

**6. FULL APPLICATION - DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURES ON SITE, THE ERECTION OF A NEW RESIDENTIAL DWELLING, WORKS OF HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING, INSTALLATION OF PACKAGE TREATMENT PLANT AND OTHER WORKS INCIDENTAL TO THE APPLICATION PROPOSALS AT NEWLANDS FARM, COPLOW DALE, LITTLE HUCKLOW (NP/DDD/0621/0670, SPW)**

**APPLICANT: MR B SIMPSON AND MS K ALLEN**

**Summary**

1. The application relates to a proposal to the erection of an open market dwelling in a location in the open countryside, outside a designated settlement. The justification advanced for the proposal is that it would result in significant enhancement of a site with a long history of untidy and derelict buildings and the storage of scrap.
2. This report concludes that the proposed development is in conflict with Core Strategy policies GSP1, DS1, HC1, and L1 because the proposal is for the erection of an open market dwelling in a relatively isolated and unsustainable location in the open countryside, not within or near to a designated settlement. Whilst the proposals would result in the removal of unsightly building, with some benefit to the landscape, this is not considered to outweigh the strong national and local policy presumption against new dwellings in the countryside. The proposed development would therefore not represent sustainable development within the National Park contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Site and Surroundings**

3. The site is located in Coplow Dale, to the west of the B6049 Bradwell to Tideswell Road and east of Washbottom Lane, which runs between Anchor crossroads, near Tideswell, and Pindale Road, Castleton. The village of Little Hucklow lies to the south. The site is to the south of the road which runs through the small collection of buildings in Coplow Dale. Access to the site is directly off this road.
4. The site includes a number of agricultural buildings, most of which are in a poor condition. The site and buildings comprise the following:
  - An agricultural building with stone walls and window openings remaining, attached to a stone barn (formerly two storey) and a lean-to with sheet roof.
  - A concrete framed former livestock shed (15.3m x 10.52m). The building is used for machinery and general storage of machinery. The building has a concrete floor and a separate side store which was formerly the dairy.
  - A large static caravan.
  - A two-bay pole barn with a concrete floor and walls being a former silage pit but used as a hay store.
  - A machinery Store (11.9m x 6.8m), concrete block with tin sheeting above and to the roof.
  - Various redundant barns.
5. It is understood that until its recent purchase by the applicants, the property had been owned by the same family for over 100 years and has been operated as a working farm up to recent years served by Newlands Farmhouse, the nearest dwelling lying some 85m to the north east which was sold as a separate lot when the land and farm buildings were sold recently at auction. It is understood that a historic farmhouse within the building group was demolished over 100years ago, and the residential use moved to the current Newlands Farmhouse to the north-east of the application site. This neighbouring house falls outside of the ownership of the current applicants. The land in the applicants'

ownership, edged blue on the submitted plan, includes the four fields which lie to the south and west of the buildings.

6. The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings on or near the site.

### **Proposal**

7. The application is for the demolition of the existing structures on site, the erection of a new open market dwelling, works of hard and soft landscaping, installation of package treatment plant and other works incidental to the application proposals.
8. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, a Heritage Statement, a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA), a Bat Roost and Barn Owl Appraisal Survey Report, with a covering letter which sets out planning policies and draws the key conclusions of these reports together.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application be REFUSED on the following grounds:**

- 1. The application site is in an unsustainable location in the open countryside, outside a designated settlement. The erection of an unrestricted, open market dwelling in this location would be contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3, DS1, HC1, and L1. The development would result in a dwelling with no essential functional need and no functional relationship to the land.**
- 2. The location and separation of the proposed dwelling from the hamlet of Coplow Dale, coupled with the scale, massing and design, do not represent an enhancement of the quality and significance anticipated by policy. The harm resulting is not outweighed by the benefit that the removal of the existing buildings would provide. The proposed development would represent unsustainable development within the National Park, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.**

### **Key Issues**

- Whether the erection of an open market dwelling is acceptable in principle and specifically whether it can be justified on the basis of enhancement
- The design and scale of the proposed development, visual impact and the impact on the landscape and other valued characteristics of the National Park.
- The heritage significance of the site and its buildings

### **History**

9. There have been no planning applications relating to this site, but the Authority's officers been in contact the previous owner regarding the appearance and condition of the site, which was unsightly as a result of significant amounts of scrap being stored around the buildings and in the field between the buildings and Washhouse Bottom. No formal enforcement notices were ever served, but the site has been tidied up and scrap removed in recent years, prior to its sale.

