

7. FULL APPLICATION - CONVERSION OF FIELD BARN TO DWELLING AT TWIN DALES BARN, FIELD TO WEST OF OVER HADDON, (NP/DDD/0122/0074), ALN

APPLICANT: MR NEIL MYCOCK

Summary

1. The application site is an isolated field barn located in open countryside 1.3km to the west of Over Haddon and approximately 700m from the nearest other building. The barn is a non-designated heritage asset and is a highly prominent in the landscape.
2. It is proposed to convert and extend the barn to create a single open market dwelling.
3. The proposed extension of the field barn would cause harm to its character and significance.
4. The domestication of the isolated field barn and its surroundings would cause significant harm to the setting of the building and the distinctive fieldscape in which it sits, resulting in harm to the landscape character and special qualities of the National Park.
5. The minor changes made from the previously refused application (with regard to the external area around the barn) do not alter the recommendation, which is one of refusal.

Background

6. In December 2021 and earlier application for a very similar development (NPDDD/0821/0866) was refused by the Planning Committee for the following reasons:

The development would cause harm to the significance of the field barn as a heritage asset and its setting. Consequently, it would not deliver conservation or enhancement of a valued vernacular building. The proposals are therefore contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, L3 and HC1; Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMC10 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The creation of a new dwelling in this isolated location within the open countryside and the domestication of the site would result in harm to the landscape character and scenic beauty of the National Park. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2 and L1, Development Management policies DMC1 and DMC3 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. The application had been referred back from an earlier Planning Committee on 5 November 2021 where despite a recommendation of refusal by officers, members had originally been minded to approve the application. However following further explanation of the policy justification for the officer recommendation of refusal members voted to refuse the application.
8. This is a revised application that seeks to address the reasons for refusal. The assessment in this report largely repeats that for the previous application, but has been updated to reflect the minor changes that have been made.

Site and Surroundings

9. The application site is an isolated field barn located in open countryside 1.3km to the west of Over Haddon and approximately 700m from the nearest other building.

10. The building is a two storey former cow house with hayloft over. It is constructed in natural limestone with gritstone dressings. The roof is collapsed but was previously covered with stone slate. There are the remains of a former single storey off-shot to the south west.
11. Access is gained via a roughly surfaced track from an unclassified road to the north west.
12. 250m south of the site is Lathkill Dale, which is designated as a SSSI, a SAC and a National Nature Reserve.
13. An unauthorised static caravan is sited to the south east of the barn and is currently occupied by the applicant. A field to the south of the building is being operated by the applicant as a camping and caravanning site and this is currently the subject of an enforcement enquiry.

Proposal

14. Planning permission is sought for the conversion of the barn to a two-bedroomed open market dwelling. A kitchen/diner and living room would be provided on the ground floor and two bedrooms and bathroom on the first floor. The single storey off-shot would be re-built and extended to the south west by approximately 1.5m. It would contain an office, utility room and bathroom.
15. A residential curtilage would be created in areas to the south-west and south-east, which are currently demarked by dilapidated stone walls
16. Parking space for two vehicles would be provided on land adjacent to the barn to the south east.
17. **The main difference between this revised application and the previous application that was refused, is that an amended site plan has been submitted which shows an existing wall to the south east of barn, which currently varies in height, raised to a consistent 1800mm around the north east perimeter of the proposed parking area. A paved yard would be created to the south of the barn (not previously shown) and the line of an existing boundary wall amended. The existing boundary walls to the south of the barn would be re-built.**

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

The development would cause harm to the significance of the field barn as a heritage asset and its setting. Consequently, it would not deliver conservation or enhancement of a valued vernacular building. The proposals are therefore contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, L3 and HC1; Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMC10 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The creation of a new dwelling in this isolated location within the open countryside and the domestication of the site would result in harm to the landscape character and scenic beauty of the National Park. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2 and L1, Development Management policies DMC1 and DMC3 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Key Issues

Principle of Development

Impact on the significance of the heritage asset and its setting.

