

**7. FULL APPLICATION - DEMOLITION OF AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS AND RESTORATION OF FIELDS, CONVERSION OF OUTBUILDING TO HOLIDAY LET. CHANGE OF USE FOR KEEPING HORSES STABLE AND MANEGE RIDING/ARENA AT MIDDLE FARM, WHESTON. (NP/DDD/0720/0671 SPW)**

**APPLICANT: CHRISTIAN BATEMAN**

**Summary**

1. As submitted the proposal was major development contrary to both national and local policy, it also raised local objection (as well as an equal amount of support).
2. The scheme has been amended by the applicant to remove the contentious parts and those parts which did not comply with planning policy.
3. The amended scheme now proposes a holiday let; a private stable and riding arena; and demolition of some agricultural buildings and restoration of that land to grass.
4. Subject to conditions the amended scheme will provide an enhancement through demolition of the agricultural buildings to the character and appearance of the area including the Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings and is recommended for approval

**Site and Surroundings**

5. Middle Farm fronts onto the southern side of Wheston Bank, the main road through the hamlet of Wheston which is not a named settlement in the Development Plan (DS1). Therefore for the purposes of applying policy the development is considered to be a countryside location. Wheston itself comprises a grouping of farms in a linear development pattern and sits within the limestone plateau landscape.
6. The farmhouse lies gable to the road at the north-eastern corner of the site with a large range of modern agricultural buildings lying to the west and which also front the main road. Some are understood to be leased to another party for rearing calves. To the rear there is a hard surfaced area previously used for silage storage and is where we have recently learned the proposed riding arena has been constructed.
7. On the south-eastern boundary there is an unauthorised stable building of recent construction finished in dark profiled sheeting. There has been some changes in levels around the stable to build up and create a level area around the building, with a retaining wall which is faced with limestone and topped with a post and rail fence.
8. During the officer's site visit there appeared to be a mobile café vehicle operating from where the submitted plans proposed a café - now omitted in the amended scheme. Signs had also been erected in the highway verge in relation to the café.
9. There is a footpath running adjacent to the south-eastern boundary of the application site. Wheston Bank, the main road through the hamlet lies to the front and a track/unmade road to the side and rear (which carries the Pennine bridleway). The site is widely open to public view from immediate and distant vantage points.
10. The site lies within Wheston Conservation Area. Nearby listed buildings include Upper Farm which is immediately opposite the site (20m), Wheston Hall and its boundary walls which are next to the site to the North West (approx. 50m to the listed buildings) with the Pennine way between. Middle Farm itself is listed on our historic building and sites record (HBSMR) as a partially extant 19<sup>th</sup> century farmstead.

11. The site is within the White Peak Landscape character area within the landscape character type Limestone village farmlands.

### **Proposal**

12. The amended proposal comprises a number of elements which include the retention of the stable building and horse riding arena, demolition of an agricultural building and silage clamp with restoration of the land to fields and the conversion with extension and alterations of an outbuilding to a holiday let.
13. The new stable part of this application is retrospective. It is clad with metal sheets to its roof and walls and has a mono pitch roof and sits on a raised platform.
14. The conversion relates to the small stone an outbuilding beside the house to form a one bed holiday let. Externally this includes replacing the mono pitched corrugated roof with a dual pitched roof in natural blue slate, and inserting windows, doors and rooflights. The accommodation would be approximately 24m<sup>2</sup> providing all the facilities for independent occupation with a rectangular garden area proposed at the rear extending into the adjacent field strip and demarcated with a drystone wall.
15. The demolition of the modern portal frame agricultural buildings has already commenced with one demolished. The land formerly occupied by the demolished buildings is shown returned to pasture for grazing.
16. The riding arena replaces an existing external agricultural storage area. This requires some re-profiling of the land and the amended plans now include level information to show this. There are no details of the proposed surface. A 1.3m post and wire fence is shown bounding the riding arena.
17. The drawings also show the extent of the change of use of the land for the keeping of the horses.
18. The plans also show indicative new tree planting mainly around the perimeter of the farmstead.
19. For clarity the former proposals to convert the agricultural buildings to business uses, storage and a new café as well as a motorhome campsite have all been omitted from the amended plans and the development description revised to suit.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- 1. Standard time limit**
- 2. Carry out in accordance with specified amended approved plans.**
- 3. Holiday let conversion of the existing building, no rebuilding.**
- 4. Holiday let to have standard short let holiday let restriction and be ancillary and within the same planning unit as 'Middle Farm house'.**
- 5. Remove permitted development rights from the holiday let**
- 6. Agree details, recess and finish of timber windows and doors (for holiday let)**

