

6. FULL APPLICATION: CONVERSION OF THE BUILDING TO CREATE NEW RESIDENTIAL DWELLING, EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS, WORKS OF HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING AND OTHER WORKS INCIDENTAL TO THE APPLICATION, FORMER NEWFOUNDLAND NURSERY, SIR WILLIAM HILL ROAD, GRINDLEFORD (NP/DDD/0121/0025, SPW)

APPLICANT: MR TIM MASKREY

Summary

1. This application relates to a proposal to create a new dwelling within an abandoned building in open countryside off Sir William Hill Road, between Grindleford and Eyam. The building currently has most of the walls standing but it has no roof, doors or windows.
2. This report concludes that the site is in a very isolated location and that whilst the existing derelict buildings may be considered to be non-designated heritage assets, this is not sufficient to justify their rebuilding and repair to create a new dwelling as this would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the landscape and would in itself require significant alteration to the fabric of the buildings. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

3. The site is located off the Sir William Hill Road which connects the site to the village of Grindleford. The site comprises of a small group of buildings including a derelict rectangular former house, an attached barn to the west and a detached outbuilding to the north. The buildings are set back around 95m from Sir William Hill Road. To the north and west of the site is Eyam Moor, and to its east is Sheriff Wood which descends down the hill into the valley of the River Derwent. A public footpath runs along the edge of the moorland to the north west of the site from where there are commanding views over the Derwent Valley and toward Froggatt edge and the wider landscape.

The former house comprises a three-bay wide structure built from rounded gritstone rubble, with dressed gritstone lintels to doors and windows. The house structure remains but is in a poor state of repair. The attached barn is also in a state of ruin. Situated to the north of the house is a small, detached outbuilding built from gritstone rubble. The building has partially collapsed and the roof has been lost.

4. No internal plaster or joinery survives. The eastern part of the building comprised two rooms, with areas of flagstone floors surviving and two fireplaces. The remains of a staircase are also present, but all floor structures have been lost, although joist pockets remain.
5. The ruined barn comprises a rectangular range built from gritstone rubble with a pitched roof of corrugated metal sheets. The roof structure does not contain any historic fabric. The northern elevation of the building is open sided, with no other extant openings into the barn.

Proposal

6. The application is for the conversion and rebuilding of the main house and associated outbuildings to provide a dwelling (Class C3 residential) and other works incidental to the application proposal.

7. The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement, a Sustainability Statement, a Structural Inspection report, and a tree survey, with a covering letter which sets out planning policies and draws the key conclusions of these reports together. The supporting statement with the application says that the aim is to reuse the existing structures and convert these to a new dwelling, providing an overall enhancement to the site.
8. The existing access from Sir William Hill Road to the site would be retained and used and parking would be provided within the site for three cars.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons

1. **The application site is in an isolated and unsustainable location in the open countryside. The substantial rebuilding, conversion and alteration of the existing buildings to create a new dwelling in this location would have a harmful impact upon the landscape character of the National Park and could harm the historic and archaeological significance of the ruins of the existing buildings in the landscape, contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3, DS1, HC1, L1 and L3 and DM policy DMC10. This harm is not outweighed by the benefit that the rebuilding and reinstatement of a non-designated heritage asset could, in principle, provide. The proposed development would represent unsustainable development within the National Park contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Key Issues

- Whether the development is acceptable in principle.
- The impact of the development on the landscape character and cultural heritage of the National Park.
- The design of the proposed development.

History

9. There have been no previous planning applications relating to this site (N.B. The Parish Council reference to a previous application appears to be incorrect).
10. 2018 – Open Enforcement enquiry - re possible unauthorised tarmac track has recently been constructed on land and past derelict farmhouse/building. Extensive excavations/building works also currently taking place at end of track past building.
11. 2019 – Open Enforcement enquiry – re Number of yurts, tepee’s and other structures which have appeared and been there for more than 28 days, vehicles also parking in field.

Consultations

12. Parish Council – *“This is the second application for conversion to a dwelling in 15 years, on this site. The Parish Council recommends approval ,with the following conditions .*
 - 1.*The development does not exceed the existing floor area ,or height of the current buildings.*
 2. *All power cables, telephone cables, mains pipe work are underground on site and on public roadside verges from the utilities in place at present .*
 3. *The dwelling is to be used by the purchaser only and not for rental, holiday let, etc.*

4. No further buildings to be allowed within the site boundary of the former Newfoundland Nursery as indicated on the location map, or within the site boundary of the proposed development above.

5. I assume that the existing track to the site, is the proposed access, this should not be tarmac, block paved.”

13. Highway Authority – No objections subject to conditions covering the following:

1. Prior provision of construction compound.
2. Visibility sightlines of 203m in both directions, as measured from a point located centrally and 2.4m back into the access.
3. Prior provision of parking facilities before occupation.
4. Submission and agreement over details of storage and recycling of refuse bins.
5. Gates set 5m from nearside highway boundary and open inwards only.

14. District Council: No response.

15. PDNPA Building Conservation Officer:

“The site is in a rural location and the buildings have been derelict for some considerable time, there is no roof on the former dwelling part of the building. The site is a former nursery, the Heritage Statement giving some history of the development. The ruin is in the middle of the rural site and doesn’t have any defined curtilage to it, the remains of a small outbuilding are close to it. Converting the ruin to a domestic house with associated curtilage development of parking and garden provision which would include hard landscaping would negatively affect the rural setting. Whilst not forming part of the current application there could be a future pressure for additional domestic buildings on the site such as garaging and sheds, this would significantly impact the setting. The provision of services to the building may have an impact either visual or if to be buried, the details should be submitted to enable an informed decision to be made.

