
6. MAJOR APPLICATION: IMPROVEMENTS AND EXPANSION OF THE EXISTING CAR PARK ASSOCIATED WITH CHATSWORTH HOUSE, TOGETHER WITH THE CREATION OF A NEW ACCESS ROAD VIA A SPUR OFF THE EXISTING A619/A621 ROUNDABOUT EAST OF BASLOW (NP/DDD/1018/0911, ALN)

APPLICANT: MR STEVE PORTER – CHATSWORTH HOUSE TRUST

Summary

1. The application seeks to reconfigure and extend the main visitor car park at Chatsworth and create a new arm and link road to the roundabout to the north of the Estate. In the planning balance, subject to conditions, including that there be no public parking below the Bastion Wall over and above the 3 major 'events,' the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the harm, such that this major development is recommended for approval.

Background

2. This application was considered by the Planning Committee on 8 November 2019. The application was deferred for further discussions between the applicant and Planning Officers on a strategic approach to transport and visitor management, the impact of the proposals on the historic parkland and landscape, particularly the impact of the removal of trees, and the impact and benefits of the proposals on local communities.
3. Following the meeting officers encouraged the applicant to withdraw the application pending further discussions with regard to the issues raised above and for consideration of an amended scheme. However the applicant has made it clear that they wish the current proposals to be determined and have now provided additional information to try to address the points raised by Members. A summary of the information submitted is as follows:
 - Environmental Policy Statement - outlines wider measures to reduce carbon emission across the Estate and a section focusing on the car park proposals.
 - Document named 'Responses to PDNPA Request for Additional Information' – includes details about the benefits to Baslow Residents of the new access road and an amended plan to show additional planting to the south of Heathylea Wood.
 - Further document named 'Responses to Members Request for Additional Information' including reasons for a continued desire to provide overflow parking below the Bastion Wall; a summary of the impact on trees; confirmation that electric charging points will be provided; confirmation that a Travel Plan has been submitted; explanation that based on a 2013 Lidar survey, the overflow parking areas relate the least sensitive areas of archaeology.
4. An assessment of this information is provided at each relevant section of the report.

Site and Surroundings

5. Chatsworth House is a stately home situated on the eastern edge of the National Park, approximately 4km north east of Bakewell. It is a grade I listed building and the 765 hectare park and garden in which it sits is included on the Historic England register of parks and gardens at grade I. The Estate is a major tourist destination within the National Park, attracting around 640,000 visitors to the house and garden each year.

6. The main access to Chatsworth House is via Paines Bridge on an unclassified road that links to the B6012 to the south east. Access can also be gained via the Golden Gates from the A619 to the north although this is usually closed to the public.
7. The application site edged red encompasses two locations: an area that includes the existing main visitor car park to the north of Chatsworth house; and an area on the south side of the 'Golden Gate' roundabout on the northern boundary of the parkland. The two sites are linked by an existing private parkland drive known as the 'North Drive'
8. There are a number of other listed buildings in close proximity to the car park. These include the Stables (grade I), North Lodges (grade I), game larder (grade II), James Paine's three arched bridge (grade I), and the terrace walls to the west of the house (known as the Bastion Walls) (Grade II). To the south of the roundabout are the Golden Gates and Lodges (Grade II).
9. The existing car park has developed and expanded incrementally over a number of years and currently can accommodate approximately 675 vehicles.

Proposal

10. This is a major planning application which seeks planning permission for two areas of development as follows:
11. To reconfigure and extend the main visitor car park to increase capacity by 30% from approximately 675 spaces to 895 spaces (plus 13 coach bays). The main elements of the scheme are as follows:
 - Re-configuration and resurfacing of the existing car park area to provide more formalised parking bays (including 40 disabled spaces).
 - Expansion of the car park to the north, west and east of the existing footprint to increase capacity.
 - Creation of a more level surface by 'cutting' material from the southern area and 'filling' within the northern area.
 - Creation/retention of a green 'picnic area' around the veteran trees in the centre of the site.
 - Relocation of ticket kiosks to the entrance to the northern zone of the car park, with a one-way system into and out of the car park.
 - Bollards, kiosks and temporary fences removed from the North Lodge car park and area of hardstanding reduced.
 - Removal of row of car parking spaces directly in front of the principle (west) elevation of the Stables.
 - Relocation of coach parking bays to the northern edge of the car park.
 - Creation of dedicated footpath links from the car park to the house/stables.
 - Widening of the access road to the west of the car park.
 - Dedicated bus stop and 15 secure cycle racks. Electrical charging points.

To create a fourth arm to the southern side of the roundabout to the east of Baslow. The main elements of the scheme are as follows:

- New arm of the south side of the roundabout including realignment of the existing arms.
- New access road from the roundabout through the woodland to the south and across an area of parkland to link with the existing access track to the south of the Golden Gates.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. **3 years implementation period**
2. **Adopt amended plans**
3. **Once the new car park is first brought into use, no public overflow parking shall take place between the Bastion Wall and the River Derwent (in the area marked green on the attached plan) over and above the operational days of the three major events – RHS flower show (5 days per year), Country Fair (3 days per year) and Horse Trials (3 days per year)**
4. **Once the new access road is first brought into use, the existing Golden Gates access shall no longer be used for access to the Estate by the general public or delivery vehicles.**
5. **The proposed access off A619 shall not be taken into use until the modifications to the roundabout have been fully completed, generally in accordance with the application drawing, but fully in accordance with a detailed scheme first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Authority.**
6. **The proposed turning area demonstrated on the application drawings for the northern access road shall remain available for use at all times.**
7. **In association with Condition 5 an ‘Access and Signage Strategy’ shall be submitted prior to the new access being taken into use, detailing the proposed operation of the new access and restrictions to the existing ‘Golden Gates’ access for approval. Once approved the proposed access shall be operated in accordance with the proposed Strategy unless otherwise agreed in writing.**
8. **Recommendations at section 6 of submitted Arboricultural Assessment by the ‘Tree and Woodland Company’ and advice in the Arboricultural Advice note (July 2019) by Anderson Tree Care to be fully adhered to.**
9. **Hard and soft landscaping scheme (including details of all surfacing; new railings to top of earthwork feature, fencing and details of supplementary planting to south of Heathylea Wood) to be submitted agreed and thereafter implemented.**
10. **Management plan for the ongoing management of Heathy Lea Wood to be submitted and agreed and thereafter implemented. Precise details of number and location of trees to be felled to be submitted and agreed.**
11. **Approved works to create an improved environment for the ancient trees in the centre of site to be completed before the extended part of the new car park is first brought into use.**
12. **Lighting scheme to be submitted and agreed.**

- 13 **Removal of car parking in front of the stable block and works and improvements to the northern forecourt to be carried out in full accordance with the approved plans before the extended part of the new car park is first brought into use.**
- 14 **Surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and agreed.**
- 15 **Archaeological scheme of works to be submitted, agreed and implemented for works to create the new access road and the car park.**
- 16 **Action Plan and Marketing and Monitoring measures set out in the submitted Travel Plan to be fully adhered to.**
- 17 **Recommendation at section 4 of the submitted bat survey by Peak Ecology to be fully adhered to. Location of proposed bat boxes to be submitted and agreed.**
- 18 **Recommendations in section 4 of the submitted badger survey by Peak ecology to be fully adhered to including that works to the western access road shall be carried out between 1 July to 31st November.**
- 19 **Full details of signage to be submitted and agreed including number, location, design and finish. Thereafter scheme to be implemented.**
- 20 **Full details of all service routes including ducting, power and water supply to be submitted and agreed.**
- 21 **Details of any CCTV installations to be submitted and agreed.**
- 22 **Details of size, design and materials of construction of ticket kiosks to be submitted and agreed.**
- 23 **Details of final profile and any adjacent earthwork profiling for the new road to be submitted and agreed.**
- 24 **Modern track to south of Baslow Lodges to be removed and footprint laid to park grassland before the new driveway is first brought into use.**
- 25 **Access and signage strategy to be submitted and agreed.**
- 26 **Full details of earthwork feature between the Stable Bank and the car park to be submitted and agreed.**

Key Issues

- Need for the proposed development.
- Impact on the setting of heritage assets and landscape character
- Ecological impacts
- Impact on arboricultural interest
- Archaeological impacts
- Flood Risk and Drainage issues
- Traffic impacts
- Overflow parking and broader sustainability principles.