- 7 **New stonework shall be natural limestone laid to match the existing with holiday let roof clad with natural blue slate.**
- 8 **Cast metal RWGs painted black and installed on rise and fall brackets directly to the stonework without the use of fascia (for holiday let).**
- 9 **Agree details of Conservation type rooflight fitted flush with the roofslope. (for Holiday let).**
- 10 **Remove permitted development rights for means of enclosure and no jumps (except within the riding arena).**
- 11 **No external lighting/flood lighting on/for the riding arena.**
- 12 **Submit and agree scheme of lighting for the site including stables.**
- 13 **Limit the change of use for the keeping of horses to the area outlined in red on the approved plan '117/E'.**
- 14 **Submit details of surfacing material for riding arena.**
- 15 **Submit details landscaping scheme for the riding arena.**
- 16 **Omit fences to the perimeter of the riding arena and replace with limestone drystone wall or a post and rail fence with mixed hedge outside.**
- 17 **The horse riding arena to be ancillary to and remain within the same planning unit as Middle Farm, for private use of the occupants only.**
- 18 **Limit stable for keeping of up to 3 horses only.**
- 19 **Submit details of spoil and waste removal from the demolition of the buildings and removal of the silage yard shall be permanently removed from the site and land in ownership.**
- 20 **Notwithstanding what is shown on the approved plans, no approval is hereby granted for any outdoor amenity space for the holiday otherwise than in accordance with an amended scheme to be agreed showing space relocated within the bounds of the farmstead.**
- 21 **Footnote: re permission not providing any change of use of the existing agricultural buildings, or associated access and yard areas.**

### **Key Issues**

20. Is the proposal major development?
21. Impact on the character and appearance of the area including the conservation area and the setting of the nearby listed buildings?
22. Amenity or highways issues?

### **History**

23. March 2021 Without prejudice to the current planning application planning and enforcement officers together have advised that removal of an unsafe agricultural building was acceptable although at the applicants risk as the application which included this had not yet been determined.

24. There is an open enforcement case on the site in relation to the erection of stables without planning permission and the unauthorised use for storage of caravans, also earth movements and landscaping have been added to this file. Reports have also been received about a café operating from the premises.
25. Enquiry 37909 – February 2020 pre application advice – Advice was provided that demolition of much of the agricultural building stock and replacing these with a 42 pitch caravan motorhome site with additional 4 log cabins and ancillary facilities as well as a single holiday let was major development, contrary to development plan policy and the NPPF and unlikely to be acceptable.
26. NP/DDD/1209/1084 Planning permission granted for steel framed agricultural building. Planning conditions require its removal when it is no longer required for the purposes of agriculture.
27. WED/1292/589 Planning permission granted for muck midden.
28. NP/WED/590/229 Planning permission granted for extension to dwelling.
29. NP/WED/1089/603 Erection of cattle building
30. Earlier history not relevant to the application, so not listed here.

## **Consultations**

### Derbyshire County Council Highways

31. *In the amended proposal, it is noted that B1 uses, café, and the proposal for caravan pitches have been omitted.*
32. *Wheston Bank varies in width at some locations, and along with the other surrounding highways, the width appears sub-standard for two-way traffic without having any passing places and an increase in two-way traffic on these highways could cause severe impacts to the free flow of traffic, particularly in the presence of PROW routes currently used by cyclists and walkers. Therefore, reviewing the amended proposal, the Highway Authority is satisfied that traffic generation from the site would not be as significant as compared to the previous proposal. However, clarification is needed for retaining existing buildings at the site.*
33. *In terms of parking associated with proposed horses and riding arena, further information is required, and parking for this business needs to be shown on a revised plan.*
34. *On site turning is recommended on classified roads (Wheston Bank) to enable vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward gear, and for the largest vehicle expected at this site, the turning to be demonstrated by a swept path assessment. A revised drawing to this effect is submitted for review.*
35. *A revised drawing incorporating the above comments and additional information as requested in this response be submitted before the Highway Authority would be able to provide further comments on this proposal.*
36. Wheston Parish Meeting – No response to date.
37. Derbyshire Dales District Council – No response to date.