Highways

Ecological considerations

Climate change mitigation

History

18. March 2021 – enforcement case opened and Planning Contravention Notice served with regard to (a) change of use of agricultural land for the purposes of caravanning, camping and siting of a residential caravan and (b) erection of a building. Following the response, the applicant was advised to consider submitting an application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the camping and caravanning use. An application has not been received. The applicant was then advised to remove static caravan by end of September 2021.
19. December 2021 – planning permission refused for conversion of field barn to dwelling (NP/DDD/0821/0866).

Consultations

20. **Highway Authority** – refer to Highway comments in relation to NP/DDD/0821/0866 which were: *‘The application site is remote from the public highway, located on a Un-named Road between Over Haddon and Haddon Grove Farm, the Road is unclassified and subject to the National Speed Limit, however, in view of the roads single vehicular width, limited passing placings in the vicinity of the site and the close proximity to a junction vehicle speeds are likely appropriately low. Nonetheless, it is recommended that the entire site frontage shall be kept clear, and maintained thereafter, clear of any obstruction exceeding 1m in height (0.6m in the case of vegetation) relative to the road level for a distance of 2m into the site from the carriageway edge in order to maximise the visibility available to drivers emerging from the existing vehicular access.’*
21. *Whilst the proposed dwelling will increase traffic movements associated with the existing vehicular access, any minor increase in traffic generation the proposal may generate is unlikely to lead to any severe road safety issues*
22. *Typically, off-street parking bays should be clearly demonstrated by the recommended dimensions i.e. each parking bay should measure a minimum of 2.4m x 5.5m with an additional 0.5m of width to any side adjacent to a physical barrier e.g. wall, hedge, fence, etc., there appears to be space within the site to accommodate the parking of 2no. vehicles which is sufficient to serve a 2.no bedroom welling.*
23. *The applicant will need to consult with the relevant refuse collection department to ascertain details of what will be acceptable to them in terms of number and location of bins. Areas of appropriate dimension designated for standing of waste bins on collection days should be demonstrated adjacent to, but not within, the public highway.’*
24. **District Council** – no response
25. **Parish Council** – *‘Over Haddon Parish Council supports the restoration of this roofless solid barn that fits into its location into the landscape well. The barn would be preserved in essentially the form it now takes within the landscape (with the notable addition of a*

roof - which it possessed until relatively recently) and, as a dwelling, could be expected to continue, for many years, to make its contribution to the overall landscape scene, which we all agreed is a positive one. The applicant's need for a dwelling to continue 31 years of farming and fit his diversification requirements is well expressed in the internal layout without harming the character of a field barn which the rebuild will maintain, Council welcomes the incorporation of eco-friendly heating and insulation to the conversion.