History

12. There is a detailed and extensive planning history for development on the Estate but in relation to the specific application site:
13. October 2017 – pre-application enquiry submitted with regard to the current proposals.
14. April 2018 – (Enq ref 32709) formal EIA screening request submitted for the current proposals. The Authority came to the view that the development does not constitute EIA development

Consultations

15. **Highway Authority** – *‘Whilst the introduction of the additional arm to the roundabout is generally supported in principle the Highway Authority would prefer to see the use of this arm become a more regular access to the premises. Without an expectation of emerging vehicles, drivers on the roundabout could potentially start to ignore the arm, on the assumption that it is never used. Use of the existing Golden Gate access could be downgraded and limited to pedestrians/cyclists only with all vehicles using the new access, It is noted that following discussion with the Highway Authority a turning area has been demonstrated in front of the new gates the remove the need to vehicles to reverse onto the roundabout – whilst demarked as ‘extant of highway works’ this area would remain private. The proposals include the provision of a significantly increased number of parking spaces which would not suggest a sustainable development. Whilst there may be planning policy issues in relation to the provision of more parking with no associated development, it is assumed that with the inefficient use of unmarked parking area, that some of this parking already occurs, albeit in a more ad-hoc overspill arrangement.’* Recommends conditions that the access is not brought into use until after the modifications to the roundabout have been implemented; the turning area to remain available at all times; Access Strategy to be submitted and agreed and the new parking areas to remain ancillary to and in association with Chatsworth House.
16. **District Council** – no response
17. **Baslow Parish Council** – *‘The Parish Council support the application as long as it removes traffic from Baslow and to enable this, the new access should remain open all the time and not just during events. No traffic from Bakewell or Manchester direction should be re-routed through Baslow but continue to use the existing main entrance. Is the roundabout layout the best for traffic flow or should the exits be more evenly spaced?’*
18. **Historic England** - *‘The new submission includes a revised design and access statement and a transport strategy. We welcome an holistic approach to the management of vehicles across the Estate but remain concerned that the sustainable limits of visitor parking and events in the Park have not been tackled more robustly. Whilst it evidently desirable that the public enjoy this exceptional place, its ability to absorb this much interest without being itself consumed is necessarily finite. The overall carrying capacity of the estate and the attritional effect of parking upon the significance of the Grade I Park and associated listed buildings remains of concern. In addition to the intrusion of parking in key views and upon the appreciation of the House in its designed setting we are particularly concerned at the impact of parking on earthwork and buried archaeological remains which contribute to the significance of the Grade I registered park and other assets.*
19. *As set out in the submitted additional information the scheme now offers a clear reduction in non-event days on which parking will occur on the grass below the Bastion Wall (i.e. in the principal view of the House). What is now offered is a limit of ten days per a year*

in addition to those days upon which 'events' occur. This limit is a benefit to the conservation and experience of the House in its parkland setting and can be set alongside the reduction in parking impact upon the Grade I Listed former stables by virtue of the parking being set back from the existing line and the benefits offered to veteran trees. These heritage benefits should however be weighed against the impacts of the new parking and access works themselves, including the archaeological impacts of the new roadway at the northern end of the Park.

20. *Were that your authority were minded to grant consent for the scheme as now proposed it should secure the benefits offered by the use of robust conditions to planning consent addressing the following issues:-*

- a. *A) That the applicant be restricted to X number of days per a calendar year in which vehicles may be parked or events held on the ground below the Bastion Wall so as to give certainty as to the overall impact upon the significance of the Grade I Listed House and Registered Park permitted. (where X is calculated by the Local Planning Authority from the data submitted in the applicant's Design and Access Statement.)*
- b. *B) That the applicant shall not permit vehicles to be parked in Chatsworth Park in conditions or in a manner likely to result in damage to archaeological earthworks or buried remains, so that the significance of the Grade I Park and the setting of the Listed Buildings may be preserved.*

21. *With regard to the sufficient assessment of the likely impact of construction works upon archaeological remains and the mitigation of archaeological impacts more broadly we refer you to the advice of the National Park Senior Conservation Archaeologist.'*

22. **Gardens Trust** – *'It is clear from the documents submitted with this application that the current parking arrangements are insufficient and unsatisfactory, leading to the unwelcome build up of traffic, congestion in Baslow, possible damage to the Grade I Three Arch Bridge, as well as occasional overflow parking to the west of the house. The GT welcomes the careful consideration given to overcoming these problems. We feel that the new entrance off the A619, the removal of pay kiosks from the north front, the resulting improvements in traffic flow and the increase of pay kiosks at the northern end of the car park extension will outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to the setting and significance of the Grade I RPG.'*

23. **Environment Agency** – no comments to make.

24. **Lead Local Flood Authority** – *'After review of the submitted FRA the LLFA would require some clarification on the proposed Car Park aspect of the development. In terms of the proposed run-off rate the applicant has indicated that a 30% betterment on the existing situation will be provided. The LLFA would expect a discharge rate close as reasonably practical to the greenfield run – off rate, this would be in line with S3 of DEFRA's Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems. Currently this appears not to be the case. The applicant is proposing to discharge surface water to 2 existing culverts, however it is unclear if there is sufficient capacity to accept additional flows and what the current condition of the culverts are. It is noted that attenuation storage shall be provided by geo-cellular storage, however it appears the applicant has not fully considered a range of SuDs features. The LLFA would expect full consideration for a whole range of SuDs features.'*