38. Peak District National Park Authority Rangers – No objections. Recommend advisory footnote re footpaths which are unaffected by the development.
39. Peak District National Park Authority Archaeologist
40. *“Middle Farm, Wheston is a historic farmstead recorded in the Peak District National Park Authority’s Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record.*
41. *The farmstead was greatly altered and expanded over the 20th century, and the core of the historic farmstead is only represented by the linear farmhouse range and the small outbuilding to its east.*
42. *Below ground archaeology*
43. *I agree with the conclusion of the heritage statement with respect to the archaeological interest of the site; the site is located within a landscape of high archaeological interest for human activity from prehistory onwards, and is located within the historic core of the medieval village of Wheston.*
44. *However, the development of the farmstead over the 20th century and extent of modern disturbance resulting from this is extensive, and the proposed development is entirely confined to within the existing development footprint.*
45. *Therefore it is unlikely that any archaeological remains or features will be affected by the proposed development, and there no concerns from a belowground archaeological perspective.*
46. *Stone outbuilding*
47. *The small stone built outbuilding is proposed for conversion to a holiday let. The heritage statement assesses this building as being of local significance, and to the bottom end of that scale i.e. this is a building with very little heritage value. Historic maps indicate that the building was added to the farmstead in the late 19th century, and it is built of traditional limestone.*
48. *It is heavily altered, with modern roof, modern window and door opening. It so altered that its original form, function and role with the farmstead is not clear.*
49. *The heritage statement asserts that it is highly likely that the building once had a pitched roof, rather than the mono-pitched roof it presently has, but no evidence for this is presented.*
50. *It is not clear whether the inside of this building retains any evidence, fixture or fittings that may help understand its origin and development, but the as existing plans suggest that it already has modern stud walling, toilet and both fittings internally. This suggests that the interior of the building has little interest, and that any interest lies in its external appearance.*
51. *The very little heritage value that this building has lies in its materials, its form and massing and in its place within the historic planform of the farmstead.*
52. *The proposed conversion requires 4 new windows and new door arrangements on 2 elevations as well as 2 rooflights in this very small structure, this along with the change to a pitched roof will change the character of the building and leave very little of the buildings current external form and appearance.*

53. *My concern is that the building is so altered, and possesses so little intrinsic heritage value, that I question whether it is worthy of conversion to a holiday let under policy DMC10.*

54. *And if it is considered to have enough interest and significance to be worthy of conversion, then shouldn't the conversion conserve the current form, interest and character of the building and not change it to such a degree?*

55. *Landscaping*

*The proposed development seeks to reduce the extent of modern development of the site, demolishing a number of buildings, reinstating some areas of field and rebuilding a drystone wall boundary that is of historic interest. These are beneficial to the historic landscape character of the area and can be considered an enhancement to the character of the site.*

56. *Conservation Area and Setting of Listed Buildings*

57. *A key heritage consideration for the proposed development is the effect on the Conservation Area and on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.”*

58. Peak District National Park Authority Built Environment

59. *The proposals are within Wheston Conservation Area and is opposite Upper House Farm, two Grade II listed buildings, there are other listed buildings close to the site.*

60. *Traditional Outbuilding*

61. *“At the front of the site there is a small outbuilding that has been identified in the Heritage Statement as a traditional building that has local significance. The building has been altered and currently has a mono-pitch roof with a modern domestic opening on the south east elevation (this has been added since the google maps images were collected). The proposal includes replacement of the recent domestic opening (on the most prominent elevation) with French doors, this elevation was blank. It is also proposed to create several new window openings on three elevations. These new openings would affect the character and appearance of the building, changing it from a small plain outbuilding to one with a significant number of domestic openings. The roadside elevation will remain blank.*