### **Consultations**

10. Highway Authority: Following an initial objection to the proposal, the Highway Authority has now responded to a revised plan and information. The plan indicates that the lands

surrounding the site are in the applicant's control; therefore, the condition for the provision of emerging visibility splays of 2.4m x 172m at the west and 2.4m x 80m at the east is acceptable. The Highway Authority requests that the applicant submits a revised plan for the emerging visibility splays to the Authority for the reference. In terms of traffic generation information, the DCC Highways is satisfied that the proposed use of the site would not intensify the use of the existing access. The Highway Authority therefore has no further objection to this proposal.

11. District Council: No response.
12. Little Hucklow Parish Council – *“The Parish Council have considered this application and support the proposal as it is bringing a derelict property back into use as a family dwelling”.*
13. Natural England: No objection. Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites.
14. PDNPA Archaeology: Makes the following comment (quoted in full as it gives important detail about the history and significance of the site):

*“This application affects a number of non-designated heritage assets recorded in the Derbyshire Historic Environment and the Peak District National Park Authority’s Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record.*

*Newland’s Farm is a partially extant historic farmstead that dates back to at least the 19th century (MPD12018). The farmhouse has been demolished and one traditional barn and other more recent farm buildings are also present.*

*Newland’s Farm is also the site of World War II military remains, with a number of structures and platforms related to an anti-aircraft gun placement. The remains of associated searchlight and barrack buildings can be identified in the field to the immediately north-west of the farmstead (MPD15665). A small structure proposed for demolition may have its origin with the WWII site rather than the farmstead.*

*A Heritage Statement has been provided and this outlines the known history and development of the site. The heritage statement was produced during lockdown and some archives could not be visited at the time, it is therefore possible that some further information could be available on the site.*

*Of the 5 buildings identified two (1 and 5) are identified as having potential heritage significance, while 3 others are identified as of minimal heritage significance.*

*Building 1 is a barn probably of Late 18th or early 19th century construction. The building has several additions to it and is in poor condition, little survives of the interior which is in poor condition and was not fully accessible due to this.*

*Building 5 is a small blockwork and brick built derelict structure its date of origin and function is uncertain and it may relate to the anti-aircraft gun emplacement and not to the farm. This structure does not appear on maps, as is the case with the anti-aircraft gun structures. This small structure could not be dated although based on its construction it is probably mid-20th century.*

*Buildings 2, 3 and 4 are all 20th century farm buildings of negligible to low heritage significance.*

*The heritage statement has outlined the history of the surviving elements of the farmstead. However, the nature of the small building 5 was not determined. With this building it has not been possible to determine its origin or function.*

Archaeological Impact of the development:

*The archaeological impact of the proposed development would be to remove all of the current buildings on the site, including buildings 1 and 5 which have heritage significance and potential heritage significance. The construction of the new house will impact on the*

*setting and views into the site. The site is currently derelict but the remains of farm buildings are currently identifiable on the site. There are no known buried archaeological heritage assets on the site but such remains could exist. Also the remains of the farmhouse that related to Newlands Farm may be present below ground and the date and layout of this structure is unknown.*

*Recommendation: The current buildings on the site are in poor condition and only 1 or 2 are significant heritage assets. Building 1 the barn is of moderate significance while Building 5 is of unknown significance due to the uncertainty regarding its function. If this building did relate to the anti-aircraft gun it would be of low significance. In addition the potential and significance for buried archaeological remains is unknown.*