25. **Natural England** – no objections

26. **Authority's Ecologist** – (in summary) following completion of activity surveys during the course of the application, no objections with regard to potential impacts on bats. Any lighting scheme will need to be designed to be minimal and low level to ensure minimal impact on bat foraging use across the site, dark space and tree habitats. Still raises concerns with regard to the impacts of works to the car park on veteran trees, and that the proposed enhancements to the veteran trees resource would not outweigh the removal of trees, and severance of woodland. No objections with regard to impact on fungi. With regard to badgers, requires clarity on the location of the road widening to ensure that works are not within a 30m buffer zone of an identified sett. Following receipt of further information, is satisfied that the proposals would be unlikely to affect great crested newt. The new access road off the roundabout will result in severance of semi-natural broadleaved woodland. Notes that the surrounding woodland plantation will receive additional management to improve its structure and diversity through selective thinning and understorey planting. Requests that this be secured by means of a condition.
27. **Authority's Archaeologist** – (in summary) the groundworks required to create the car park and the access road will result in direct and irreversible harm to features of archaeological interest, where they survive, and cause harm to the archaeological interest of the site as a whole. Taking into account the nature and significance of these features is confident that should this aspect of the development be deemed to be acceptable, the impacts can be appropriately mitigated by a conditioned scheme of archaeological work. Has concerns with regard to the long term sustainability of the proposed parking strategy because of the cumulative impact of parking within the parkland in areas with extant archaeological earthworks. Parking over earthworks, particularly when the ground is wet/saturated, could result in harm to the earthwork remains. Concerns about the level of public benefit the development would achieve without the removal of car parking below the Bastion Wall. If areas of archaeological earthworks are used to ease pressure on the use of the Bastion Wall, then the harm will be displaced elsewhere rather than removed. If the application is deemed to be acceptable, recommends conditions for:
- Restricting the number of days that events can be held or cars can be parked below the Bastion Walls.
 - Ensuring that there is no parking in the parkland within areas of archaeological works.
 - An archaeological scheme of work for the new access road and car park.
28. **Authority's Landscape Architect** – no landscape visual objections to the proposed alterations to the car park. Welcomes the arboriculture report it is *'very clear and gives good recommendations for tree protection and management of existing and proposed trees.'* Raises some detailed queries with regard to some detailed elements of the car park design.
29. **Authority's Conservation Officer** - A full car parking strategy which removes overflow car parking in front of the Bastion Wall, as requested by the Authority and Historic England at the pre-application stage, has not been provided. Car parking in this location has a negative impact on the setting of the Grade I listed Chatsworth House, Grade II listed Bastion Wall and other associated designated heritage assets, causing less than substantial harm to their significance. Parking on the grass in front of the Bastion Wall also risks long-term harm to the fabric of the Grade I Registered Park and Garden in this exceptionally sensitive location. As noted by Historic England, without a full car parking strategy which addresses, and resolves this issue, I would not support approval of the proposed improvements and expansion of the car parking.

30. **Authority’s Tree Conservation Officer** – no objections. The ‘betterment works’ provide exceptional reasons, which is to improve the root environment of the exiting veteran trees and would not result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats.
31. **Authority’s Transport Planner** – *‘Overall, I believe that the revised Chatsworth Park Travel Plan fulfils the requirements of a Travel Plan, for a development of this scale, and in this location. The Travel Plan sets out a measured approach to managing car-borne access, and the impact of that access on the site. It also indicates an intent to increase the proportion of visits that are made by public transport and other more sustainable transport options. This is set against a stated objective (8) of stabilising visitor numbers to the site. In combination, the travel plan objectives should reduce the overall number of car-borne journeys for both staff and visitors.*
32. *The Travel Plan sets appropriate targets, along with opportunities to monitor the effectiveness of the actions in meeting them. It also demonstrates an ability to respond to evidence of the success or failure of any particular action. This flexible approach should offer best the opportunities to achieve targets and deliver objectives.*
33. *The applicant has taken the previous advice offered and used it to produce a suitable travel plan that I believe is in accordance with the Peak District National Park Core Strategy Policy T2F.’*

REPRESENTATIONS

34. Three letters of objection from Friends of the Peak District/CPRE have been received over the course of the application. In summary the letter raise objections to the proposed car park extension, to any parking below the Bastion Wall and to the proposed new access road. They support the improvement to the existing car park. Points raised include:
- Measures to encourage sustainable travel are insufficient. The submitted Travel Plan continues to meet demand for car parking – instead Chatsworth should use current parking capacity as a demand management tool to reduce car dependant trips and increase incentives to use bus, car share and cycle.
 - Since the application was submitted climate change has development to an existential threat and emergency – it is imperative that traffic reduction should be implemented urgently and Chatsworth should play its part.
 - New access track would lead to loss of boundary mixed woodland, 6 trees and a strip of medieval and post medieval field system and tracking, the impact of which is considered permanent and irreversible by the PDNPA.
 - With the North Drive in place traffic impacts would occur regularly on two routes. This would spread the cumulative impacts of moving traffic across a wider area detracting from the landscape, visual enjoyment and cultural heritage. The benefits have not been adequately demonstrated.
 - Concerns about impacts of overflow parking.
35. Seven individuals have written in to object (one individual wrote three letters). The letters raise the following points (in summary):
- Application narrowly focuses on, without question, on meeting and increasing demand for car-based visitor travel. Instead the proposals should manage demand. Increasing supply will worsen problems in years to come.
 - Climate change and localised pollution impacts are ignored.
 - The applicant wishes event parking to set aside as a separate issue but it is not.

- Use of the north drive as a main access would ruin the peaceful aspect of the parkland, it is currently only used for events.
- If the north access is used regularly by vehicles, it would not be useable by families with small children, wheelchair users etc.
- The applicant needs to look at the bigger picture – proposals offer short term solution by increasing car park capacity. The problem will then need to re-visited again before long.
- Chatsworth should look at off-site parking and ride and real incentives to use public transport.
- Application does not uphold Chatsworth's so called 'green credentials'.
- New spur to roundabout will create gridlock in Baslow as those leaving the Estate will have priority over those leaving Baslow.
- No account taken of existing car parks at Calton Lees, the garden centre and the farmshop. A shuttle bus operates from Calton Lees over the Xmas period but this is not mentioned. Use of Calton Lees could ease pressure on areas near the house.
- No analysis of the impact of additional traffic when approaching the Estate from the A6 through Rowsley.
- Applicant makes much of the benefit of moving car parking way from the stables but then the whole area in front of the stables is used for a market over the Xmas period.
- Applicant has provided much detail with regard to its carbon footprint in recent applications for solar panels but fails to do so on this major application.

36. One letter of support has been received from 'Marketing Peak District and Derbyshire' on the grounds that the proposals would improve accessibility to the Estate by private and public transport; would encourage visitors to stay longer and increased their spending; and the road would improve traffic flows, reduce congestion and benefit the wider economy.

Main Policies

37. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L2, L3, RT1, CC1, T1, T2, T3, T7

38. Relevant Local Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC9, DMC11, DMC12, DMC13, DMT3, DMT2, DMT7

39. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for national parks in England and Wales: Which are; to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public. When national parks carry out these purposes they also have the duty to; seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Parks.

National Planning Policy Framework

40. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been revised (2019). This replaces the previous document (2012) with immediate effect. 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.

41. Para 172 of the NPPF states the great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing 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 these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks. The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. Planning 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.
42. National policies with regard to promoting sustainable transport are set out in chapter 9 of the NPPF. Para 102 states that transport issues should be considered at an early stage so that: the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed; opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised ; opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued; the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.
43. Para 108 states that in assessing applications for development, appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location; safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.
44. Para 109 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
45. With regard to the historic environment para 193 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Para 195 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.

Development Plan

46. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies (DMP), adopted May 2019. These Development Plan Policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. In this case, it is considered there are no significant conflicts between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and government guidance in the NPPF.

