rise to adverse landscape impacts.
3. In breaking through the field boundary and extending the building group between two fields it would also harm the significance of the medieval field system, harming this important archaeological heritage asset.
4. Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal.

Site and surroundings

5. The application site is a field located on the outskirts of Parwich approximately 250 metres away from the Conservation Area. A range of modern agricultural buildings are sited in the field to the west of the proposed new building.
6. The site is adjacent to the highway and would be accessed by the existing access into the farm, where the holding's existing agricultural buildings stand.
7. The boundary of the site comprises of mature trees and hedgerows, shielding the view of the field from the road.

Proposal

8. To erect a general purpose agricultural building. This would be positioned in the field to the east of the one containing the existing group of farm buildings, close to the roadside boundary. Planting (hedgerow) between the two fields has already been removed to facilitate access to the application site from the field containing the existing buildings – access in to the new building would be taken through one of the existing buildings. Excavation and surfacing works have already been undertaken to facilitate the development. These works do not have planning permission and where they amount to development are therefore currently unauthorised.

RECOMMENDATION:

9. That the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:
 1. **The siting of the building would cause harmful encroachment into the open and undeveloped countryside, rather than forming an appropriate extension to the existing building group. The development would therefore fail to make use of the least obtrusive or otherwise damaging possible location as required by policy DME1. Due to its size and appearance, this siting would result in harm to the rural character of the landscape at this location, causing harm to the special qualities of the National Park, contrary to policies GSP1, 2, and 3, L1, and DMC3.**

2. **By extending the existing developed area through adjoining fields the development would harm the legibility and significance of the medieval strip fields, causing archaeological harm to this non-designated heritage asset that is not outweighed by other policy or material benefits, contrary to policies L3 and DMC5.**

Key Issues

10. The archaeological impacts of the development.
11. The impact of the development on the appearance of the locality.

History

12. 2017 – Planning permission granted for additional livestock building and extension to the existing agricultural building
13. 2013 – Planning permission granted for agricultural building.

Consultations

14. **Highway Authority** – No highway objections on the basis the building is used for agricultural purposes, in support of existing farming activities carried out on surrounding controlled farmland.
15. **Parish Council** – Supports the application on the grounds that it is in the economic interest of the community.
16. **District Council** – No response at time of writing.
17. **PDNPA – Archaeology** – Raise concerns about the archaeological impacts that the preparatory works already undertaken have had (and may have had) in terms of hedgerow removal and excavation of ground.
18. Irrespective of those works however, they conclude that the extension of the building group in to a further field results in harm to the significance of the medieval field system - the most important, and rarest, historic landscape feature type within the National Park.
19. They therefore object to the siting of the building, and suggest that another less harmful alternative is sought.
20. The full response can be viewed on the Authority's website, and is also further detailed in the 'Archaeological impacts' section of this report, below.

Representations

21. 3 letter of representation have been received, one supporting the application (from the District Councillor for the Ward) and two objecting to it. The grounds for support are summarised as:
 - Wish to support our local young farmers in order to make sure that our 'food miles' are less; sourcing local is far better for the nation and for the environment.
22. The grounds for objection are summarised as:

- The size and location of the building would have a adverse landscape impacts
- Query whether there is an alternative location available resulting in a reduced level of visual impact, such as within the existing group of buildings
- Much of the land farmed is at another location, and it is questioned whether a building should be located there instead
- Query the agricultural justification for a building of the size proposed

Main policies

23. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L3, CC1

24. Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DME1

National planning policy framework

25. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was first published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. It was last revised and republished 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 Local Plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies document 2019. Policies in the Local 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 Local Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.

26. Paragraph 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.'

27. Part 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework deals with conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

28. Amongst other things, paragraph 199 states that 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.

29. Paragraph 203 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. It states that 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.

Local Plan

30. GSP1, GSP2, jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.

31. GSP3 requires that particular attention is paid to the impact on the character and setting of buildings and that the design is in accord with the Authority's Design Guide and development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park.