62. *The proposal is to convert to a small holiday let, being open plan apart from the small bathroom. There is no detail of the internal features of the building within the Heritage Statement, the existing plan shows the current layout with a low brick wall and stud partition for a toilet. The existing plan form will be significantly altered, however as the interior has not been described or photographed an informed view cannot be made.*

63. *It is proposed to change the existing roof to a pitched roof, the Heritage Statement identified that this was the likely roof form. The roof will have two rooflights inserted on the south east elevation, this is the prominent elevation within the Conservation Area and therefore not in line with the Design Guide. Rooflights are also domestic features, this is a traditional agricultural building so rooflights are not generally an appropriate feature. The Heritage Statement provides no evidence for the pitched roof other than “was most likely its original roof form”. It is questionable whether the building fits within the policy for conversion as it may not be of sufficient historic or architectural merit to warrant its conversion, although the Heritage Statement does describe it as “a heritage asset of local significance, although at the bottom end of that scale.” The large number of new openings does not fit with the conversion principles outlined in the Design Guide, the character of the building itself is not shaping the conversion. The external character of the building will be extensively altered by the conversion proposed.*

64. Associated with the holiday let a small courtyard garden is proposed to the south east of the building, this is currently an agricultural area, this would create a domestic curtilage to the building that is on the prominent elevation which would affect the character and appearance of the building and the conservation area.
65. Farmyard and demolished buildings (Note – comments edited to amended scheme only)
66. The fields surrounding Middle Farm (south of the road) are identified within the conservation area appraisal as of important open space, buildings 5, 6 and 7 are within, and remain in this important open space. The removal of some of the large agricultural buildings will reinstate some of this important open space, returning it to a grass covering would contribute to the important open space.
67. The southern part of the site is to have building 8 removed and returned to grass/field, this is a positive contribution to the conservation area and reinstatement of important open space. Overall, whilst some building removal will enhance the conservation area, the current proposals will have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.”
68. Peak District National Park Authority Landscape Architect. (Note – Comments edited to amended scheme only)
69. “The application site is located within the ‘Limestone Village Farmlands’ LCT in the White Peak LCA. It is also located within the Wheston Conservation Area. It is not located in the Natural Zone. The site is currently a large ‘mass’ of a number of agricultural buildings and structures – the removal and re-purposing of these has the potential to improve the site and its setting. The application includes tree planting – however, as defined this does not offer enough screening and setting enhancement. However, provision of adequate landscaping could be conditioned.
70. Is lighting proposed as part of the application? This would potentially have adverse effects on landscape character and adverse visual effects. Again, this could be conditioned. What is the landscape treatment for the NW site corner (adjacent to units 5 and 6)? Some existing trees are on site in this location (despite the application stating that ‘no trees or hedges are on the proposed development site’) - these should be retained and protected. Additional planting should also be proposed here. This needs to be defined, but could be conditioned. The DAS states that ‘lines of trees will be planted at the boundary of the site to provide comprehensive visual screening’. I am not of the opinion that the planting as shown will achieve this (see attached mark-up comments). All trees need to be planted at an adequate size (standards as a minimum) and be adequately protected.
71. The LVA is generally weak and doesn’t consider issues of vehicle movement and changes to landscape character or likely visual effects as a result of the use of the site changing from a farm to business units / touring caravan pitches. The LVA significantly under-represents the sensitivity of both the LCT and the Wheston Conservation Area.
72. Summary
73. Other elements of the scheme may be considered positive – although a condition will be required to address issues of the adequacy of landscaping (marked up plan provided on the file).”

## Representations

74. 20 representations have been received there are 10 in support and 10 in objection.

75. Objection is raised on the following grounds – (Note – Comments edited to amended scheme only(where clear))

- The sustainability of the proposed development in this location.
- Contrary to policy the proposal would result in the total loss of agricultural business from the site.
- Significant adverse impact on the landscape and community.
- Significant adverse impact on the tranquillity of the area.
- Highways issues, including safety and access.
- The rural location would necessitate all visitors and workers travelling to the site by private vehicles.
- Would harm the character of the conservation area and the hamlet.
- Ecological and Environmental issues and considerations.
- Local wildlife would be disturbed by the increase in activity at the site. And the application lacks any survey work to establish if protected species would be affected.
- Contrary to planning policy and guidance.
- The proposal is unneighbourly.
- Concern over lighting.
- Concern over impact on operation of neighbouring agricultural business.
- Won't provide local employment.
- Screening will take 20 – 30 years to establish.