26. *The addition of the clause restricting domestic paraphernalia to the screened area and the fact that no caravans can be kept on the site of the application can only be of benefit.*
27. **Authority's Archaeologist** – no response to date. However the response on the previous application was as follows: *'Twin Dales farm is a historic field barn and outfarm recorded in the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record and the Peak District National Park Authority's Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record. The main range dates to the 19th century, and was constructed as a cow house (2 sets of stalls with central feed passage) with hayloft over. A small ruined single storey structure attached to its south west is later, but still of 19th century date. So little survives of this structure its original function cannot be ascertained. It could have served as a small calf house.*
28. *The site is in a remote location over 1km from the centre of the village. It is located in a fieldscape of post 1650 parliamentary enclosure, not enclosed until the early 19th century (1080 parliamentary enclosure award of Bakewell). Prior to this the area formed part of Over Haddon Common, an area of common pasture for the village. The existing fieldscape of drystone wall represents a good example of this kind of enclosure, giving over the fossilised medieval strips to the east; the edge of Over Haddon's medieval field system is c.148m to the east of the site, with view across both fieldscapes and historic landscape character areas from the site. Views to and from the site are extensive across the woods of Lathkill Dale, the White Peak Plateau beyond, and across to over Haddon.*
29. *Field barns are an important part of the Peak District's landscape, they are highly characteristic and strongly contribute to local distinctiveness, even more so when combined with the distinctive pattern of dry stone wall enclosure reflecting the development of the historic landscape, such as in this case. This fieldscape setting of the barn makes a positive contribute to its significance, particularly its historic interest.*
30. *The barn is located in an area rich in lead mining remains, with High Priority Lead Mining sites to the c.70m to the south (Mandale and Lathkill Dale Mines, Soughs and Veins) and Mandale rake c.300m to the north-west. The access track to the barn runs over part of Mandale Rake (not the High Priority part) recorded in the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record and the Peak District National Park Authority's Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record. At this location agricultural improvement has led to the loss of surface hillocks, but an extant shaft still survives and belowground archaeological remains are likely to survive, despite loss of the surface expression of features. Lead mining at Mandale rake and mine is known back to the 1200s and to have continued into the 19th century. A legal case between 1284 and 1288 resulted in the first setting down of Derbyshire mining laws and customs; a very significant historical event for the Derbyshire and Peak District landscape and the exploitation of its mineral wealth.*
31. *It is possible that the field barn at Twin Dale may have had a historically association with lead mining in area, where dual miner-farmer economy operated. Relict lead mining remains and field barns are an important feature of this landscape. Such barns are typical in certain areas of the White Peak and in occur in clusters in areas of intensive lead mining activity reflecting the dual miner/farmer or miner/trader economy of the area. The lead mining interest in the immediate setting of the field barn contributes positively to its significance, particularly its historic interest.'*

32. The response raised concerns about a number of aspects of the proposed development that cause concern from a heritage perspective. These include the proposed extension, new opening in the NW gable, rooflights, and door opening detailing. In respect of the impact on the historic landscape, notes that: *'With respect to the historic landscape, currently as unoccupied, ruinous buildings the site is integrated within its surrounding agricultural landscape, and it owes its existence and position to the way this landscape, enclosure and farming practice has developed. The introduction of a residential and domestic use into this location within this historical landscape, with everything this entails (domestic curtilage and paraphernalia, parking, provision of services, light pollution, movement of vehicles, provision of a bin store etc.) would introduce elements that are out of place, incongruous and are harmful to this heritage asset.'*

Representations

33. One hundred and ten letters of support have been received some from local residents and some who appear to be visitors to the applicant's campsite. The responses can be viewed in full on the website, but in summary the following points are raised:
- a. It would be better to see the field barn repaired and converted to a dwelling rather than becoming more dilapidated.
 - b. There is a need to local housing for young people.
 - c. The scheme is sensitive and has limited impact on landscape.
 - d. There would be little or no impact on wildlife in the area.
 - e. It would be good to have the landowner living close to the campsite.
 - f. The building is currently an eyesore.
 - g. The camping business supports local facilities

Main Policies

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3, HC1, CC1, CC5.

Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMT3, DMT8

National Planning Policy Framework

34. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. The latest revised NPPF was published on 20 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 Development Management Policies (adopted May 2019) 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 more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.
35. Paragraph 176 of the NPPF states that *'great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.'*

36. The NPPF directly refers to the National Parks Circular which makes clear that the Government considers it inappropriate to set housing targets within the National Parks and instead that policies should seek to deliver affordable housing to meet the needs of local communities. Paragraph 78 and 80 of the NPPF re-inforce this approach together saying that planning authorities should seek to promote sustainable affordable housing in rural areas and that permission for isolated new housing in the countryside should only be granted where there are special circumstances.
37. When determining application affecting heritage assets, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance (para 194). Great weight should be given to an asset's conservation (para 199). Any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification (para 200). Were a proposal will lead to a less than substantial harm to the significance of an asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (para 202).