Core Strategy

47. Policy GSP1 E states that in securing national park purposes major development should not take place within the Peak District National Park other than in exceptional circumstances. Major development will only be permitted following rigorous consideration of the criteria in national policy. GSP2 states that opportunities should be taken to enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park. This is expanded in policy L1 which relates directly to enhancement of landscape character, L2 to sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance and policy L3 relating to the conservation and enhancement of features of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance.
48. Core Strategy policy T1 seeks to encourage sustainable transport and reduce the need to travel through giving priority to conservation and enhancement; encouraging modal shift to sustainable transport and minimizing traffic impacts within environmentally sensitive locations.
49. Core Strategy policy T2 C states that no new road schemes will be permitted unless they provide access to new businesses or housing development or there are exceptional circumstances. Those road schemes (including improvements) that fall outside of the Planning Authority's direct jurisdiction will be strongly resisted except in exceptional circumstances.
50. T3 seeks to achieve high quality design in transport infrastructure. T7 states that non-residential parking will be restricted in order to discourage car use and will be managed to ensure that the location and nature of car and coach parking does not exceed environmental capacity. New non-operational parking will normally be matched by a reduction of related parking spaces elsewhere and wherever possible it will be made available for public use.
51. 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. CC1. B says that development must be directed away from flood risk areas, and seek to reduce overall risk from flooding within the National Park and areas outside it, upstream and downstream.
52. Policy RT1 states that the National Park Authority will support facilities which enable recreation, environmental education and interpretation, which encourage understanding and enjoyment of the National Park, and are appropriate to the National Park's valued characteristics. Opportunities for access by sustainable means will be encouraged. New provision must justify its location in relation to environmental capacity, scale and intensity of use or activity, and be informed by the Landscape Strategy. Where appropriate, development should be focused in or on the edge of settlements. In the open countryside, clear demonstration of need for such a location will be necessary.

Development Management Policies

53. 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.

54. Development Management policy DMC5 states that applications affecting a heritage asset should clearly demonstrate its significance including how any identified features will be preserved and where possible enhanced and why the proposed works are desirable or necessary. Development of a heritage asset will not be permitted if it would result in harm to, or loss of significance character and appearance unless the harm would be outweighed by public benefit. DMC8 states that planning applications involving a Registered Park and Garden and/or its setting will be determined in accordance with policy DMC5.
55. DMC7 aims to ensure that development preserves the character and significance of listed buildings.
56. DMC11 seeks to achieve net gains to biodiversity or geodiversity as a result of development. DMC12 aims to safeguard sites, features or species of biodiversity interest.
57. DMC13 states, amongst other things that trees and hedgerows, including ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees, which positively contribute, either as individual specimens or as part of a wider group, to the visual amenity or biodiversity of the location will be protected. Other than in exceptional circumstances development involving loss of these features will not be permitted.
58. DMT3 states, amongst other things that where new transport related infrastructure is developed, it should be to the highest standards of environmental design and materials and in keeping with the valued characteristics of the National Park. Development, which includes a new or improved access onto a public highway, 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 which does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality and where possible enhances it.
59. DMT7 states that new or enlarged visitor car parks will not be permitted unless a clear, demonstrable need, delivering local benefit, can be shown. Where new or additional off-street visitor parking is permitted, an equivalent removal of on-street parking will usually be required. In considering proposals for new or enlarged car parks in the Natural Zone and in Conservation Areas, the developer is expected to have assessed alternative sites located in a less environmentally sensitive location, capable of being linked to the original visitor destination either by a Park & Ride system or right of way.
60. DMT2 seeks to achieve any local road improvements in a way that does not cause harm to the landscape. Schemes with the sole purpose of increasing capacity of the network will not be permitted.

Assessment

Whether the proposals represent major development

61. In terms of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 the current proposals represent 'major development' as the application site edged red extends to more than 1 hectare (in fact it extends to 5.6 hectares). In planning policy – both national and local – the term major development is also referenced. Specifically paragraph 172 of the NPPF and Core Strategy policy GSP1 seek to resist 'major development' in National Parks in all but exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that they are in the public interest.
62. Para 131 of the Authority's Development Management policy document provides clarity on the issue. It points out that 'Footnote 55 of the NPPF (2019) states, *'whether a proposal is 'major development' is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account*

its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated or defined.’ In making this assessment close regard should therefore be had to the impact of a scheme on the special qualities of the National Park utilising the Landscape Strategy and other tools advocated by this document.’

63. In this case the application site is located within the Chatsworth Parkland, which is a highly sensitive landscape in that it is a grade I Registered Park and Garden and there are numerous listed buildings and undesignated heritage assets within the vicinity of the site. In addition, Chatsworth is an extremely popular tourist destination, with the park and gardens holding a central place in the history of English landscape design. Taking into account this sensitive setting and the significant operational development that is proposed, the view is taken that the proposals do indeed constitute major development within the National Park. Planning permission should therefore only be granted if it is considered that exceptional circumstances exist and that the proposals would be in the public interest. The public interest benefits that would arise are discussed further in the relevant section of the report below.

Whether the principle of the proposed development is acceptable.

64. With regard to the proposed car park extensions, Core Strategy policy T7 and Development Management policies DMT7 together make it clear that new or enlarged visitor car parks will not be permitted unless a clear, demonstrable need, delivering local benefit, can be shown. Furthermore policies T2 and DMT2 seek to resist new local road schemes unless there are exceptional circumstances and provided they do not cause harm to the landscape.

65. Consideration with regard to the impact of the proposals on the significance of the identified cultural heritage assets; on archaeology; and on ecology interests including trees are crucial to the determination of this application.

66. The acceptability of the principle of the development in this instance therefore rests upon a balanced view being taken as to whether or not any harmful impacts from the introduction of a major form of development would be outweighed by public benefits. This analysis will take into account the 3 criteria that para 172 of the NPPF refer to with regard to assessing major development in National Parks i.e.

- The need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitted it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- 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.

67. The report will look at need, then the physical impacts of the development and finally the broader issues of overflow parking and sustainable development and will seek to provide a ‘planning balance’ between them.

Issue 1: Need for the proposed development

68. Car park re-configuration/extension

69. The application is accompanied by a Design, Planning and Access Statement, a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan. These documents explain that the main car park at Chatsworth House is used to park general visitors to the property, numbering on average 24,700 to 26,000 cars per month during the open season between April and

December. When the House and Gardens are closed numbers per month average between 6000 and 6,500. In addition the car park is used by staff, volunteers and contractors, together with coaches.