*As non-designated heritage assets 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 then the following conditions are recommended (summarised in this report):*

*• Building recording: A level 3 photographic, descriptive and drawn record to supplement (not duplicate) the existing heritage statement, which can form part of the record. This should be undertaken on buildings 1 and 5. This work needs to be carried out by a suitably qualified and experienced heritage/archaeological contractor in accordance with the nationally agreed standards of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, and to a written scheme of investigation approved by the Senior Conservation Archaeologist. These recommendations are in accordance with NPPF para 205, and a suitable condition to achieve this is suggested.*

*• Archaeological monitoring: A programme of archaeological monitoring of all groundworks undertaken in relation to the development to record archaeological remains related to buildings 1 and 5, the former farmhouse and any unknown archaeological remains”.*

15. PDNPA Ecology: Recommends additional survey work on the dewpond (now carried out) and conditions in respect of bats and barn owls in the event of an approval.

## **Representations**

16. We have received four representations, all supporting the application and raising the following points:
- A new dwelling on this site, where the foundations are still in situ from the original house, would be an enormous improvement on the eyesore that is currently there and has been for tens of years.
  - The current site has a bad effect on the landscape and environment and any improvement would be beneficial.
  - The applicants are a young family trying to make a living by farming in the area where they were born and the proposed plans for the site would enhance the site beyond recognition.
  - The proposal is well designed, and it is good to see the use of sustainability measures, especially in today’s climate.
  - There is no landscape harm caused by this proposal.
  - The site is an eye sore, having been neglected for many years and used as a dumping ground by the previous owner. The farm is clearly visible from all around the locality, but sadly in its current condition it has a significant negative impact on the landscape, there is a mismatched set of largely collapsing buildings and abandoned artefacts, and is in contrast to the surrounding fields, farms, buildings, and other properties
  - This application is supported by the Parish Council.

## **Main Policies**

17. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, DS1, CC1, HC1, L1, L2 and L3.
18. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC10, DMH6, DMT3, DMT8.

## **National Planning Policy Framework**

19. 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.
20. 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.”*
21. In relation to housing, paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.
22. Paragraph 80 states that planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:
  - a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
  - b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;
  - c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
  - d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
  - e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
    - i. is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
    - ii. would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

## **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. DS1.C. sets out the forms of development that are acceptable in principle in the countryside outside of the Natural Zone. There is no scope for the erection of new housing here other than as part of development needed to secure effective conservation and enhancement.

28. Policy HC1C says:

*“In accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2:*

- I. it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings; or*
- II. it is required in order to achieve conservation or enhancement in settlements listed in core policy DS1.*

*Any scheme proposed under CI or CII that is able to accommodate more than one dwelling unit, must also address identified eligible local need and be affordable with occupation restricted to local people in perpetuity...”*

The policy also says that exceptionally, new housing can be accepted where the proposals would address eligible local needs or where they are for key workers in agriculture, forestry or other rural enterprises in accordance with core policy HC2.

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, DMC10 and DMH6.

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. 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. Policy DMC10 addresses conversion of heritage assets, permitting this where the new use 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.

36. Policy DMH6 states that re-development of previously developed land for housing will be permitted provided that: i. the development conserves and enhances the valued character of the built environment or landscape on, around or adjacent to the site; and ii. where the land is inside or on the edge of a Core Strategy policy DS1 settlement, and subject to viability, an element of the housing addresses local need for affordable housing potentially including starter home or custom or self-build housing provision. However, the application

of this policy is discussed in more detail below as the land and buildings at Newlands Farm do not fall within the definition of “previously developed land”.

### Supplementary planning documents (SPD) and other material considerations

37. The adopted climate change and sustainable building SPD provides detailed guidance on construction methods and renewable technologies along with a framework for how development can demonstrate compliance with policy CC1.
38. The adopted Design Guide SPD and supporting building design guide provides detailed guidance on the local building tradition within the National Park and how this should be utilised to inform high quality new design that conserves and enhances the National Park.