In its current form the building sits well within the landscape and natural environment. The building has begun to be reclaimed by nature, as a ruin within the rural enclosure at the edge of Eyam Moor it makes a contribution to the local landscape. By converting it to a habitable dwelling will significantly change the way it sits within its environment, and how it affects it. Part of the value and significance of the building is the way it now fits within the natural environment, any conversion would have a negative impact on this. The building design in looking at the proposals for the building itself this appears to work reasonably well in its current form with very little loss of historic fabric to create a layout that works for modern living. The proposal will use the existing openings, with a couple unblocked. The proposals could be amended for a suitable scheme for the building, with the appropriate details. This would be subject to the principle of conversion of the ruin being acceptable.

Externally the proposals work with the existing openings, with some in the attached barn that have historically been blocked being unblocked. Details of windows and doors have been submitted at 1:50, more details would be better at an appropriate scale. Within the main building some windows are proposed to have fixed external shutters, the differentiation in window styles is suitable way to demonstrate these two building uses. The split should be based on evidence of features or use. There is a small amount of discussion within the Heritage Statement about the sections of development and use, this could be clearly shown on a plan.

For the attached barn the north elevation, it is unclear from the plans and there is limited detail within the supporting documents, but it looks like a large, glazed arrangement within the existing large opening. This would be an honest treatment for the large opening, less sub-division within the glazing may reduce the impact further. A small amount of wall is required to be built to accommodate the glazing.

It is proposed for the roof to be reinstated using natural blue slates and the corrugated roof of the barn replaced with natural blue slates. The use of material should be informed by evidence of roofing material onsite. Internally it is proposed to retain the historic stone fireplaces, and the stairs are proposed to follow the historic ones evident from stones onsite. On the ground floor some building of likely collapsed internal walls is proposed and two breaches of historic fabric, at least one a former external wall, to enable all three elements of the property to be accessed internally. At first floor level two further breaches are proposed, along the spine wall, with further consideration of the stairs and bathroom arrangements, would it be possible to reduce the need for these breaches? This could also remove the need for a stud wall close to the historic fireplace which could detract.

The rooflights are concerning, especially the ones to the south elevation. This is the elevation most visible from the road, guidance in the Alterations and Extensions SPD says they are best confined to the rear roof slopes. They are located quite low down the roof, again not within SPD guidance. They are above the windows, which fits guidance, however they are a rather domestic feature and proposed in the former agricultural part. This would not be suitable in terms of building interpretation, they should be omitted from this location as the rooms do have a window for natural light. Rooflights are also proposed on the north elevation, again in the former agricultural part, this area is an entrance way/corridor with an external door. It would be better if they were removed from the proposals.

New walls are proposed to the north and south of the building to define the curtilage, they are proposed to be drystone walls, which should be of the same material and design as others on the whole enclosure reflecting the traditional material and detailing.

Details that could assist with an informed decision on the building would be the treatment of the ground floor for insulation, RWG, ventilation for extracts and SVPs that should be internal, other external service requirements e.g. flues for wood burners. The use of materials for the proposal should be detailed, these should be traditional.

In summary the conversion of this derelict building would have a negative impact on its significance and its setting. The proposals require some amendments and additional information for an informed design decision should it be felt a conversion may be suitable at this location”.

Comments on additional/revised details:

“My comments will remain the same on the location. For the building design some amendments have been made to the proposals to address some of the comments raised in the previous consultation.

- Window plans – more detailed drawings of the cross sections have been submitted.*
- External shutters – these have now been removed to the proposed elevations, addressing concerns that the previous proposal was not based on evidence of externally opening shutters.*
- Barn glazing – the rebuilding has been omitted and glazing shown across the whole opening, this is more honest. The glazing is shown sub-divided as before.*
- Roof material – the drawings have been amended to state “as existing onsite”, although the exact material to be used has not been confirmed.*

- *Internal layout – this has been amended for the stairs and bathroom layout to remove the breach of historic fabric, this is welcomed.*
- *Rooflights – all 4 remain in the same position so these concerns have not been addressed.*
- *Details – additional details have not been submitted”.*

16. PDNPA Archaeology: Makes the following comment (quoted in full as it gives important detail about the history and significance of the site):

Recommendation: *In the first instance I request that :*

- *The additional information detailed above and requested by other Officers is provided, to allow a proper consideration of the significance of the heritage asset and the impact of the proposed development.*
- *The proposals amended in accordance with officer advice.*

Detailed response:

This is an unusual site and is certainly a heritage asset. As the supporting heritage statement sets out, it is a heritage asset of regional interest with historic, architectural and archaeological interest within the standing buildings. The historic buildings at the site appear to comprise a 2 storey range that includes former residential living space of at least 2 bays, a third bay that appears not to be of domestic origin, an attached single storey open sides shelter and a small detached outbuilding. The buildings are set in middle of group of rectilinear fields with linear tree planting that that appear to relate to the use and function of the site as a Nursery in the 19th and 20th century. Interestingly on the historic Ordnance Survey maps the buildings are set within a circular enclosure within the fields, which is usual.