70. The information provided demonstrates that the main car park (675 spaces) is frequently unable to meet regular demand for parking spaces leading to overflow car parking on grassed areas within the parkland. The locations used vary depending on weather and ground conditions but the most frequently used are the 'Helipad' (south east of the house) and 'below the Bastion Wall' (in front of the principal elevation of the house). These provide 250 and 350 extra spaces respectively. In 2017 there were also 32 days (excluding the 3 major 'events') upon which parking demand exceeded the 1275 parking spaces provided by all these areas and on those days further overflow parking takes place on areas of parkland the north of the house.
71. In addition to what the Estate describes as these 'general operational days' (which include the Christmas period) Chatsworth also runs three large scale events, which attract very high demand for parking. It is stated that each event has an individual plan for parking associated with it. The events include The Horse Trials (3 days in May), the RHS Flower show (5 days in June) and the Country Fair (3 days in September). The Horse Trials attract approximately 8000 vehicles, the RHS 23,000 vehicles and the Country Fair 16,000 vehicles.
72. It is stated that Chatsworth has undertaken an exercise to consider various options, including moving parking further away from the House to a new location. The Estate considers that whilst the benefits to heritage assets would be clear, a completely new car park with capacity to hold 700 cars would need to be created with service links to the House and the potential impacts on the parkland and potentially on local villages would be significant. It is stated that a Park and Ride scheme at Barbrook (on the north side of the site of the old walled garden at Home Farm just south of Baslow) was considered but this was discounted for a number of reasons including the planning policy issues of constructing a large new car park, the prominence and harm of a car park in this location, build and operational costs and lack of enthusiasm by visitors to use Park and Ride (as evidenced by visitor comments when a shuttle bus was operated during the Christmas markets).
73. Consequently the Estate has decided to focus on improving/expanding the existing car park and the application seeks to create an extra 220 parking spaces to meet demand, by a combination of the reconfiguration of the existing car park and by extension into the adjacent parkland. It states that there a number of issues relating the existing parking arrangements as follows:
 - There are no defined parking bays leading to inefficient use of the space and sometimes resulting in parking on grass.
 - Parking surfaces are poor and badly eroded due to lack of effective drainage systems.
 - The sloping ground and loose surfacing compromises safe access and leads to negative customer feedback.
 - The car park arrangements impacts on the health of veteran trees as well as the setting of the House.
 - There is no formal traffic flow and limited signage creates conflict between vehicles entering and exiting as well as conflict between vehicles and pedestrians.
 - Public bus stop facilities are basic and there are poor pedestrian links to the visitor entrances.

74. Our view is that the issues with the layout, surfacing and traffic flow with regard to the existing car park are recognised and in principle (subject to consideration of impact on heritage assets, ecology, archaeology etc.) the rationalisation and improvement of this area is welcomed. However, the expansion of the car park is less clearly supported by policy. With regard to potential alternative schemes/sites, there have been no detailed pre-application discussions with regard to these and so it is difficult to come to a view on their acceptability.

New access road link

75. The Design and Access Statement states that the proposals for the new north access have been brought about by a number of issues. As there is a weight limit on Paines Bridge, (on the main access to the south of the house), delivery vehicles and heavy traffic particularly during events are directed through the Golden Gates on the northern boundary of the parkland. The gates (Grade II listed) have recently been refurbished and there have been issues with damage to the gates by delivery vehicles/HGVs etc. The existing junction between the driveway and the A619 east of Baslow has limited visibility to the west which raises safety issues. When this drive is used at times of high traffic demand, temporary traffic lights have to be deployed on the A619, leading to tailbacks into Baslow village. It is stated that the new arm off the roundabout will negate the need for traffic lights and will enable traffic to flow more freely on entering/exiting Chatsworth. The new access road, which by-passes the Golden Gates will reduce any potential direct impact on their significance.
76. Whilst new road schemes are usually resisted, in this case, only the new arm onto an existing roundabout (within the highway verge) would become part of the public highway. Beyond the highway boundary to the south the new road would be a private access road only and consequently, subject to an assessment of the impacts on traffic flows within the local area and physical impacts such as impacts on landscape character, heritage assets, ecology and archaeology it is considered in principle that the proposals can be compliant with T2 and DMT2.

Issue 2: Impact on the setting of heritage assets and landscape character

Car park re-configuration/extension

77. There would no impact upon the fabric of any of the heritage assets at Chatsworth as the proposals relate only to groundworks and operational development in and around the car park. However, there is clearly potential for the proposals to impact upon the setting of the various assets including grade I listed buildings which are of exceptional national importance.
78. There would be some heritage benefits to the scheme. At present there is a row of parking spaces placed directly to the west of the grade I listed stable block. When looking along the formal approach to the stables from the west, the parked vehicles intrude into the view of the northern corner of the building, causing harm to its setting. The submitted plans show that this row of parking spaces would be removed and the area returned to grass. Because of the levelling works that would be carried out within the car park a 'ha ha' embankment feature would be created to define the edge of the car park at this point. Subject to agreement of any fencing to be erected on top of the embankment it is considered that the feature would be a natural looking feature that would also help to screen the cars to the north.
79. At present there is a clutter of pay kiosks, temporary fencing and general activity of vehicles manoeuvring directly in front (to the north of) the grade I listed North Lodges and the grade I listed House. By moving the pay kiosks to the north side of the car park this

will reduce the clutter and the movement of vehicles in this area and parts of the currently wide expanse of hardstanding would be returned to grass in a style more reflective of the historic layout.

80. Removing coach parking from along the access road to the south of the car park would also enhance the setting of the House, Stables and Game Larder.
81. There is potential impact by virtue of the proposed 'levelling' works which seek to create a more level surface by 'cutting' material from the southern half of the existing car park and using that material to 'fill' in the newly extended northern area. The existing car park is situated on land that slopes quite steeply upwards from west to east as well as upwards from north to south. This respects the surrounding topography in that Chatsworth is set into the valley side to the north of the river Derwent and has itself been constructed on a raised platform. An overly engineered, level surface would appear at odds with these natural surroundings. Sections have been provided during the course of the application which demonstrate that there would still be an 11m fall across the 170 width of the car park from east to west and 15m fall across the 250m length from south to north. Consequently whilst the overall surface would be more even, the car park as regraded would still on the whole be sympathetic with the prevailing levels in the area.
82. The existing surface to the car park is a poor and un-bound light coloured gravel material that causes harm to the setting of the listed building. It is proposed to use a bitumen surface with a decorative gravel top dressing in a manner used elsewhere on the Estate. Subject to agreeing a sample the proposed this would be an enhancement.
83. A full heritage, landscape and visual impact assessment was submitted with the application. In deferring the application members asked for more clarity in the report with regard to landscape impacts. A total of twenty viewpoints (near, middle and long distance views) were analysed in the assessment. In the shorter range views (i.e. from within and directly adjacent to the car park) the report assesses the residual impact as beneficial because of removing car parking from the stable bank and removing clutter and improving the environment of the forecourt. Officers concur with this conclusion. In middle distance views, for example from road and parkland across the river to the west, the report assess the residual impact as broadly low to negligible (after mitigation). This is because whilst the car park will still be a visible feature from these views, the proposed additional tree planting to the south of the car park would reduce the visual impact.
84. Whilst we agree with this assessment in terms of long term impacts, in the short to medium terms the loss of existing trees, in addition to the engineering and surfacing works that will take place, means that the car park is likely to be more prominent and therefore more harmful in views across the parkland from the south and the west until the additional replacement tree planting proposed (101 trees in total) is mature enough to provide an effective screen.
85. In longer distance views e.g. from the parkland to the north and from 'The Stand' to the north east, residual impact is assessed as being negligible to low (after mitigation) because existing parkland trees and woodland screen already screen views towards the site and the additional tree planting would provide further cover in the longer term. We agree with this assessment.
86. The main area where harm would be caused would be by the loss of approx. 0.24 ha of the grade I registered parkland to car parking, mainly to the north and east of the existing car park. To the east the area in question is part of a grassed embankment that separates the car park from the 'Farmyard' area and to the north it is an area of parkland grass and mature trees. A significant number of trees (35 in total) would be felled (the impact of this is assessed later in the report) within this area and the areas in question

would be levelled and hard surfaced. Officers concur with the submitted Landscape Impact Assessment that the proposals would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the grade I Registered Park and Garden. The NPPF makes it clear that great weight should be given to conserving heritage assets and that any harm should require clear and convincing justification.