### Assessment

#### Principle of proposed development

39. For the purposes of the Development Plan, the application site is considered to lie in open countryside because of the distance between the application site and any nearby named settlements (Core Strategy policy DS1). In common with the NPPF, the Authority’s housing policies do not permit new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances.
40. With regard 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 or enhancement in settlements listed in Core Strategy policy DS1.
41. Policy DMH6 allows housing development on previously developed land in principle. However, paragraph 6.91 of the housing chapter of the Development Management Policies (DMP) makes it clear that land that is or has been occupied by agricultural buildings is not previously developed land for the purposes of applying the Development Plan. Elsewhere it states that Core Strategy policy HC1 must be read in conjunction with policy DMH6. Paragraph 6.97 also states that outside of DS1 settlements applications for housing will be assessed against policies DS1 and GSP2. The site at Coplow Dale is not within or near to a designated settlement so it is clearly within the open countryside.
42. The key issue in assessing the principle of this development is therefore whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the erection of an open market house and whether the development is in accordance with policies GSP1, GSP2, DS1, HC1, DMH6 and paragraphs 79 and 80 of the NPPF.
43. The Planning Statement submitted with the application argues that the existing range of farm buildings on the application site are all in a poor condition and the former farmhouse building is in such a state of disrepair it is not viable to convert it. (*Officer Note: This view contradicts the Heritage Report and our Archaeologist’s view that the original farmhouse was demolished some 100years ago and it is not known if there are any surviving features below ground of that former dwelling*). It adds that the extent of the rebuilding that would be required would effectively result in almost entirely new appearance and the loss of the historic fabric of the building.
44. The Statement therefore concludes that in its current state the site detracts from the character and appearance of the area. It also adds that this is reflected in the enforcement history of the site associated with the previous landowner (although as noted in the Planning history section above, no formal action was ever taken and the site was significantly improved and buildings repaired before it was sold). It therefore states that a



new dwelling could deliver enhancement to the area and this is more viable than rebuilding the existing structure.

45. The Planning Statement refers to policies GSP2 and DMH6 in support of the application. It acknowledges that the site is not in or on the edge of a designated settlement. It argues 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”*. The Planning Statement acknowledges the planning policy presumption against new housing in the open countryside, outside designated settlements, but it argues that *“given that the site currently detracts from the landscape, it is considered that there are tangible planning benefits arising from this proposal through building a new, high quality dwelling which would serve to enhance the surrounding landscape”*.
46. Notwithstanding what is argued in the Planning Statement, policy DMH6 is not applicable in this application. Paragraph 6.89 of the Development Management policies states that in some circumstances, housing development can assist in conservation and/or enhancement of previously developed sites and heritage assets. Paragraph 6.90 goes on to say that previously developed land means land which is, or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This is commonly referred to as brownfield land and is a nationally recognised definition for planning purposes. Paragraph 6.91 then states that, for the avoidance of doubt, previously developed land (brownfield land) is not land that is or has been occupied by agricultural (including horticultural buildings) or forestry buildings.
47. Paragraph 6.95 states that *“if there is no evidence that the land is previously developed but the Authority still considers that enhancement would be beneficial in the wider interests of its statutory purposes, it may permit open market housing as a means of enabling this. This could be relevant to agricultural land and buildings in and on the edge of settlements. However, the expectation will remain that at least some of the proposed housing (subject to viability) will address an evidenced local need for affordable housing of the type provided for by policy DMH1”*. Paragraph 6.97 adds: *“Outside of Core Strategy policy DS1 settlements and away from other forms of built development, applications for housing will be assessed against Core Strategy policies DS1 and GSP2”*.
48. With regard to the fact that the proposal is for an open market house, rather than an affordable local needs house, the Planning Statement says that the second part of DMH6(ii) requires that where housing is inside or on the edge of a DS1 settlement, subject to viability an element of the housing should address policy aims for local affordable housing, but that in this case, the site is not in nor on the edge of a DS1 settlement so there is no policy imperative to making the housing affordable where the first part of the policy is met.
49. This issue was raised recently in an application on another site. Whilst policy DMH6 does not have a requirement for affordable housing on previously developed sites outside of named settlements, the supporting text states that DMH6 must be read in the context of core policies including HC1 and that if affordable housing is needed in the locality, it should be provided on site. The advice from the Authority’s Policy team is that while DMH6 is silent on the issue of affordable housing on sites outside of named settlements, this policy must be applied in the context of our core housing policies and national policies, which are restrictive and focus on providing housing to meet identified local needs. Where new housing may be the best way to achieve conservation and enhancement this may require the impetus of open market values, but wherever possible such development should add to the stock of affordable housing.