32. DS1 supports extensions to existing buildings in principle, subject to satisfactory scale, design and external appearance.
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. Core Strategy policy L3 requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal significance of archaeological, artistic or historic asset and their setting, including statutory designation and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest.
35. Core Strategy policy CC1 requires development to make the most efficient and sustainable use of land and resources, to take account of the energy hierarchy (reducing the need for energy; using energy more efficiently; supplying energy efficiently; and using low carbon and renewable energy) to achieve the highest standards of carbon reduction and water efficiency, and to be directed away from flood risk areas.
36. DME1 deals specifically with agricultural development and states the following:
37. New agricultural and forestry buildings, structures and associated working spaces or other development will be permitted provided that it is demonstrated to the Authority's satisfaction, that the building at the scale proposed is functionally required for that purpose from information provided by the applicant on all the relevant criteria:
 - (i) 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.

B. New agricultural and forestry buildings, structures and associated working spaces or other development shall:

- (xi) be located close to the farmstead or main group of farm buildings, and in all cases relate well to, and make best use of, existing buildings, trees, walls and other landscape features; and
- (xii) not be in isolated locations requiring obtrusive access tracks, roads or services; and
- (xiii) respect the design, scale, mass and colouring of existing buildings and building traditions characteristic of the area, reflecting this as far as possible in their own design; and
- (xiv) avoid adverse effects on the area's valued characteristics including important local views, making use of the least obtrusive or otherwise damaging possible location; and
- (xv) avoid harm to the setting, fabric and integrity of the Natural Zone.

38. DMC3 states that development will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place.
39. Development Management Policy DMC5 provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals. It also requires development to avoid harm to the significance, character, and appearance of heritage assets and advises that development affecting non-designated heritage assets that fails to do so will only be supported if it is considered to be acceptable following a balanced judgement that takes into account the significance of the heritage asset.

Assessment

Principle of development

40. Policy DME1 permits new agricultural buildings providing that the building is functionally required for that purpose.
41. White Park Farm runs a 20 head beef suckler cow herd, with up to 20 calves at foot, 9 heifers, and a flock of 70 Texel ewes. In addition, they operate a mobile animal farm and fencing contracting services to supplement income.
42. The proposed building is required to accommodate increasing stock numbers, plus hay and straw bales and machinery. A breakdown of stock numbers and required floorspace has been provided, and further details of additional storage needs have been provided during the course of the application, including:
- Hay storage 200 round bales - 150 sqm
 - Straw storage - 178 sqm
 - Corn store – 5 sqm
 - Machinery:
 - International tractor c/w front loader = 8 sqm
 - JCB Fastrac = 13 sqm
 - Muck Spreader = 10 sqm
 - Chain Harrows = 8 sqm
 - 360 digger = 8 sqm
 - Livestock Trailer – 15' x 6 = 8.36 sqm
 - Bale trailer – 8' x 48' = 35.7 sqm
 - Flail mower = 4 sqm
 - Total Machinery = 95 sqm
43. This demonstrates that additional building space is required, and that the proposed building would not be excessive to meet that need.
44. Representation has queried why the building cannot be sited at land farmed by the applicants at Hulland Ward. We are advised by the applicant's agent that the land at that location is tenanted on a grazing/cutting lease only, with evidence from the leasing agent having been submitted in support of that position. On this basis buildings cannot be built on that land by the applicant, and so it remains necessary for them to graze livestock at that location but to lamb and house them at the Parwich base.
45. On this basis, it is accepted that the building is functionally required for the purposes of agriculture, and its erection therefore complies with policy DME1 in principle.

Siting, design, and appearance

46. In terms of design and appearance, the proposed building would be a modern portal framed building with a pitched roof. It would be a large structure – measuring 25m long by 15m wide by 6.65m to the ridge.
47. Materials would be profile metal sheeting roof and upper walls above concrete panels to the lower walls. It would reflect the appearance of the modern agricultural buildings.
48. The proposed building would be sited on land adjacent to the existing building group, and adjacent to the roadside. It would extend the building grouping in to a further field to the south east of the group, increasing the encroachment of the site in to the open countryside.
49. Where visible from the highway – from which it would be only partly screened, particularly when the roadside planting is not in leaf – it would appear as a large and prominent structure at the roadside.
50. Further, the roadside enclosure of the existing development (planting and timber fencing and gates) mean that it wouldn't be read as part of a larger building group in many views either.
51. This would harm the character of the largely undeveloped landscape in this location.
52. By contrast, positioning the building within the same field as the existing buildings would better contain the development, and reduce its visibility in wider views due to the aforementioned roadside boundary treatment.
53. We requested that the applicant consider this alternative during the course of the application. They have advised that they want to pursue the development as proposed however, and that the volume of excavation required in the other field would be prohibitively expensive. They also advise that the alternative site would be on a different level to the existing buildings, and not in as close proximity. No further details have been provided on those issues however, and why it would not be possible to position the building close to the existing ones and excavate to achieve matching levels.
54. Based on the submission, it is therefore not accepted that the development would make use of the least obtrusive or otherwise damaging possible location, as policy DME1 requires, and would have an adverse impact on the landscape character of this part of the National Park, contrary to policies GSP1, 2 & 3, DS1, L1, DMC3 and DME1.