New Road Link

87. There would no physical impact on the fabric of any listed buildings. However the proposals have the potential to impact upon the historic parkland and the setting of the Grade II listed Golden Gates Lodges. The submitted Heritage, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment analyses 11 viewpoints (from within the parkland and from public access routes outside). In views from the parkland to the east and from the North drive itself, this is currently an area of open parkland. In these views the report assesses the visual impacts of the road itself as being low to negligible. The road surface would be perceptible in these views as would the increase in vehicle movements along the road. However the report states that existing and proposed tree planting will provide screening for some sections. The report also recommends minor earthwork profiling adjacent to the road to reduce visibility. This suggestion does not appear to have been incorporated into the submitted plans but could be required by condition.
88. At the north entrance to the estate a belt of woodland trees known as Heathy Lea Wood defines the northern boundary of the designed landscape and provides an effective screen from the public highway. A 22m wide strip of this woodland would be removed to create the new access road (although the remaining plantation would still be an effective boundary). When the previous application was deferred members asked for more information on the impacts of the loss of the woodland. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment states that impacts would be low to negligible provided that the new access drive is not located on the same alignment as the A621 and that the route curves to prevent open views along the drive into the park. In fact, as submitted the plans show that the new road would be on the same alignment as the A621 and while the road would curve slightly, it is likely that there would be views into the parkland from the road and vice versa. A revised plan has been submitted which explains that the presence of a Severn Trent major pipeline prevents moving the road to the west and moving to the east would lead to more loss of parkland trees. The plan suggests that more tree planting is provided adjacent to the southern boundary of Heathylee Wood to screen views. Clearly as the road itself cannot be planted with trees, there is still likely to be a corridor through which views can be obtained, however we consider that careful and selective planting slightly further into the parkland would provide an effective visual buffer (whilst still maintaining the open parkland character). This is important in order to maintain the sense of containment of the Parkland, which is a key characteristic in this area. This can be required by condition as part of an agreed landscaping scheme.
89. There would some loss of parkland grassland and individual trees which would represent a permanent change to the surface along the line of the new driveway and the fact that there would be two exit/entry drives at this location rather than one as historically designed. This would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the grade I Registered Park and Garden and to the setting of the grade II Lodges by the addition of a second driveway close to it.

Issue 3: Ecological Impacts

90. An ecological appraisal and fungi survey were submitted with the application and during the course of the application a badger survey and bat surveys have been submitted.

91. The submitted surveys identified two trees with bat roosting potential which were to be felled as part of the proposed development. As a result the Authority requested that activity/emergence surveys were undertaken. These have been completed and the Authority's ecologist is satisfied that there would be no adverse impacts on bats subject to the recommendations of the reports being adhered to and a lighting scheme to be agreed in order to ensure minimal impact on bat foraging use across the site, dark space and tree habitats.
92. There are no objections with regard to impact on fungi or great crested newt. A badger survey was submitted during the course of the application and we are satisfied that the proposals would not adversely affect local badger populations.
93. The new access road off the roundabout will result in severance of semi - natural broadleaved woodland. The Authority's ecologist notes that the surrounding woodland plantation will receive additional management to improve its structure and diversity through selective thinning and understorey planting as mitigation and requests that this is secured by means of a condition.
94. Subject to conditions it is considered that the proposals would not adversely affect the ecological interests listed above in accordance with Core Strategy policy L2.

Issue 4: Arboricultural Considerations

95. Paragraph 175 of the NPPF states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.
96. An arboriculture Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. This explains that there are large number of trees within the application site, with a total of 88 trees and 9 groups of trees in the visitor car park and 21 trees, 5 groups of trees and one area of woodland within the site for the new access routes. A high number of these are categorised as high and moderate quality and represent a significant asset to the landscape.
97. The proposals would have a significant impact on trees. A total of 35 trees would be felled at the visitor car park, consisting of 20 Category B trees (mature trees of moderate quality) and 15 Category C trees (trees of low quality). At the north access a corridor of woodland 22m wide (0.14ha in area) would be removed together with 11 individual trees (4 category B and 7 category C). The trees to be removed are all within the footprint of the existing and extended car park. The trees on the banking to west of the car park will all be retained.
98. The Arboricultural Assessment concludes that the loss of trees (in particular the 16 Category B (moderate quality) oaks at the car park) would have a detrimental impact on the landscape value and associated tree benefits in the immediate vicinity of the site, but concludes that the impact would not be significant given that other existing mature tree cover will be retained. A total of 101 new trees would be planted within and to the south and north of the car park.
99. As an enhancement measure the scheme proposes to retain, protect and enhance the 21 Category A veteran trees at the car park. Of those trees there is a group of 3 ancient trees within a central grassed picnic area and two veteran oak pollards located within the car park near the picnic area that have been heavily compromised by surfacing and parking within their entire root zone.

100. It is proposed to increase the green buffer zone around these trees by restoring the compacted ground to grassland and where surfacing is to be retained, the existing compacted surface would be removed, the tree roots protected with webbing and the new permeable surface installed.
101. During the course of the application the Authority's ecologist raised concerns with regard to the impacts of parking space within the extended car park on the eastern boundary. Two ancient trees sit on the grass banking above the car park and to date there has been no incursion into their root zones. As submitted the plans showed the introduction of parking space within the root protection zones which would cause harm to the trees contrary to the NPPF. As a result, and following negotiations, amended plans have now been received showing the parking spaces within these root zones removed and replaced with parking spaces on the road spur up to the farmyard instead.
102. The proposed north-south access road in this area would also have impacted on the root zones and so this has been shifted slightly to the west. Whilst this brings the road closer to veteran trees to the west than previously proposed, the new roadway would still be further away from the trees than exists at present so there would still be an overall enhancement.
103. As amended the Authority's Tree Conservation Officer is satisfied that the proposals would enhance the environment for the veteran trees. Nonetheless the proposals would result in the loss of a significant number of trees overall, which weighs against the proposals in the planning balance.

Issue 5: Archaeological Considerations

104. A detailed Heritage Assessment has been submitted which addresses impact on archaeological remains. Both the site of the car park remodelling and extension and the proposed northern access road are sites of archaeological and historic interest and contain extant earthwork features and predicted below ground archaeological remains. The report states that it has been informed by previous archaeological investigations within the car park and wider landscape at Chatsworth. A total of 57 features of archaeological interest have been identified from field survey, the analysis of Lidar data and from aerial photographs. These features include the remains of former medieval and post-medieval field systems, the route of the 1759 turnpike road from Baslow to Chesterfield, along with the location of former drives and landscape features including the game larder compound to the north-east of the House and the potential site of the former ice-house.
105. The gradual development of the car park during the second half of the 20th century has resulted in a section of landscape that is apparently devoid of archaeological features. However, the Assessment states that it has not been possible to confirm with confidence whether there are any surviving remains below the existing ground surface. The formation of a new access road in the north parkland will involve the loss of a strip of the medieval and post-medieval field system and its associated trackways.
106. The Authority's senior archaeologist concludes that both the proposed northern access and the works to the car park will result in permanent and irreversible harm to known and predicted archaeological features. However, taking account the nature and significance of these features, and the fact that many of them are predicted, rather than known features, she is confident that this harm can be appropriately mitigated by a scheme of archaeological survey and monitoring secured by condition.
107. The scheme will need to include:

- Topographic survey of the affected earthwork features.
 - Strip, map and record exercise of the areas with highest impact or greatest sensitivity – the deeper cut areas, the deeper excavation for the attenuation tanks and in the area of the predicted ice house.
 - Archaeological monitoring of the shallower cut areas where in proximity to known or predicted archaeological features.
 - Archaeological monitoring of the groundworks and trenches required for drainage and services where they are located in proximity to known or predicted archaeological features.
108. The Archaeologist does express concerns however about the cumulative impact of overflow parking in the parkland, on archaeological features and this is discussed later in the report.