50. Having given this matter some consideration, officers agree that the costs of removing the buildings or repairing them to a good standard where this is more appropriate, would make it unviable to restrict the new dwelling to an affordable local needs dwelling, particularly if the scheme is for a single dwelling. However, officers do not accept that this would make an open market dwelling acceptable.

Whether the development is required to enhance the site and its landscape setting

51. The Planning Statement says that the proposal has been considered with regards to the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan. The application is also supported by a Landscape and Visual Assessment. The Development Management Policies proposals map shows that the site is within the Landscape Character Area the 'Limestone Village Farmlands' (the land just to the west of the buildings is Limestone Hills and slopes). Within the Authority's Landscape Strategy and Action Plan (2009), the character of Limestone village farmlands is summarised as: "A small-scale settled agricultural landscape characterised by limestone villages, set within a repeating pattern of narrow strip fields bounded by drystone walls". This accurately describes the wider landscape setting of this site.
52. The LVA states: "*Within the guidelines for protection of the landscape of the White Peak, it is considered that: "Traditional farm buildings are of significant value to the character of the landscape and it is important to maintain the fabric and appearance of such buildings." and: "Traditional buildings are an important feature and their renovation and maintenance should be encouraged." It is proposed that the new dwelling is constructed of local materials and designed to be in keeping with the surrounding landscape. The dwelling would replace the existing footprint of buildings and would not appear any more dominant in the landscape than the existing but would enhance the landscape by removing the harm caused by the existing buildings which are in poor condition"*.
53. The LVA concludes that: "*The proposed development would be successfully assimilated into the local landscape and long-term effects would be neutral or beneficial in nature with no adverse effects arising.*  
*Due to topography, built form and vegetation, the site is visually well contained and the proposal would result in long-term neutral to negligible beneficial visual effect. Protection and enhancement of the most significant landscape features and sensitive building design would have long-term negligible to minor beneficial effect on landscape features, a long-term negligible to minor beneficial effect on landscape character and a positive response to landscape related policy at National and Local levels.*  
*The main landscape and visual effects will be experienced at a site level and from the immediate viewpoints and adjacent footpath.*  
*The removal of the incongruous and derelict buildings and restoration of the site would, if considered alone, have major beneficial effects on local landscape and visual receptors.*  
*The proposed development provides the opportunity for these improvements to be realised, and in turn the development will conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park."*
54. In response to this, Officers accept that the site has been unsightly for many years, although it has improved significantly in recent years through the removal of most of the scrap that was stored on the site for no apparent purpose. Most of this appears to have been removed prior to the recent sale of the property. It was a matter which officers had raised with the previous owner over many years, but no formal enforcement action was taken. The remaining issues on the site are therefore largely related to the buildings (particularly as it has been demonstrated that more temporary items such as scrap can be removed without the need for an "enabling" development").
55. It is acknowledged that the existing building group is relatively untidy and unsightly, with most of the buildings in poor structural condition. The buildings are visible from nearby

roads and footpaths. There is no dwelling within the current ownership at the site and it is not clear whether the current owners have any intention to use the site/land for agricultural purposes; all the buildings would be removed from the site as part of the development.