The belowground archaeological interest of the site is not covered by the existing heritage statement and needs to be considered. The site sits within a set of fields that were previously part of Eyam Moor, enclosed as part of the 1813 Foolow and Eyam parliamentary enclosure act. There are extensive prehistoric remains within the immediate area, including scheduled sites, relating to prehistoric settlement and agricultural activity, and funerary and ritual activity. Here, as other areas of the Derbyshire East Moors there is significant and well-articulated evidence over extensive areas for human exploitation of the gritstone uplands from the Neolithic to the post-medieval periods. Known sites lie within the adjacent Eyam Moor, largely a reflection of the extent of agricultural enclosure of the landscape. Subsequent land improvement and management has dictated where visible earthwork sites have survived, rather than this being a reflection of the true extent of prehistoric activity.

Newfoundland Nursery and its surrounding fields form part of the same landscape, albeit one affected by 19th century enclosure, on a south facing gentle slope from the moorland plateau at the same height as sites on the adjacent moorland. It is highly likely that the same kind of prehistoric, as well as later activity, as evidenced on the moorland to the north occurred in the vicinity of Newfoundland.

There has never been an archaeological survey or assessment of the particular field but survey of adjacent farms and of Eyam moor indicate the high level of archaeological interest and potential of this area. A similar range of features can be anticipated at the site, with potential for features and remains relation to human activity from prehistoric agricultural, settlement, funerary and ritual, through to regionally important medieval hollow ways and routeways to post-medieval quarrying. Although the establishment of the Nursery and the improvement of the fields will have affected the survival and legibility of features that pre-date the 19th century enclosure of this landscape, archaeological interest and potential remains. From the information available I would estimate that there is a moderate likelihood of archaeological remains at the site, and that it is likely that archaeological remains would be of no more than regional significance in their own right,

but may contribute to the understand of nearby designated archaeological remains and features.

A structural statement has been submitted based on a structural inspection of the site.

- This is a ruined building within external stonework, no upper floors and no roof.*
- The structural information does not present sufficient detail or details proposals to give comfort that the ruined structure can be returned to a safe and habitable state without needing to take down large sections, rebuild, underpin etc. The Authority needs enough information be satisfied that a conversion, rather than rebuild is possible to secure to future of this heritage asset.*
- I therefore recommend that a more detailed structural assessment and properly scoped and drawn proposals for how the building can be structurally secured should form part of the application.*

We could do with understanding the site and building and its historic development a little more.

- It is unclear from the supporting information what the extent of the original 'house' was. The Heritage Statement (Fig.2) suggest that the whole of the larger 2 storey rectangular range might have been the house. However, the plans of the site suggest the third bay had no internal connection to the living space, and the character of the elevations suggest this bay have had a non-domestic function.*
- Understanding the historic development and use of the building is essential to help inform the proposals for the re-use of the building. Was the site built as a purpose build nursery serving the formal gardens and country houses of the region? Was it originally a farmstead that was adapted, or even a field barn or outfarm that was developed into a nursery. The 1842 tithe map within the heritage statement suggest that was a small structure here by that time (an outfarm perhaps?), and the presence of a pond serving two fields suggests an agricultural rather than horticultural origin for the site. Further historic background research such as a review of the tithe map apportionments or even the census might help provide this understand.*
- This is relevant because at present the proposals include different window and door treatment across the main range, with a mixture of more domestic style treatment, and then single glazed fixed panes with shutters more suited to conversions of barns and agricultural buildings, which may be inappropriate and harmful in this context and blur the distinction between the different parts of the building.*
- Similarly roof lights in a previous domestic part of the building might be acceptable, but less appropriate in the non-domestic areas.*
- The current design is blurring the character and function and would make the building difficult to read and understand in the future, and treatment should be informed by the historic character of the building/ different areas of the building.*

Comments on the proposals

- I note and support the comments on the Building Conservation Officer and Landscape Architect about the landscape impacts of bringing the site back into residential use. The building itself contains evidence that it was once an inhabited residential site, and if it is to be in domestic use again, this needs to done carefully and sensitively to not harm the significance of the heritage asset or its unsettled, agricultural landscape setting.*
 - I fully support the comments of the Building Conservation Officer with respect to further details needed and suggested revisions to the design to minimise harm to the significance of the heritage asset (para.190 NPPF). I would highlight the need to revisit and simplify the glazing to the large opening in the attached outbuilding, to consider the number, size and positioning of rooflights.*
 - The proposal makes good use of the existing apertures and opening in the building, this is welcomed.*

- *Changes to the internal layout, circulation and planform are required, but most of the internal layout will remain, and the proposals incorporate historic features such as the fire places, and intend to keep the stairs in their original position. This is welcomed.*
- *The proposed site plan indicates a number of new drystone walls are proposed to define the site extent, those proposed are linear and create rectangular enclosures around the site. The site's extent was historically defined by an unusual circular enclosure. This is a special feature of the site and if the Authority judges that reinstating residential use of the site is acceptable, then I would recommend it is considered if the circular curtilage could be reinstated, rather than inserting an entirely new rectangular enclosure in the area.*
- *The proposed development will require groundworks (hard landscaping, new services and drainage within the site, underground of drainage and services to the site, pack treatment plant, parking and turning areas, track treatment, footings for new walls etc.) These have the potential to encounter, damage and destroy previously unknown and unrecorded archaeological remains, deposits and features, and result in harm to the archaeological interest of the site. If all other aspects of the proposed development were considered acceptable (e.g. landscape impact, proposals to the building, design etc.), then I am confident that the belowground archaeological impacts could be appropriately mitigated by a conditioned scheme of archaeological works covering all the groundworks associated with the development.*
- *It is likely that a conditioned scheme of building recording will also be required, however, as detail above further information is required in order to ascertain that the ruined structure can be returned to a safe and habitable state without needing to take down large sections, rebuilding, underpinning etc. The Authority needs enough information to be satisfied that a conversion, rather than rebuild is possible to secure the future of this heritage asset.*