Core Strategy

38. 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.
39. The approach to housing and conservation in the NPPF is consistent with the Authority's development strategy (Policy DS1) which says new residential development within the National Park should normally be sited within named settlements, and Policy HC1. C which sets out very similar criteria to the NPPF in terms of the exceptional circumstances in which a new house can be granted planning permission in the National Park.
40. Policy HC1. C I and II states that exceptionally new housing will be permitted in accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2 if it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings or where it is required in order to achieve conservation or enhancement within designated settlements.
41. Policies L1 and L3 say that development must conserve or enhance the landscape character and cultural heritage of the National Park. Development that harms the landscape or cultural heritage will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.
42. Policy L2 states the development must conserve and enhance any sites, features or species of biodiversity importance and where appropriate their setting. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where is likely to have an adverse impact on any site, features or species of biodiversity importance or their setting.
43. 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 Plan

44. Policy DMC3 expects a high standard of design that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape.

45. Policy DMC11 provides more detailed criteria to assess development that may affect protected sites, species or habitats.
46. Policy DMC5 states that Development of a designated or non-designated heritage asset will not be permitted if it would result in any harm to, or loss of, the significance, character and appearance of a heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), unless:
 - a) substantial harm or loss of significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; or
 - b) in the case of less than substantial harm to its significance, the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
47. for designated heritage assets, clear and convincing justification is provided, to the satisfaction of the Authority, that the:
 - a) substantial harm or loss of significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; or
 - b) in the case of less than substantial harm to its significance, the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
48. Policy DMC10 sets out that the conversion of a heritage asset will only be acceptable when the building can accommodate the new use without changes that adversely affect its character, such as major rebuilding. The building must be capable of conversion. The changes brought about by the new use must conserve or enhance the heritage significance of the asset, its setting and landscape character. 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.
49. Development Management Policy DMT3 states the development will only be permitted where, having regard to the standard, function, nature and use of the road, a safe access that is achievable for all people, can be provided in a way that does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality and where possible enhances it. DMT8 states, amongst other things, that that residential off street parking should be provided unless it can be demonstrated that on-street parking meets highway standards and does not negatively impact on the visual and other amenity of the local community.

Assessment

Principle of Development

50. The relevant housing policy is Core Strategy policy HC1. This policy continues the Authority's long standing policy position that housing will not be permitted solely to meet open market demand. This approach is consistent with the National Park Circular and the NPPF.
51. Core Strategy policy HC1 sets out the exceptional circumstances in which new housing will be permitted in the National Park. The approach of allowing affordable housing and workers housing where there is an established need, and, of allowing market housing where it is required to achieve significant conservation and enhancement in accordance with policies GSP1 and GSP2 is considered to be a sustainable approach for providing housing within the National Park without undermining the landscape and valued characteristics.

52. This application is not for an affordable house to meet an identified local need or for a farm workers dwelling, it is for an open market dwelling. A lot of weight has been given by third parties who have supported the application, to the applicant's local farming connections. The supporting information states that the applicant has a strong local connection having lived in the Parish for at least 10 of the last 20 years. The applicant is currently living in a static caravan adjacent to the barn. However, it must be stressed that the application does not propose a dwelling that would have a local occupancy restriction. The Authority would have no control over future occupiers and whether or not they would have any local connection. In any case, with an internal floor area of approx. 107sqm the barn would be above the maximum permissible floorspace even for a 5 person dwelling (97sqm) and so would be unlikely to remain affordable to those on low to moderate incomes anyway.
53. A Heritage Assessment has been submitted with the application, and this, along with the response from the Authority's archaeologist, confirm that the barn in question is a non-designated heritage asset. It is an example of remote 19th century field barn. Such barns are an important part of the Peak District's landscape. They are highly characteristic and strongly contribute to local distinctiveness. The barn is listed within the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record and the Peak District National Park Authority's Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record. Consequently we are satisfied that the building is a 'valued vernacular' building for the purposes of policies HC1 (c).
54. The main consideration is whether or not the proposed development would deliver conservation or enhancement of the barn and its landscape setting in accordance with policies L1 and L3.