Issue 6: Flood Risk and Drainage Issues

109. A flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application. This confirms that both sites are within flood risk zone 1 (low risk of flooding) and therefore the Sequential Test is deemed to have been addressed and the Exception Test need not be applied.
110. The report states that disposal of surface water from the refurbished car park via infiltration (the preferred option within the Planning Policy Guidance) is not practicable due to underlying ground conditions and also the steeply sloping nature of the site. Surface water attenuation storage will be provided via below ground geo-cellular crates, which will include petrol, oil and grit separators in the interest of pollution control. At present there is no interception of surface water run-off and so the proposals would represent a betterment on the existing situation with regard to the potential for pollution of the water environment.
111. A number of comments were made by the Local Lead Flood Authority on the proposals and the engineers who compiled the flood risk assessment have responded. We are satisfied that subject to a condition to submit and agree full details of the drainage scheme, the proposals accord with Development Management policy DMC14 in respect of pollution and disturbance and addresses the requirements of CC1 with regard to flooding.

Issue 7: Traffic Impacts

112. A transport assessment has been submitted with the application which analysis the impacts of the proposed development on the local highway network.
113. The report explains that the main vehicular access to the estate is from the B6012 from where visitors enter and exit the main car park via Paine's Bridge. A secondary vehicular access is provided to the north of the Estate via a junction located 110m to the west of the A619/A621 three-arm roundabout. This leads to the Golden Gates, which are open and used by general traffic only during large events. At present, due to restricted visibility and difficulty in accommodating right turning traffic, temporary traffic lights are used to control traffic flow at busy times. This can lead to traffic tailbacks along the A619.
114. The assessment states that the proposed new arm to the roundabout and the new access road will be used at peak times and during large events (i.e. not every day). The intention is that traffic from the Estate can exit without travelling through the village of Baslow and without the need for temporary traffic lights as at present. Through modelling of existing and predicted traffic growth the report concludes that all four arms of the roundabout would operate within capacity during a future year 2023.

115. Consequently the report concludes that the residual traffic impacts of the proposed development are not considered to be severe within the context of the NPPF and therefore the highway impacts are acceptable.
116. When members deferred the application in November 2019 they asked for further information with regard to the impact of the roundabout on the residents of Baslow. Since then the applicant has provided a further summary of the traffic modelling data which confirms that the roundabout will operate within its capacity and with only minimal queues during the Saturday peak hour. The report indicates that at the peak hour on the busiest Saturday, only 1.4 vehicles would be queuing on the A619 west arm (the road from the roundabout back into Baslow). The Transport Assessment also emphasises that the predictions and assessment has been undertaken based on traffic flows for the busiest peak hour on the busiest Saturday (when the RHS flower show was underway) and that therefore there is confidence that the roundabout would remain free flowing during large events and busy periods. Throughout the remainder of the year, traffic flows at the roundabout would clearly be lower.
117. We are satisfied that these predictions are likely to be accurate. Some objectors have expressed concerns that vehicles exiting the Estate on the new arm of the roundabout would have priority over those leaving Baslow and therefore congestion could still occur within the village. Whilst this point is noted, is not borne out by the modelling in the Transport Assessment and it is also true that the Estate could open the Golden Gates and allow traffic to use the substandard existing access at any time without any control from the Authority. The new arrangement would negate the requirement for temporary traffic lights and overall the proposals are likely to result in more free flowing traffic through the village than at present during large events. This would be a positive benefit to the amenity of local residents.
118. At the committee meeting in November 2019 some members asked why the new access road could not be open for use at all times. This is a query that was also raised by Baslow Parish Council and the Highway Authority. If the new access road were available for use at all times, then clearly this would mean that traffic entering and exiting the Estate from the north would not have to travel through Baslow village at any time, and this would provide a greater degree of benefit to the amenity of local residents. The issue is, however, that if the access road were open permanently, we consider that there is a high possibility that the new road would be used by through traffic heading from the north (A619 Chesterfield and A623 Sheffield) to the A6 and the south (Matlock). Rather than being a means of access for visitors to the Estate, the road would effectively become a new highway carrying general traffic. This would in turn lead to more traffic in the parkland and across the narrow Paines Bridge. It would be difficult to control this through signage and any proposals for traffic control, for example by means of a kiosk close to the new junction with the roundabout, could lead to tail backs. If the new access were to become a general purpose road then this would be contrary to policies T2 and DMT2, which seek to resist new local road schemes.
119. The applicant has also emphasised that they wish maintain access for most visitors via the normal west drive as this gives the historically correct and impressive first view of the house in its setting.
120. Our view remains that in terms of highway impacts, overall the proposals would benefit highway users, visitors to the Estate and local residents by facilitating more free flowing traffic at the busiest times.

121. A condition to submit and agree an Access and Signage Strategy to agree the operation of the new access and any restrictions to access to Golden Gates as suggested by the Highway Authority is considered to be necessary.

Issue 8: Overflow Parking and wider sustainability issues

122. One of the main concerns raised by consultees (including Historic England and the Authority's archaeologist and conservation officer) and by objectors is the wider sustainability credentials of the proposals and in particular the continued proposals to make use of the wider parkland for overflow car parking, despite the proposed increase in capacity of the car park by 220 spaces.
123. For clarity, the Authority has never come to the view that the events (other than the RHS which is run by an outside organisation) or the use of the parkland for overflow parking constitutes 'development' because it is considered to be ancillary and incidental to the main use of Chatsworth House as a stately home and major visitor attraction.
124. Core Strategy policy T1 states that conserving and enhancing the National Park's valued characteristics will be the primary criterion in the planning and design of transport and its management but also states that modal shift to sustainable transport will be encouraged. T2 F states that Travel Plans will be used to travel.
125. In deferring the application in November 2019 the Members asked for more clarity around the production of a Travel Plan. We can confirm that a Travel Plan has been submitted. The Authority's Transport Planner has confirmed that the Travel Plan sets out a measured approach to managing car-borne access, and the impact of that access on the site. It also indicates an intent to increase the proportion of visits that are made by public transport and other more sustainable transport options. This is set against a stated objective (8) of stabilising visitor numbers to the site. The response states that In combination, the travel plan objectives should reduce the overall number of car-borne journeys for both staff and visitors.
126. Notwithstanding these measures, the Estate proposes that the main mode of transport to the Estate will continue to be by car and their overall approach is to continue to try to meet demand. Objectors feel that the Travel Plan measures do not go far enough and that the Estate should instead use current capacity as a demand management tool.
127. Following comments by Members at the November 2019 Planning Committee, about a more strategic approach to traffic and visitor management, the Estate has chosen not to provide a more detailed analysis of other options and schemes for traffic and visitor management. It takes the view that the current proposals represent that only viable scheme and wishes to pursue it as submitted. The applicant has, however submitted an 'Environmental Policy Statement'. This outlines wider measures to reduce carbon emission across the Estate and also contains a section focusing on the car park proposals and how the Estate feels the development would achieve its environmental objectives. It outlines an existing commitment to finding ways to reduce vehicle numbers through a '*Responsible Visitor Charter*' (which encourages visitors to car share or come by alternative means of travel including public transport, walking and cycling) and a '*Visitors and Sustainability Programme*' which has involved setting up an internal working group with the aim of achieving short, medium, and long term targets for reducing car visits e.g. working with transport operators to increase coach trips by 15% over 10 years; reducing barriers to and enhancing the use of public transport to increase use by 10% over 10 years; increasing park and ride uptake by 20% over 10 years; increasing bicycle trips by 5% in 4 years; and increasing staff members using non-car methods by 5% in 10 years). Nonetheless as stated above the proposals remain as before, and revolve around the creation of additional parking capacity (and thereby reducing the