Comments on additional/revised information:

Heritage Statement

The heritage statement has been updated and revised to:

- *Examine further the historic use of the property and site, including examination of census records - this has clarified that the site was used as a dwelling for a nurseryman and his family at the time of the 1881 and 1891 census, but had no evidence of occupation prior to this, suggesting that a residential property at the site was added between 1871 and 1881.*
- *Provide more detail on the historic use of the main building range, particularly the section that was once in residential use and the parts of the building used for agricultural/horticultural function. This clarification is extremely useful when assessing the proposed window and door treatment and whether any appropriate differentiation is being maintained to clearly distinguish between the differing historic use by use of different window and door detailing.*

Comments on revised scheme

Revisions to proposed domestic curtilage and enclosure – *the proposals have been revised to reinstate the unusual historic circular enclosure around the site, rather than an entirely modern pattern of enclosure as was previously proposed. This is welcomed as it will reinstate a lost element of the site that is highly distinctive and will enhance the legibility of its historic form and significance, reinstating the relationship between the site and surrounding landscape. It is certainly a better way to achieve a residential curtilage should domestic use be reinstated than the previous proposals.*

Treatment of doors and windows – *the additional heritage information supplied makes clear the historic division between the residential part of the building and the parts of the building in agricultural/horticultural use. The proposed treatment of windows and doors accords with this. There are more domestic style windows and doors proposed for the parts of the building that were once a dwelling, with plainer and more appropriate treatment*

of the openings in the former agricultural areas including recessed single glazing with shutters. This will help to retain the legibility of the historic function of the building.

*Impact on significance of historic building - The proposal makes good use of the existing apertures and opening in the building. Changes to the internal layout, circulation and planform are required, but most of the internal layout will remain, and the proposals incorporate historic features such as the fire places, and intend to keep the stairs in their original position. The modern interventions will be legible as such. Working with the historic fabric and features of the building in this way is welcomed and means the conversion can be achieved with only **minor harm to the historic and architectural interest of the building as a heritage asset.***

*If all other aspects of the proposed development are considered acceptable (e.g. landscape impact, proposals to the building, design etc.), then I am confident that these impacts could be appropriately **mitigated by a conditioned scheme of building recording.***

Below ground archaeological interest – as detailed in my previous consultation response, the site has belowground archaeological interest. For the sake of brevity I will not restate the detail of this here, but please refer to the earlier response.

The proposed development requires groundworks (hard landscaping, new services and drainage within the site, underground of drainage and services to the site, pack treatment plant, parking and turning areas, track treatment, footings for new walls etc.) These have the potential to encounter, damage and destroy previously unknown and unrecorded archaeological remains, deposits and features, and result in harm to the archaeological interest of the site.

*If all other aspects of the proposed development are considered acceptable (e.g. landscape impact, proposals to the building, design etc.), then I am confident that the belowground archaeological impacts could be appropriately **mitigated by a conditioned scheme of archaeological works covering all the groundworks associated with the development.***

Structural information – no additional detail has been provided other than to confirm that it is the opinion of the engaged structural engineer that the only rebuilding required is off the collapsed section of masonry, and that no further taking down, rebuilding, underpinning etc. is required to secure the conversion. Given the current condition of the building as a ruin without a roof or internal floors at the first floor level to tie the building together, the Authority needs to be satisfied that the ruined structure can be returned to a safe and habitable state without needing to take down large sections, rebuild, underpin etc. The need to extensively take down and rebuild the structure would harm its significance. **Could the extent of rebuilding, limited to rebuilding of only the collapsed masonry, be secured by condition?** That way if when works start it turns out additional rebuilding is required this would need to be covered by a variation of condition and would allow the Authority to consider this.

Landscape - The site has long been ruinous without any occupation. Although historically occupied from sometime in the mid-late 19th century onwards, the reintroduction of residential use into what has become a rural site may not be appropriate in such a location in the open countryside from a landscape perspective, but I will leave such advice and comments to the Landscape Architect to consider.

Recommendation

As a non-designated heritage asset a balanced planning decision needs to be made that has regard to the significance of the heritage asset and the scale of any harm or loss to its significance (NPPF para. 203)

Should the planning balance be favourable, I recommend that the harm identified above is mitigated by a conditioned scheme of archaeological work that comprises a Level 2 Building Recording to supplement the existing heritage statement, and archaeological

monitoring of all external groundworks (including but not limited to landscaping, new services and drainage within the site, underground of drainage and services to the site, pack treatment plant, parking and turning areas, track treatment, footings for new walls etc.)

This needs to be carried out by a suitable qualified archaeologist to the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists and in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation to be approved by the Senior Conservation Archaeologist.

A condition to secure this is suggested below.

I also recommend that conditions are included to:

Limit the extent of rebuilding to the existing collapsed areas of masonry as indicated on the elevation drawings.