76. Support is raised on the following grounds –

- Need for a campsite within walking distance of Tideswell
- Will bring business to the area at a time when holidaying will be in this country.
- Wheston has developed with extensions added to family homes, improvements to redundant stone buildings and the introduction of holiday lets, this proposal will be no different.
- Will reinvigorate deteriorated, fallen buildings and introduce a thoughtfully designed use of the farm and will improve Wheston aesthetically, enhancing the conservation area.
- Will boost the local economy.
- There are laybys on the lanes used to approach the site, so concerns about access are not accepted.
- The scheme includes pasture restoration and landscaping
- Local Employment

77. Officers note that the representations have been made in relation to the scheme as submitted. Most of the comments raised relate to the previous scheme, whilst we did undertake a full reconsultation it has not generated any revised representations. So the representations need to be considered insofar as they remain relevant to the amended scheme and development description.

**Main Policies**

Relevant Core Strategy policies: DS1, GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, L1, L2, L3, RT1, RT2, RT3, T1, T3, T6, T7.

Relevant Development Management policies: DM1, DMC1, DMC3, DMC4, DMC5, DMC7, DMC8, DMC10, DMC14, DMR1, DMR2, DMR3, DMR4, DMT3, DMT5, DMT6, DMT8.



### **National Planning Policy Framework**

78. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised 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.
79. 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.'
80. Para 177 explains that when considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:
- (a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
  - (b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and  
any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

### **Core Strategy**

81. 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.
82. 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.
83. 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.
84. Policy L1 requires that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape Character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan and other valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.

85. 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.

86. RT2: Hotels, bed and breakfast and self-catering accommodation

Proposals for hotels, bed and breakfast and self-catering accommodation must conform to the following principles:

A. The change of use of a traditional building of historic or vernacular merit to serviced or self-catering holiday accommodation will be permitted, except where it would create unacceptable landscape impact in open countryside. The change of use of entire farmsteads to holiday accommodation will not be permitted.

B. Appropriate minor developments which extend or make quality improvements to existing holiday accommodation will be permitted.

C. New build holiday accommodation will not be permitted, except for a new hotel in Bakewell

#### Development management policies

87. The development management policies require a high standard of design (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). DMC3 also protects the amenity of the area and neighbouring properties.

88. DMC10 Conversion of a heritage asset

A. Conversion of a heritage asset will be permitted provided that:  
(i) it can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character (such changes include enlargement, subdivision or other alterations to form and mass, inappropriate new window openings or doorways and major rebuilding); and  
(ii) the building is capable of conversion, the extent of which would not compromise the significance and character of the building; and (iii) the changes brought about by the new use, and any associated infrastructure (such as access and services), conserves or enhances the heritage significance of the asset, its setting (in accordance with policy DMC5), any valued landscape character, and any valued built environment; and (iv) the new use of the building or any curtilage created would not be visually intrusive in its landscape or have an adverse impact on tranquillity, dark skies or other valued characteristics

89. DMR3 Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation.

Outside settlements listed in Core Strategy policy DS1:

A. Where self-catering accommodation is acceptable, its use will be restricted to no more than 28 days per calendar year by any one person.

90. DMR4 Facilities for keeping and riding horses

Facilities for keeping and riding horses will be permitted provided that the development:  
(i) is specifically designed to accommodate horses; and (ii) is constructed of a scale or design, utilising materials that are appropriate to the function of the building; and (iii) is located adjacent to existing buildings or groups of buildings; and (iv) does not alter the valued landscape character by changing the landform or in any other way have an adverse impact on its character and appearance; and (v) is not likely to cause road safety problems; and (vi) in the case of commercial stables/riding centres, has good access from the strategic and secondary road networks and to an adequate bridleway

network that can accommodate the increased activity without harming the valued characteristics of the area or their enjoyment by others.