Impact on the significance of the heritage asset and its landscape setting

55. Twin Dales farm is a historic field barn and outfarm of local/regional significance. The two-storey part of the barn dates from the 19th century and was constructed as a cow house (2 sets of stalls with central feed passage) with hayloft over. It sits within an extensive fieldscape enclosed by drystone walls. It is highly visible within this undeveloped landscape, in views from the surrounding area including across the woods of Lathkill Dale and from the road heading west out of Over Haddon. The barn is located in an area rich in lead mining remains and it is possible that the barn may have had a historic association with lead mining, where a dual miner-farmer economy operated. In summary the core significance of the barn lies in its historic interest, architectural interest and archaeological interest.
56. The Authority's Farmstead Character Statement describes field barns as single buildings set within or on the edge of a field away from the main farmstead. They are a highly significant feature of the Peak District, and combine with the intricate patterns of dry-stone walling and hay meadows to form an integral and distinctive part of its landscape and have been subject to high rates of change. These buildings enabled land to be managed remotely and avoided the bringing of stock and produce to the main farm. In this case the barn has agricultural origins but was also likely related to historic lead mining activity around Over Haddon, reflecting a dual economy where 'miner-farmers' worked the veins into the 19th century.
57. The barn is located in a fieldscape of post-1650 parliamentary enclosure, not enclosed until the early 19th century. Prior to this the area formed part of Over Haddon Common, an area of common pasture for the village. The existing fieldscape of drystone wall represents a good example of this kind of enclosure. The edge of Over Haddon's medieval field system is c.148m to the east of the site, with view across both fieldscapes and historic landscape character areas from the site. Views to and from the site are extensive across the woods of Lathkill Dale, the White Peak Plateau beyond, and across to over Haddon.

58. Historic farmsteads and their associated buildings and barns are an integrated part of the rural landscape of the National Park. Most barns are physically associated with a farmstead, either within villages and settlements or in the countryside. The Authority's policies recognise the importance of these buildings and that sometimes the best way to achieve their conservation and enhancement is to allow for conversion to a residential use. Planning decisions have consistently delivered this aim. For example, since 1 January 2021, 20 units of holiday accommodation, 11 dwellings and 8 units of ancillary accommodation have been approved through the conversion of barns and traditional buildings, mostly under delegated powers. These have been buildings that are within building groups, on farmsteads or within settlements.
59. The key difference however with the barn that is subject to this application is that it is a remote and very isolated field barn, completely unrelated to any other built development and intrinsically linked through its form and function to the historic landscape in which it sits. Therefore it is highly sensitive to change and unlike the barns referred to above, where a residential use would conserve and enhance the building, in this case such a use would cause significant harm to its special qualities.
60. A submitted structural survey concludes that the building is in reasonable condition but suggests that the south corner would need to be partially re-built. The proposed conversion scheme largely works within the external envelope of the existing structure and makes good use of the existing openings. Alterations to the door and window details to designs are reflective of the agricultural character of the building.
61. The scheme proposes to re-build the ruined south western single storey off-shot which is considered acceptable as this is historic element of the outfarm. It is also proposed to extend this structure to the south west which on balance members considered the extension to be acceptable previously.
62. The main concern with the proposals is the impact of domestication on the character and setting of the field barn. The barn sits at the southern edge of a medium sized field. On its south eastern side is a small enclosed area probably used for stock handling/collection. The way the agricultural land butts right up to the walls of the building very clearly reflects the historic function of the barn and results in the barn being completely integrated within the landscape. This close physical relationship between barn and land is clearly visible from the surrounding area. In particular the walled enclosure, in which the proposed domestic curtilage would be located is visible from the road to the north east as are the openings within the walls of the building. The submitted Heritage Statement confirms that the setting of the barn has high/medium significance, sitting as it does within a well preserved historic landscape.
63. This amended scheme proposes a high wall to the north east of the proposed parking area which attempts to screen parked vehicles and bins in views from the road to the north east. It is accepted that a wall in this position would screen the cars in views from the road. As amended the scheme now also shows a yard area to the south west of the barn as well as the lawned area to the south east. Whilst the yard area would be more enclosed, the lawned area to the south east would still be in use as garden and domestic activity and paraphernalia in this area would still, as previously, remain visible from the road to the north east.
64. As with previous scheme, harm would still occur through domestication of the barn itself (artificial and external lighting, curtains and blinds, hanging baskets, flower beds, lawns, washing lines, movement of vehicles etc), which would all signal a domestic use of the building in an otherwise wholly agricultural, pastoral landscape. Our view is that these impacts cannot reasonably be mitigated or controlled by planning conditions to any