Remove PD rights to ensure to ensure harm resulting from changes within the setting of the heritage assets such as proliferation of domestic buildings or structures are minimised.

Scheme of archaeological works:

a) No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological work for a programme of level 2 building recording and archaeological monitoring of groundworks 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

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
2. The programme for post investigation assessment;
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
5. 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 then 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”.

17. PDNPA Landscape Architect –

The application site is located in the Enclosed Gritstone Upland LCT within the Derwent Valley LCA. This landscape is described as ‘an enclosed upland landscape associated with high ridges, shelves and former moortops. This is a landscape of isolated stone farmsteads with regular and irregular fields enclosed by drystone walls with patches of acid grassland. There are scattered mature boundary trees and groups of trees’.

- No Design & Access Statement seems to have been supplied with the application? Trees are proposed for removed, but no tree survey (to BS5837) has been provided.
- The design/specification of the access track not specified within the application.
- Replacement tree planting (species/sizes etc) have not been specified.

Given this, I object to the application on the grounds of insufficient information.

The building on site (a farmhouse, barn and outbuilding) appear to be long derelict – and were presumably associated with the sites use for agricultural and then subsequently as

a plant nursery. There is no domestic residential buildings in the surrounding landscape – it is largely unsettled outside of settlements apart from agricultural properties. Domestic conversion of this building would strongly conflict with a key element of landscape character and become an isolated domestic residential property in an unsettled agricultural landscape. Access to the site is agricultural – a field gate and apparently unsurfaced track (or possible wheel tracks). If the scheme is considered acceptable, I would request that the access is ‘low key’ and retains its agricultural character – i.e. only wheel tracks, not a fully surfaced track. No overhead services apparent – if the scheme is deemed acceptable, then I would request a condition that any new services need to be U/G – overhead electricity / phone lines would be very inappropriate and highly intrusive in this landscape

Representations

18. We have received no representations.

Main Policies

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

20. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMC13, DMT3, DMT8, DMU1 and DMU2.

National Planning Policy Framework

21. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 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 our 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. There is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the development plan and the NPPF and our policies should be given full weight in the determination of this application.

22. Paragraph 176 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.*”

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

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). 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.

24. Policy GSP2: *Enhancing the National Park* states that:

- Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon.
- Proposals intended to enhance the National Park will need to demonstrate that they offer significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area.
- When development is permitted, a design will be sought that respects the character of the area.
- Opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings. Work must be undertaken in a manner which conserves the valued characteristics of the site and its surroundings.
- Development in settlements necessary for the treatment, removal or relocation of nonconforming uses to an acceptable site, or which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted.

25. 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.

26. Policy GSP4 says that to aid the achievement of its spatial outcomes, the National Park Authority will consider the contribution that a development can make directly and/or to its setting, including, where consistent with government guidance, using planning conditions and planning obligations.

27. Policy DS1 sets out the Development Strategy for the National Park.

28. Policy HC1 says that exceptionally, new housing can be accepted where the proposals would address eligible local needs and would be for homes that remain affordable with occupation restricted to local people in perpetuity. The provisions of HC1 are supported by policy DH1, DH2 and DH3 of the Development Management Policies, which gives more detailed criteria to assess applications for affordable housing to meet local need.

29. Policy L3 'Cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance' states that:

A. '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;

B. 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;

C. Proposals for development will be expected to meet the objectives of any strategy, wholly or partly covering the National Park, that has, as an objective, the conservation and where possible the enhancement of cultural heritage assets. This includes, but is not exclusive to, the Cultural Heritage Strategy for the Peak District National Park and any successor strategy

30. 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.

Development Management Policies

31. The most relevant development management policies are DMC3, DMC5 and DMC10.
32. Policy DMC3A says 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.
33. Policy DMC3B sets out various aspects that particular attention will be paid to including: siting, scale, form, mass, levels, height and orientation, settlement form and character, landscape, details, materials and finishes landscaping, access, utilities and parking, amenity, accessibility and the principles embedded in the design related SPD and the technical guide.
34. 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 details the exceptional circumstances in which development resulting in such harm may be supported.
35. Development Management Policy DMC10 addresses conversion of heritage assets, provided that would conserve its character and significance, and where the new use and associated infrastructure conserve the asset, its setting, and valued landscape character. It also notes that new uses or curtilages should not be visually intrusive in the landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquility, dark skies, or other valued characteristics. For a market residential use DMC10B states these will only be permitted where the new use “is required to achieve the conservation and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the significance of the heritage asset and the contribution of its setting.” It goes on to state that;
36. C. 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 including:
 - (i) the supply of utility and infrastructure services, including electricity, water and waste disposal to support residential use;
 - (ii) the provision of safe vehicular access;
 - (iii) the provision of adequate amenity space and parking;
 - (iv) the introduction of a domestic curtilage;
 - (v) the alteration of agricultural land and field walls;
 - (vi) any other engineering operation associated with the development
37. Policy DMC13 says that planning applications should provide sufficient information to enable impact on trees, woodlands and other landscape features to be properly considered. Development should incorporate existing trees which should be protected during the course of the development.
38. The Design Guide states that *“the guiding principle behind the design of any conversion should be that the character of the original building and its setting should be respected and retained”*.