Archaeological impacts

55. The proposed development is within an area of ancient enclosure; fossilised medieval strip fields. These are fields that relate to the medieval open field system of Parwich. They are present today in the retained field shape and field boundaries, characterised by the enclosed narrow strips with a characteristic s-shaped curve, and with extensive areas of lynchets and ridge and furrow earthworks. Fields that reflect these very early enclosure patterns survive extensively to the west, south and east of the village, and ridge and furrow earthworks also survive within the field where the building is proposed.
56. The Authority's archaeologist advises that the fossilised medieval strip fields are a rare and precious landscape character type and important to the Peak District National Park, having intrinsic landscape value, and providing the area a distinct character, and a 'time

depth' to the landscape. The archaeologist advises that they are the most important, and rarest, historic landscape feature type within the National Park.

57. Based on this assessment, they are concluded to be a non-designated heritage asset of regional significance, and of archaeological interest.
58. The Archaeologist recognises that any new building within this field system is likely to have some archaeological impact, but that different options that would result in greater or lesser degrees of harm.
59. They advise that – notwithstanding the fact that the proposed site has already been prepared – building in the proposed position and extending the farm building group in to the field to the east of the existing group would be more harmful to the historic landscape than keeping the any new buildings within the field already built in and associated with the existing farm building group, even though this would require new groundworks.
60. They advise that the impact of any new groundworks could be mitigated if needed – but that there is no way to mitigate the impact of the proposed building extending the farm building group into a new field, the loss of the section of important historic hedgerow, and the impact on this important section of historic landscape.
61. Based on the impacts identified by the Archaeologist, we must agree that they cannot be mitigated. The arrangement and form of the field system is key to its historic and archaeological interest; eroding the legibility of that by extending development between fields cannot be offset through any reasonable mitigation measure.
62. As a result the proposals are contrary to policies L3 and DMC5.

Amenity impacts

63. The building would be positioned approximately 75m northwest of the nearest residential property, and 185m southeast of the next nearest. For the proposed use, this position would minimise adverse impacts beyond those that would ordinarily be expected to be associated with the existing farm operating from the site.
64. The development is concluded to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties.

Highway impacts

65. The development would conserve highway safety, as it would use an existing access and would not result in a significant increase in the intensity of use of the site, being part of the existing farm business.

Climate change mitigation

66. The applicant advises that the building would incorporate sustainably sourced materials and would have clear sheeting areas to the roof to avoid the need for artificial lighting. Given the nature of the development these measures are considered sufficient to comply with policy CC1.

Planning balance

67. The NPPF advises that where development would result in less than substantial harm to a non-designated heritage asset, it is necessary to have regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset when reaching a planning judgement. Whilst the harm identified is localised, the heritage asset has been identified to be of high

local significance, being the rarest and most important historic landscape feature in the National Park. The incremental erosion of the medieval field system through development is incompatible with the conservation of this asset. In this case, there may also be less harmful locations where the development could take place instead, but these have been discounted without compelling planning reasons as to why they could not be undertaken.

68. This all weighs heavily against the proposals, and is concluded to significantly outweigh the very modest benefits that permitting a building in this location would afford in terms of the management of the landscape and in supporting the economic wellbeing of local communities.

Conclusion

69. The development would result in harm to both the character and appearance of the landscape in this location, and to its archaeological significance, contrary to planning policy.
70. There is no conflict between the intent of relevant policies in the Development Plan and Government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no other material considerations that would indicate planning permission should be granted.
71. Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

73. Nil

Report Author: Mark Nuttall, Senior Planner (South)