56. Whilst the removal of the existing buildings would be an enhancement given their current condition and appearance, this is true of a great many groups of agricultural buildings in the National Park. Given their location in the open countryside, their replacement with unrestricted, open market dwellings would set a clear precedent encouraging proposals for dwellings on similar sites, resulting in development in unsustainable locations in the National Park, contrary to Development Plan policy and guidance in the NPPF.
57. The Planning Statement explains that the proposal is for a traditionally styled double fronted farmhouse, with a rear projection including garage below and bedroom above, set back from the road and served by a drive. The dwelling is on a similar footprint to the existing building (Building 1), with split faced, random coursed limestone walls with gritstone detailing in the cills, quoins and door openings. The roof is proposed to be blue slate. Other traditional detailing includes the addition of chimneys at the ridge gable and high levels of solidity in the gables. Whilst this form and design is not, in itself objectionable, it would be the sole building on site, rather than being part of a farm group. Consequently, it would appear as a rather suburban development, standing apart on its own and having no functional relationship with the surrounding landscape, unlike traditional farmhouses.
58. This proposal is unacceptable in principle. However, had it been for a different development within policy, such as for an agricultural worker to meet a functional need on the land then officers would have sought an improved design and layout to recreate a more traditional form and character in accordance with the historic farmsteads and hamlets of the area.

#### Heritage Considerations:

59. The Heritage Statement states that there are five buildings within the site, of which only Building 1 and Building 5 were identified as having the potential to retain any heritage significance. The site is situated adjacent to a World War II defence site identified by the Peak District National Park Historic Buildings and Sites and Monuments Record.
60. In terms of its significance, the Statement says: *“Building 1 is a barn, in poor structural condition, missing historic fabric such as original roofs and internal fixtures and fittings. As a result of its surviving architectural, archaeological and historic interest as part of the earlier post-medieval farmstead, the building is considered to be of moderate heritage significance. The substantial loss of historic fabric and extensive alteration of the building as well as the earlier demolition of the historic farmhouse are considered negative elements.*

*Building 5 is a small derelict outbuilding, showing signs of rebuilding from salvaged materials from across the site. Architecturally the building retains no interest, its dereliction masking any indication of its earlier use. Despite this the building may retain some historic interest should it hold a connection to the adjacent World War II defence site. This report could not establish with any degree of certainty whether this building holds a historic connection with the defence site and as such it is considered that the heritage significance of the building is currently unknown. Due to the condition of the building and signs that the building was rebuilt, it would be the contribution of the building to understanding the plan form of the defence site, only, which would be of interest rather than the structure itself.*

*The proposals will result in the demolition of Building 1 and 5. The Building proposed for construction has been designed with consideration to the local vernacular and uses*

*materials in keeping with the traditional building stock of the area. Its design emulates that of a traditional farmhouse, a feature which was lost from the farmstead in the early 20th century, and thereby maintains the legibility of the surrounding landscape.”*

61. In response to this, the advice from the Authority’s Archaeologist is that the current buildings on the site are in poor condition and only buildings 1 or 5 are significant heritage assets. Building 1, the barn, is of moderate significance while Building 5 is of unknown significance due to the uncertainty regarding its function. If this building did relate to the anti-aircraft gun it would be of low significance. In addition the potential and significance for buried archaeological remains is unknown. As non-designated heritage assets, 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 paragraph 203). Should the planning balance be favourable then planning conditions are recommended.
62. On the basis of the assessment of the heritage interest of the site, it is therefore considered that the buildings are not in themselves of sufficient significance or interest to justify conversion or restoration to open market dwellings and, given their condition, they would require significant rebuilding and repair. In relation to the main building (building 1), the Heritage Assessment notes that *“As a result of its surviving architectural, archaeological and historic interest as part of the earlier post-medieval farmstead, the building is considered to be of moderate heritage significance. The substantial loss of historic fabric and extensive alteration of the building as well as the earlier demolition of the historic farmhouse are considered (a) negative element”*. Whilst this is not considered to be a reason for refusal in itself, it could provide a basis for a more sympathetic scheme that is more likely to be in accordance with the Authority’s policy.