Assessment

Principle of proposed development

39. The Authority's adopted policies do not allow new housing in the National Park unless there are exceptional circumstances. With regards to the principle of residential use, policy HC1(C)I of the Core Strategy states that exceptionally new housing can be accepted where, in accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2, it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings.
40. The Heritage Statement which accompanies the application concludes that the existing house and outbuildings are considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. Taking this assessment into account, together with the advice of the Authority's own officers, it is considered that the barn is a non-designated heritage asset; consequently the principle of converting the building to a dwelling may be acceptable under Core Strategy policy HC1 and DM policy DMC10, which sets out the matters that should be considered in dealing with any such proposal. These policies support the principle of converting non-designated heritage assets into open market dwellings provided that the development is required to secure the conservation or enhancement of the building and the impact of the conversion on the building and its setting is acceptable. This is therefore the key issue in the determination of the application.
41. This application relates to a former dwelling and barn which is in a ruinous condition. It is clear that any former residential use rights have been abandoned due to the condition of the building and the length of time since it was previously occupied; the application does not seek to argue that the building has existing residential use rights. Consequently, the remains of the property in effect have a 'nil' use in planning terms. The submitted application proposes to redevelop the site to create an open market dwelling and associated domestic curtilage. The application proposes to retain the existing structure as far as possible and to re-use existing openings where possible.
42. A structural survey has been submitted in support of the application. This advises that "*...in my opinion, this building has not suffered to any significant extent from this type of early, primary, settlement – or subsequently – despite the slope of the site. Although some walls exhibit a slight lean and there is some distortion of the elevations, generally, wall and reveals are effectively plumb, features like the lintels are level. I come to the conclusion that the footings may well be founded on the rocky substrate, a proposition supported by the fact that rock outcrops can be seen close to the walls. However, whilst the walls have not been subject to settlement, they are open to the weather and have suffered severely as a result. Mortar has weathered away resulting in open construction and partial collapse. Timber lintels have rotted, in some places disintegrated completely, leaving the wall above in a precarious state. Nevertheless, with careful and judicious rebuilding of the collapsed sections, the replacement of rotted timber lintels and the packing and pointing of the elevations – inside and out – I am of the opinion that much of the elevations can be reinstated. However, I must caution that these old stone walls are unpredictable. Therefore, as a precursor to the start of work it would be prudent to construct a scaffold which will not only provide access but will also provide temporary support to the walls.*"
43. The site is located in an isolated location in open countryside, well outside the nearest village of Grindleford, where policy DS1 makes a strong presumption against new dwellings because this would represent an unsustainable form of development.
44. The Planning Statement submitted with the application seeks to argue that this is a "brownfield" site, or "previously developed land". It says that paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that "*Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set*

out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously developed or 'brownfield' land'." The Planning Statement acknowledges that the existing buildings on the site have not been used for a significant period of time, but it argues that the land is occupied by existing buildings that have been used as a house in the past and that are of historic merit, and that the site has not "greened over" and blended into the landscape. It also says that DMP Policy DMH6 allows for the redevelopment of Previously Developed Land for residential use. Part (i) of Policy DMH6 states that development will be permitted provided that *"the development conserves and enhances the valued character of the built environment or landscape on, around or adjacent to the site"*.

45. The Planning Statement argues that in terms of enhancement of the site, primarily through the rebuilding of the derelict structures and the use of blue slate roofing and natural gritstone to match the existing. The statement says that this will have a significant enhancement to the appearance of the buildings within the landscape. It adds that the conversion and rebuilding of the more dilapidated parts of the site will reinstate the historic arrangement of the buildings on the site, giving them a viable future use and providing the financial impetus to undertake the required works to maintain and enhance the appearance of the buildings.

46. Whether the development is required to conserve a non-designated heritage asset

The submitted application is supported by a Heritage Statement which says that the remains of the site and buildings have historic and archaeological significance. The heritage appraisal has been assessed by the Authority's Senior Archaeologist and Conservation Officer (see detailed comments above). Development plan policy DMC5 requires an assessment of significance to be with an application which relates to a heritage asset and reflects paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Heritage Statement sets out the principles that have guided the design approach to reinstatement and rebuilding and says that these follow directly from the analysis of its heritage significance, the contribution made by its setting to that significance and the understanding set out in the Heritage Statement of the character of the surrounding landscape and the need to protect it.

47. The Heritage Statement states: *"The site encompasses the remains of a dwelling and associated outbuildings, built between 1813 and 1839 to provide accommodation for Newfoundland Nursery. The buildings at the site are considered to comprise non-designated heritage assets of regional significance. The key elements of the site's significance is the integrity of its 19th Century arrangement, distinctive local vernacular and surviving internal features; and its association with the production of ornamental plants for estates in the area. The current condition of the building is poor, with total loss of roof from the main house and the collapse of external areas of stonework. It is likely that collapse will continue, and the asset lost, unless works are undertaken to repair and make the structure weathertight. The loss of this building would result in harm to the historic environment through loss of locally distinctive development of historic and architectural interest that makes a positive contribution to the character of the historic landscape. Returning this building to residential use, could secure its preservation, and subject to the development of an appropriately sensitive scheme would lead to the enhancement of the historic environment"*.