meaningful extent. We remain of the view that this is a wholly unsuitable site for the introduction of a new residential use.

65. As previously, letters of support have raised concerns about the building becoming more dilapidated if left undeveloped, or that it could be lost completely. The building is not harmful to the landscape at present. It is well integrated into its surroundings as set out above. It is acknowledged that the roof has collapsed and there may be uncertainty about the retention of the building in the long term. However a lower intensity and more low key use would conserve the building and its setting and would be the optimum viable use for the building. Ultimately, the harm caused by introducing a wholly unsuitable residential use in this landscape would be far more harmful to the landscape character and special qualities of the National Park than the further deterioration of the building.
66. The Planning Inspectorate has supported officers' view on this issue. In a recent appeal decision (dismissed) for an isolated barn conversion near Lathkill Grove Farm, Monyash the Inspector concluded, (in discussing the impacts of domestic paraphernalia) that *'Such operations and uses would also physically and visually sever the building's connection with the adjacent agricultural land, thus further eroding its rural character'* and that *'The building would appear as a dwelling, albeit one with agricultural origins, rather than as a barn.'*
67. Finally the agent refers to an appeal decision for the conversion of a barn on the outskirts of Winster (opposite Lead Ore House – ref APP/M9496/W/20/3260769), where the appeal was allowed. The agent states that the appeal was allowed despite the barn in question being more visually prominent than Twin Dales. Whilst this appeal decision is noted, it does not change the recommendation on this application. Furthermore it should be noted that that scheme was for conversion to holiday accommodation, where the need for and therefore the harmful impacts of domestic curtilage can be less, and also the building in Winster is much more closely related to other built development being close to the edge of the village and other residential properties.

Highways

68. The proposed dwelling would be accessed via the existing access track from the unclassified road to the north west. The roadside boundary wall on the public highway is set back some 4m from the edge of the carriageway and therefore we are satisfied that adequate visibility can be achieved in view of the likely limited vehicle speeds. Adequate on site parking space would be provided to meet the needs of the development.
69. No works are proposed to upgrade or otherwise alter the existing access track (which appears to have been recently re-surfaced).

Climate Change Mitigation

70. A 'Sustainability Statement' has been submitted with the application. This explains that an air source heat pump is proposed to provide heating and hot water. Argon filled double glazed units, low energy light fittings, high levels of insulation, and use of reclaimed local stone, low carbon cement and timber from a sustainable source are amongst the measures proposed. It is considered that the proposals demonstrate sufficient consideration of climate change mitigation measures in accordance with policy CC1.

Other considerations

71. A protected species survey was not submitted on the basis that as the building has no roof and is in exposed and unsheltered location, there is limited potential for use by protected species. We accept this conclusion.

72. The barn sits some 700m away from the nearest neighbouring residential property. As a result there would be no opportunities for overlooking, and the proposed use would be unlikely to generate undue noise and disturbance. The proposals therefore comply with Core Strategy policy GSP3 and Development Management policy DMC3 in these respects.

Conclusion

73. In conclusion this amended scheme for proposed change of use of the barn to an open market dwelling would cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset and the wider landscape of the National Park. The minor changes to the external treatment of the barn's surrounds do not constitute sufficient justification for a different decision to be made from the previous refusal. Any benefits of the proposed development would not outweigh the harm that has been identified, contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3 and HC1 and Development Management policies DMC1, DMC3, DMC5 and DMC10.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

Report Author: Andrea Needham, Senior Planner