frequency with which overflow parking takes place on grass). A further response by the applicant emphasises that Chatsworth does not wish to increase visitor numbers but seeks to maintain current levels while reducing environmental impact and improving visitor experience.

128. Our view is that the whilst the Estate is making efforts to promote a shift to public transport, the approach taken with the current application, to focus on the expansion the car parking facilities does conflict with the thrust of the Authority's policies with regard to sustainable transport. The proposals are for major development within the National Park and should only be accepted in exceptional circumstances if there are definite and meaningful public benefits that clearly outweigh any harm. One of the main ways in which this can be achieved is by addressing the impacts of overflow parking.
129. As stated above, as well as the main car park, at busy times the Estate uses the 'Helipad' (which can accommodate 250 vehicles) and the area in front of the Bastion Wall (which can accommodate 350 vehicles). Information provided suggests that cars were parked below the Bastion Wall on 53 days (outside of the main 3 events) On 32 days of the year demand outstrips these areas too and further overflow parking takes place in areas to the north of the House. The Design and Access Statement states that the proposed increase in capacity of the existing car park by 220 spaces will lead to a reduction in the need to utilise the grass below the Bastion wall on 'operational days', which is welcomed. However the proposals are still to retain some overflow parking in this area.
130. The impacts of overflow parking has been an identified issue at Chatsworth for some time and at the pre-application stage the need to try to address the issue, particularly with regard to parking in the most harmful area below the Bastion Wall, was emphasised. As stated by Historic England parking in this area is intrusive and harmful to key views and upon the appreciation of the House in its designed setting and also harmful to earthwork and buried archaeological remains which contribute to the significance of the Grade I registered park and other assets. Indeed the Estate's own Parkland Management Plan (2013) acknowledges that parking in this areas has a *'high visual, landscape and archaeological impact so an alternative solution must be found'*. We therefore consider that continued use of this area for parking, on top of the events that already take place in and have an impacts on the area is not acceptable. Development Management policy DMT7 makes it clear that where visitor parking is permitted, an equivalent removal of on-street parking will usually be required. As this is not feasible in this location, an equivalent removal of harmful overflow parking in this area is considered to be a reasonable alternative.
131. To be clear, initially the application requested the use of the area below the Bastion Wall for parking on 28 days a year over and above the three main events. This was reduced to 10 days during the course of the application. The RHS show (which was granted planning permission in 2016) is open to the public for three days in June. However the information submitted with that planning application stated that there is a substantial 'setting up and taking down' period so that the total time that there is activity and visual intrusion in front of the House's principle elevation is 45 days in total. The Horse Trials (3 days) and Country Fair (3 days) are mainly located to the west of Paine's Bridge but car parking can take place in front of the Bastion Wall.
132. The applicant has made it clear that it does not agree to such a condition. In fact since the application was deferred in 2019, a document provided by the Estate has clarified that in fact 29 days of overflow parking in front of the Bastion Wall would be required. The extra 19 days are needed, it says, for potential use during the Christmas market season, depending on weather conditions. It is considered that a further 19 days on top of the already substantial figure during the event days would be excessive, very difficult to enforce and harmful to the significance of the Registered Park and Garden and Grade

I listed House. A condition that limited parking to 29 days would be so difficult to enforce that it would not meet the tests for planning conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Guidance. The benefits of removing parking from this area (other than for limited days during the major events) are clear. A condition that requires no public parking in this area over and above the 3 events is considered to be reasonable, enforceable, related to the development and otherwise in accordance with the tests.

133. We remain of the view that the condition is essential in order to demonstrate the enhancement which is the exceptional circumstance required for major development, to ensure compliance with policies T7, L3 and DMT7 and to ensure that the public benefits clearly outweigh the harm that has been identified.
134. The Authority's archaeologist and Historic England have also expressed concerns about the impacts of overflow parking on archaeological remains in other areas of the parkland, as well as below the Bastion Wall. Since the previous committee meeting in November 2019 the Estate has provided an extract from a Lidar survey of the parkland, carried out in 2013 and have emphasised that this shows that the overflow parking areas are the least sensitive in terms of archaeology. Whilst this point is acknowledged, this does not of course mean that there are no impacts and in fact the plan produced does show features within some of the overflow areas. This is a wider issue for the Estate to address. However on balance, given that overflow parking can take place without permission at present, it is considered that the proposed restriction of parking below the Bastion Wall only, is the limit to which the Authority can reasonably restrict overflow parking such that the public benefits on the whole outweigh the harm brought about by this particular planning application.

Conclusion

135. In conclusion, there are a number of public benefits associated with this application. They include the removal of parking from the west of the stables; improvement to the layout and appearance of the north forecourt; improvements to the environments of very important ancient trees; improvements to the visitor experience of those visiting Chatsworth and the surrounding parkland and potential improvements to traffic congestion issues in an around Baslow. On the other hand, there are areas where harm has been identified. These include the loss of parts of the grade I park and garden, the loss of 35 trees (including 16 mature oak trees) and an area of woodland and impacts on archaeological features. On balance, we consider that the benefits would only outweigh the harm if the wider impacts of overflow parking are significantly addressed by removing the most harmful parking from beneath the Bastion Wall in order to ensure that visitors can continue to enjoy the important grade I heritage asset within its designed landscape and wider setting.
136. We have considered whether it would be acceptable for each of the two elements of the scheme to be developed independently from each other, or whether in fact one is reliant on the other. We consider that the benefits to local residents of the new access link outweigh the harm identified within the Parkland and so this element of the scheme would be acceptable in its own right. The development of the car park is not necessary to make the road link acceptable. Likewise, we do not consider that the proposed car park extension is likely to lead to such increases in overall number of visitor to the Estate (provided that parking beneath the Bastion Wall is restricted), that it is essential that the road link goes ahead at the same time. The car park element of the scheme can be justified in the planning balance independently of the new access. Consequently we do not consider that there needs to be any phasing or other control over the timing of the works.

137. We are satisfied that subject to such conditions (and the other conditions outlined above) the proposals would be in the public interest and would meet the tests for major development set out in the NPPF and adopted development plan policies. The application is recommended for approval.

Human Rights

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

- (ii) List of Background Papers (not previously published)

- (iii) Nil

Report Author: Andrea Needham, Senior Planner