48. In terms of its significance, the Statement says that Newfoundland Nurseries was founded in the late Georgian period, formed on a new encroachment into Eyam Moor. The construction of a building at the site coincided with the creation of the nursery, and was subsequently expanded during the mid to late 19th Century, including the addition of living accommodation. The market for which Newfoundland Nurseries was producing its plants was not uncovered as part of the limited research conducted for this report, but adverts

suggest it was principally concerned with ornamental trees and shrubs. There is an oral tradition that the site produced plants for Chatsworth Estate. Consequently, the building is considered to possess regional heritage significance, deriving from.

- Its architectural interest, which makes a medium contribution to its significance, due to its distinctive local vernacular construction, the survival of 19th Century details internally including fireplaces, and the extent to which the 19th Century arrangement of the site survives.
- Its historic interest, which makes a low contribution to its significance, in relation to its history as a nursery associated with the propagation of plants for designed gardens and landscape.
- Its archaeological interest, which makes a low contribution to its significance, deriving from evidence for the phased development of the structure.
- The setting of Newfoundland Nursery is principally established by the relationship of the building to its surrounding enclosures which formed the essential economic basis for the building's existence, whilst its rural location reflects the agricultural nature of its business. These characteristics make a positive contribution to its significance, in preserving legibility of its former use.

The Heritage Statement concludes that the site contributes positively to the landscape character of the Dark Peak area of the Peak District National Park. Whilst the ruinous appearance of the building is of artistic interest, the principal value of the building is its architectural and historic interest as a surviving example of a rare site type associated with the development of estate landscapes which are one of the defining characteristics of the region. This contribution has been eroded by change in use from nursery to pasture, and is at further risk from the potential collapse of the building.

49. The submitted Planning Statement therefore argues that the principle of the proposed conversion of the existing buildings is acceptable under Policy HC1, and that the new build elements provide sufficient enhancement to the site to be acceptable under Policy DMH6, conserving the significance of the structure by sensitively restoring the cottage, utilising the existing building materials on site.
50. However, the advice from the Authority's Conservation Officer is that whilst the scheme may result in some restoration of a non-designated heritage asset, *"The building has begun to be reclaimed by nature, as a ruin within the rural enclosure at the edge of Eyam Moor it makes a contribution to the local landscape. By converting it to a habitable dwelling will significantly change the way it sits within its environment, and how it affects it. Part of the value and significance of the building is the way it now fits within the natural environment, any conversion would have a negative impact on this"*.
51. The Authority's Senior Archaeologist's advice is set out in detail above, including comments on the revised details. In summary, her view is that *"Working with the historic fabric and features of the building in this way is welcomed and means the conversion can be achieved with only minor harm to the historic and architectural interest of the building as a heritage asset. If all other aspects of the proposed development are considered acceptable (e.g. landscape impact, proposals to the building, design etc.), then I am confident that these impacts could be appropriately mitigated by a conditioned scheme of building recording"*.
52. It is acknowledged that the proposal is to re-use existing materials as far as possible and to minimise the amount of rebuilding that is required following the existing internal layout, but it is considered that due to the very poor condition of the building, the proposed development is likely to necessitate demolishing or significantly altering a substantial part of the existing structure. Although the existing walls remain and are generally straight, the building is in a ruinous condition with no roof, windows, doors, internal floors or services and is unlikely to have any substantial foundations.

53. Experience elsewhere in the National Park has shown that such schemes usually involve much more rebuilding and other interventions that are initially anticipated. It is therefore considered that the proposed development could actually harm any significance that the remaining structure possesses contrary to Core Strategy policy L3 and the Framework and DMP policy DMC10. Whilst externally the house would appear similar to the former building, internally the building would largely be a modern structure. It is pertinent to note that the application includes reference to an appeal that was allowed following the Authority's refusal of an application to reinstate the residential use of an abandoned dwelling at Callow Bank (near Hathersage and now known as Smelters Cottage). In practice, this building has been substantially rebuilt and is, in effect a new dwelling in the open countryside (albeit restricted to holiday use).
54. Furthermore, the provision of a residential curtilage and parking area would domesticate the setting of the building, which currently has a very low impact on its wider setting, being a low-key feature which is now an established part of the landscape. It is therefore considered that any benefits of restoring the buildings would not outweigh the harmful impact the development would have on the landscape character of the National Park or the harm of creating a new dwelling in an unsustainable and isolated location in open countryside. It should be noted that the Authority's Landscape Architect has objected to the application as "*Domestic conversion of this building would strongly conflict with a key element of landscape character and become an isolated domestic residential property in an unsettled agricultural landscape*".
55. The harm arising from the introduction of a residential use, unrelated to the essential management of the land holding loss of historic fabric, would not be outweighed by the benefit derived from conserving the remaining structure. It is accepted that the existing may ultimately be lost if it does not have a beneficial use, but in this case the landscape harm and unsustainable location are considered to outweigh the need to retain the building as a non-designated asset. The submitted Heritage Statement acknowledges that the renovation would alter the character of the building, diminishing its "artistic interest" as a ruin being reclaimed by nature, but considers that the benefits to the heritage interest of the National Park from preserving this important site type is considered to be greater. This is clearly a judgment about the relative merits of the building and the landscape impact of the proposed development. It should be noted that the Authority's specialist officers all express concern about the wider landscape impacts, whilst acknowledging the significance and interest of the buildings.