### **Assessment**

#### 91. Principle

92. As submitted the proposal was for a substantial mixed use major development. We wrote to the applicant explaining that the location is not a sustainable location and the impact of the development on its surroundings would be at odds with its quiet out of (DS1) designated settlement location in the hamlet of Wheston and adversely affect the valued characteristics of the area.
93. The scheme would have failed the national and local tests for major development. However it has since been revised with amended plans and a new development description. Although the site area remains the same, the scale of the development is much reduced.
94. The amended scheme essentially removes most of the locally contentious elements of the proposal and what we are left with is a site which is classed as major development solely by virtue of the size of the site area. However it is not considered to be major development for the purposes of the NPPF or the Development Plan as we are left with demolition of a few agricultural buildings and restoration to pasture, a domestic stable and riding arena, use of defined land for the keeping of horses and a conversion of an outbuilding to a small holiday let. The issues in relation to major development in a National Park and its location not being sustainable are therefore overcome by the amended scheme which now proposes a scale and type of development which is suitable for its out of designated settlement location.
95. The principle of each proposal in the amended scheme is now supported by policies in the development plan. The main issues are now the impact of the siting, design and layout of each element upon the site and its setting and is assessed below in detail and considered as a whole.

#### Holiday let

96. The building being converted is a stone shed of little heritage significance. It is however a traditional building within the Conservation Area. It is therefore considered to be worthy of conversion to a holiday let, provided the character of the building can be conserved and enhanced.
97. This scheme would replace the mono-pitched roof with a dual pitched roof clad with natural blue slate so its form and general appearance would be improved.
98. The amended plans reduce the size of the opening in the gable and remove a window and reduce the size of the doorway. This will help the building retain its solid robust appearance, rather than appearing overtly domestic as per the submitted scheme.
99. Whilst this simple traditional building is considered to be of sufficient age to be worthy of conversion to a holiday let, its not considered to be a heritage asset of enough character or significance to warrant conversion to a dwelling to meet policy HC1, it would also be too small for permanent occupation and sited too close to the main dwelling. In accordance with RT2 and DMR3 and standard short let holiday occupancy restriction will be required by planning condition in any approval.
100. In addition permitted development rights for alterations and extensions and outbuilding will need to be removed which could otherwise harm the simple character of the building and therefore also its setting.

101. Of most concern however is the proposed walled amenity space for the holiday let which extends outside the strongly defined farmstead to subdivide part of the adjacent historic strip field. This would cause visual and landscape harm to the setting of the historic farmstead and the Conservation Area as a result of this prominent intrusion. We acknowledge that the proximity of the holiday let to the main farmhouse does not lend itself to the provision of adjacent outdoor space however there is no reason why an area of outdoor area sited close by within the farmstead close to the stable building could not be provided. In this instance whilst not as convenient this would overcome the landscape impact objection which is otherwise considered significant enough to warrant refusal of the proposed holiday let. A condition is therefore proposed to omit this in favour of an amended location to be agreed within the farmstead.
102. The holiday let will operate in close proximity to the existing dwelling and share access and circulation space, essentially it operates as part of Middle Farm and therefore will need to be retained within the same planning unit and ancillary to Middle Farm. This can be achieved by the suggested planning condition.

#### Demolition of the agricultural buildings

103. Whilst these buildings are within the Conservation Area they are elements which detract from it so removal of the buildings and restoration to pasture offers an enhancement to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and raises no amenity issues.

#### The stables

104. The stable building exists so this part of the application is retrospective. In its edge of farmstead setting the finish is considered to be acceptable. Where the land has been built up the retaining wall is finished appropriately with natural limestone and this helps soften its impact.
105. External lighting to the stable could create an adverse impact on the landscape so a planning condition is necessary to ensure there is no external lighting other than in accordance with an agreed scheme. With this there would be no amenity issues.

#### Riding arena

106. There are significant earthworks related to the proposed riding arena and earthworks underway on site in relation to demolition of a building. The proposed levels of the arena do not raise any significant issues and to date we have had reports that the riding arena has been constructed on site at the applicants own risk.
107. The Pennine bridleway runs directly behind the site at a slightly higher level. The surface and boundary treatments are therefore going to be open to public view at close quarters as well as distant views.
108. The surface should be a dark finish, and there are various products available to achieve this so a planning condition can ensure that this is achieved. At present the sand surface in situ is not appropriate as it will stand out inappropriately in the landscape.
109. The arena is also shown on the plans with a post and wire boundary, however, on site a post and rail fence has been installed. A limestone drystone wall would be preferable, in this landscape setting. However with appropriate hedge planting outside the post and rail fence to screen this type of inappropriate fencing it can be accepted. A planning condition is therefore suggested to require submission of detailed landscaping to include a mixed hedge to the riding arenas perimeter.