#### Sustainable building and climate change:

63. 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 includes a Design and Access Statement. The statement sets out how the new dwelling would meet the requirements of policy CC1 and our adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance ‘Climate Change and Sustainable Building, as follows:
- *Use energy more efficiently: All appliances and fittings will be low demand. The dwelling has been designed to provide cross ventilation during hot periods. It has south facing glazing to take advantage of daylight and solar gain.*
  - *Supply energy more efficiently: The site benefits from an existing mains electricity supply which the new property will be connected to. All other energy requirements will be supplied by the site itself.*
  - *Use Low Carbon and Renewable energy: Heating and hot water will be provided via a combination of ground source or air source heat exchanger. A solar PV bank will be installed on the south facing roof and connected to the national grid to feed back into the grid any energy not required on site.*
  - *The proposal achieves the best possible carbon reductions by using locally supplied materials reducing the supply chain and by having a long life cycle as a building due to the standard of construction. It also makes use of and enhances existing building fabric.*
64. Whilst these proposals are rather generic, the application is considered to be generally acceptable in this regard.

#### Ecology

65. A Bat Roost and Barn Owl Appraisal Survey Report was submitted as part of the application. This concluded that the surveyed buildings were assessed to have a low to

moderate potential for bats to inhabit and/or roost within them, but the comprehensive search of the buildings produced no evidence of bats roosting within any of the buildings at the time of the survey or indeed ever having been present within the buildings. The report concluded that Buildings B1, B2 and B3 were assessed as having a moderate potential for bats and B4 and B6 were assessed as having a low potential for bats, so further survey effort was necessary to confirm or refute the presence of bat roosts within the buildings.

66. The presence of barn owls was confirmed within building B3. A barn owl roost site (unlike a bat roost) is not protected by UK legislation. However, a barn owl nest site is protected and the site was assessed as a potential barn owl nest site.
67. In response to this report, the Authority's Ecologist has recommended conditions in the event of an approval.
68. A survey was also carried out on the dew pond within the site, at the Authority's request. This confirmed that the pond is not suitable for Great Crested Newts as it is overgrown, but the applicants have agreed to enhance the dew pond to make it more suitable for aquatic life.

#### Highway issues

69. The access to the site from the road would remain as the existing, with the track that leads to the buildings being upgraded. Following an initial objection, the Highway Authority now has no objection, subject to a revised plan for the emerging visibility splays to the Authority for the reference. This has been provided and shows a section of walling west of the access interferes with the splay and would be required to be lowered or set back to clear the splay. No details of this have been provided.
70. 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 DM policies DMT3 and DMT8 subject to satisfactory details being agreed regarding the impact of the required splays on the traditional roadside boundary walls which are a valued characteristic of this rural lane and the surrounding area.

#### Impact on amenity

71. The property is located in a relatively isolated location, so there would be no impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties, the closest of which is to the east of the access. The proposal therefore accords with policies GSP3 and DMC3 in these respects.

#### Conclusion

72. It is considered that the proposed development is in conflict with Core Strategy policies, particularly GSP1, HC1, and L1, because the proposal is for the erection of an open market dwelling in a relatively isolated and unsustainable location in the open countryside, not within or near to a designated settlement. The proposal is not justified as an essential functional dwelling or as the conservation of a building of architectural or historic significance. Whilst the proposals would result in the removal of unsightly buildings, with some benefit to the landscape, this is not considered to outweigh the strong national and local policy presumption against new dwellings in the countryside. The proposed development would therefore not represent sustainable development within the National Park contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

73. 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**

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

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

75. Nil

76. Report Author: Steven Wigglesworth, Planner