Siting and landscape impact

56. The application site is located in a particularly sensitive position in the landscape, on the edge of open moorland which is designated as Natural Zone, and representing wilder landscape qualities (policy L1). The site is visually isolated and is not seen in the context of any nearby built development. The visual isolation of the site is readily apparent from Sir William Hill Road and from open access land on higher ground. Due to the relatively isolated nature of the site, the impacts of the proposed development would be readily apparent. Whilst the existing structure is currently relatively inconspicuous in the wider landscape, the reinstated/rebuilt building and domestic curtilage would have a much greater impact. Increased activity at the site when the dwelling is occupied would also be noticeable; this would include vehicles accessing and parking at the site and domestic activity within the curtilage, particularly at night. Lights from the proposed development at night would be particularly noticeable in this isolated location which is characterised by profound darkness. This is an issue which Inspectors have acknowledged as being important in the National Park on appeals relating to isolated sites.

57. There are also a host of other changes outside of planning control which homeowners tend to carry out to personalise their property. Within a village setting these are constrained and usually have minor impacts but in the open countryside the impacts tend to be more profound. New fencing, formal domestic tree and plant establishment, minor signage and other land management changes would all be outside of planning control and experience has shown elsewhere the adverse impacts such as creeping domestication has upon valued landscape character.
58. To conclude on this issue, the proposed development would have a harmful impact is considered on the historic landscape character of this part of the National Park. This harm is not outweighed by the benefit that the rebuilding and reinstatement of the original dwelling, a non-designated heritage asset, could, in principle, provide.

Design, sustainable building and climate change

The scheme has been revised since submission, largely in response to comments by the Authority's Conservation Officer and Senior Archaeologist. The additional heritage information supplied now makes clear the historic division between the residential part of the building and the parts of the building in agricultural/horticultural use. The proposed treatment of windows and doors accords with this. There are more domestic style windows and doors proposed for the parts of the building that were once a dwelling, with plainer and more appropriate treatment of the openings in the former agricultural areas including recessed single glazing with shutters. This will help to retain the legibility of the historic function of the building. Overall, the proposal makes good use of the existing apertures and opening in the building. Changes to the internal layout, circulation and planform are required, but most of the internal layout will remain, and the proposals incorporate historic features such as the fireplaces, and intend to keep the stairs in their original position. The modern interventions will be legible as such. The Senior Archaeologist concludes that working with the historic fabric and features of the building in this way is welcomed and means the conversion can be achieved with only minor harm to the historic and architectural interest of the building as a heritage asset. If all other aspects of the proposed development were considered acceptable (e.g. landscape impact, proposals to the building, design etc.), she advises that the belowground archaeological impacts could be appropriately mitigated by a conditioned scheme of archaeological works covering all the groundworks associated with the development.

59. Policy CC1 and the NPPF require development to make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources, take account of the energy hierarchy and achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency. The application provides a Sustainability Statement. The statement sets out how the reinstated dwelling would meet the requirements of policy CC1 and our adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Climate Change and Sustainable Building'. The proposals are rather generic, stating that the proposal makes the best use of existing buildings by reusing the existing building to provide a new dwelling. The conversion of the building has been designed using a 'fabric first' approach, prioritising design and construction to improve thermal performance and reduce the need for energy, such as large amounts of thermal insulation, high-performance windows and doors, 100% low energy light fittings, 'A' rated white goods to kitchen and high efficiency hot water/ heating boiler. Overall, whilst the application is considered to be generally acceptable in this regard, as noted above the location of the reinstated dwelling is not sustainable as it would rely on a high level of car use.

Impact on amenity

60. The property is located in a relatively isolated location with no immediate neighbours so there would be no impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal therefore accords with policies GSP3 and DMC3 in these respects.

Trees and protected species

61. There are a number of mature trees within the boundary of the site. The application is not accompanied by a tree survey to assess whether there would be any impact on trees as a result of the development. However, officers have assessed this on site and, subject to appropriate protection during construction and any necessary mitigation, the proposal is unlikely to affect any trees which are significant in the landscape or are otherwise important, in accordance with policy DMC13.

Highway issues

62. Access to the site from Sir William Hill Road would remain as the existing, via the track that leads to the building. Three car parking spaces would be provided within the site boundary. The Highway Authority has no objection, subject to conditions. The proposals are therefore in accordance with Policy DMT3 and DMT8.

Other Issues

63. If approved, a planning condition would be required to ensure that any new utility infrastructure on land in the applicant's ownership and control is installed underground to would ensure the proposal is in accordance with DM policies DMU1 and DMU2. Overhead lines would have an unacceptably intrusive impact of the landscape. However, it should be noted that the applicant would not be able to guarantee that service lines on land outside his ownership and control would be placed underground, so it is likely that overhead lines and poles could be erected in the highway or across adjacent land; this would further exacerbate the visual impact of the development, contrary to policy L1.

Conclusion

64. It is considered that the proposed development is in conflict with Core Strategy policies DS1, HC1, L1 and L3 because the proposal is for the restoration of a derelict building to a dwelling in an isolated and unsustainable location in the open countryside. The site is on the edge of the Natural Zone landscape, representing an area and experience of wilder quality. As such the development would harm the landscape character of this part of the National Park and the works to the buildings themselves, whilst restoring some aspects of the non-designated assets, could harm historic and archaeological significance of the ruins of the existing buildings in the landscape. The proposed development would therefore not represent sustainable development within the National Park contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

65. Having taken into account all material considerations and issues raised in representations we conclude that the proposed development is contrary to the development plan. Therefore, the application is recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

67. Nil

68. Report Author: Steven Wigglesworth, Planner