### Highway Considerations

110. The highway Authority raised significant concerns about the more extensive scheme originally submitted.
111. Although they still have questions on the amended scheme in relation to the nature of the equestrian use, Officers have clarified with the applicant that the horse related use is just personal use for 2-3 horses. Officers therefore do not consider that this part of the proposal gives rise to any significant highways implications.
112. We note there is adequate parking for the holiday let as it would have 1 dedicated space for the 1 bedroomed holiday let. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the policies of the development plan insofar as they relate to highways.

### Heritage assets and the Conservation Area

113. In accordance with DMC5 a heritage statement has been submitted in support of the proposal. This is required as the site is within a Conservation Area, and includes conversion of traditional buildings on a site with an HBSMR record. At pre-application stage officers suggested that such a heritage statement could help to inform the restoration of eroded strip field systems. Also there are a lot of earth works proposed for the riding arena and restoration of the fields following demolition of the buildings.
114. With the amended scheme the area of most concern in relation to heritage assets is formation of the yard area to provide the outside amenity space for the holiday let. This is of concern as it is in part of a strip field system and as discussed above its omission by the suggested condition is considered essential to conserve the valued landscape character.
115. With the omission of the holiday garden area from the filed strip there are no adverse impacts on the setting of nearby listed buildings or the Conservation Area will benefit from an enhancement via new holiday let roof form and material as well as the removal of the steel portal frame agricultural buildings.
116. There have been some detailed concerns raised by our Conservation Officer in relation to the conversion to holiday let. However the amended plans now propose a scheme which would better retain the building simple and robust appearance.
117. We therefore do not consider that there would be an adverse impact on the significance of the heritage assets at or off the site or the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

### Biodiversity

118. The representations raised an issue with a lack of a protected species/habitat surveys to support the proposal. We note however that the buildings being demolished and the outbuilding being converted have sheet roofs which are unsuitable for bats and therefore the proposal insofar as it relates to those building does not require a protected species survey to be undertaken.
119. We appreciate the concern related to wildlife corridors and the potential impacts of the development. Planning conditions are suggested to ensure there is no external light associated with the riding arena and carefully controlled for the stables. In all other respects the demolition of the buildings and restoration to pasture is unlikely to have any negative impacts on biodiversity in comparison to the existing building and silage clamp. In contrast the scheme if approved would bring about new pasture and tree and hedge planting which would bring about modest enhancement to the site in terms of its offer to the biodiversity of the area.

### Amenity

120. The amended scheme will not harm the amenity of the site or neighbouring properties. Planning conditions already mentioned which limit the use of the stables and riding arena to personal use for 2-3 horses and control external lighting will ensure the amenity and visual amenity of the area is conserved.

### Landscape

121. There is a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) submitted to support the proposal. Our Landscape Architect has commented on this and whilst this raised some concerns and suggestions for planting most of the concern was in relation to parts of the proposal which have been dropped since the amended plans were submitted and development description amended.
122. Subsequently the Landscape Architect has advised the remaining parts of the scheme are positive in terms of their impact on the landscape.
123. In conclusion we consider that the amended scheme with the conditions already suggested in this report will not harm the landscape, and is therefore in accordance with the policies of the development plan and the NPPF.

### Conclusion

124. This amended scheme with revised development description has removed the contentious elements of the earlier submission and will provide an enhancement of the site by converting a traditional outbuilding, demolishing portal frame agricultural buildings, and replacing a silage storage yard with a riding arena
125. With the above suggested planning conditions the proposals will enhance the character and appearance of the site and its Conservation Area setting including the setting of the nearby listed buildings and is therefore in accordance with the policies of the development plan and the NPPF

### Human Rights

126. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
127. List of Background Papers (not previously published) Nil
128. Planning Officer – Steven Wigglesworth, Planner