

**5. FULL APPLICATION - ERECTION OF CONVENIENCE STORE WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING, LAND ADJACENT NORTH SIDE OF WHITECROSS ROAD AND ADJACENT EAST BOUNDARY OF TIDESWELL BUSINESS PARK, TIDESWELL, (NP/DDD/1222/1577, JS)**

**APPLICANT: ACKROYD & ABBOTT LTD**

**Summary**

1. The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a convenience store with associated access, parking and landscaping on a site on the northern edge of the village of Tideswell. The store would replace the existing store in the centre of the village, which is relatively small and constrained in layout. The proposed site is considered to be acceptable in terms of its relationship to other development on the edge of the village. Although the location is less central than the existing shop, it will provide the village with a larger shop with a greater range of goods and with on-site parking. The siting, layout and design of the proposed building are considered to be acceptable. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

**Site and Surroundings**

2. The site proposed for the relocation of the store occupies a vacant plot of agricultural land in Tideswell, fronting onto the B6049 Whitecross Road, on the northern edge of the village, to the south-west of the A623 junction at Anchor crossroads. The site is located approximately 300 metres north-east of the centre of Tideswell.
3. To the north-west of the site there are three agricultural buildings, including barns and farmyard. Immediately to the west of the site there is an existing employment site, including the recently completed Markovitz building supplies building. The Whitecross Industrial Estate is a safeguarded employment site in Policy DME3 of the Development Management Plan.
4. The nearest residential properties are to south on both sides of Whitecross Road. Agricultural land adjoins the site to the north and west, with agricultural land on the eastern side of Whitecross Road.
5. The site is served by public transport with a bus stop located approximately 100 metres from the site, on Whitecross Road.
6. The existing Co-op Store is located in the centre of Tideswell at the junction of High Street, Whitecross Road and Church Street. The proposal site is located approximately 550 metres north-east of the existing store.
7. The site is not within Tideswell Conservation Area, which lies to the south. There are no listed buildings on or near the site.

**Proposal**

8. The application is for the erection of a new, replacement Co-op convenience food store, comprising:
  - A single storey building sited adjacent to the B6049 Whitecross Road;
  - Dedicated loading/unloading bay;
  - Associated car parking area and landscaping.
9. The building's footprint is approximately 480m<sup>2</sup> (40 metres by 12 metres), with a ridge height of around 6 metres. The internal shop floor area is 279m<sup>2</sup>. The building would be

orientated along the south-eastern boundary. Access would be from an existing estate access road which itself takes access off Whitecross Road.

10. The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement, a Transport Statement, a Landscape and Visual Appraisal, an Archaeological Assessment, an Ecology Assessment and a Phase 1 geophysical desk study.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- 1 3 year commencement.**
- 2. Restrict use to a convenience store within the Use Classes Order.**
- 3. In accordance with submitted plans, subject to detailed design conditions, including use of natural limestone for external walling and boundary walling.**
- 4. Details of any external lighting to be submitted to and agreed by Authority.**
- 5. Carry out agreed landscaping scheme within first planting season following commencement of development.**
- 6. Hours of opening and delivery (not to exceed 8am to 8pm Monday-Saturday, 10am-4pm Sunday).**
- 7. Archaeological watching brief during excavation.**
- 8. Scheme of environmental management measures to be submitted and carried out.**
- 9. Highway conditions.**

### **Key Issues**

- The principle of development
- Impact on the landscape character and special qualities of the National Park
- Economic benefits
- Highways Impacts

### **History**

11. There is no relevant planning history, other than a pre-application request and response in relation to this proposal. This is summarised in the Planning Statement as follows: *“A pre-application meeting was arranged with officers at PDNPA, which was agreed on account of the importance of the convenience operator to the settlement of Tideswell and its proposed relocation.*

*Within the meeting, plans were presented to officers, which were considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to amendments concerning the orientation of the site layout. Specifically, it was felt that siting the new premises at the roadside, as opposed to the rear of the site as had been proposed, would be more appropriate so as provide a better visual barrier for the parking area from the public domain. As such, the parking area would be repositioned to the northwest of the proposed new premises.*

*With consideration to the potential impact on a local centre as a result of the operators proposed relocation, it was also agreed that an appropriate property search would be undertaken within the settlement of Tideswell. This exercise would ensure that there are*

*no alternative sites that would provide a sequentially preferable location for the new premises. This is discussed in further detail in section 6.4 of this statement.*

*Finally, the requisite supporting materials to accompany a full application were agreed with officers. All supporting materials have been either submitted with the application or are in preparation to be submitted within the determination period (where not explicitly required for validation purposes)."*

## **Consultations**

12. Highway Authority: *"The vehicular access to the proposed site is from Whitecross Road, which is an unlit Classified Road subject to 30mph at the east of Meverill Road. The vehicular access road appears substandard in terms of surfacing and may require to be upgraded. The upgrading of the access road in terms of street lighting also needs to be assessed.*

*It is further noted that the overgrown pedestrian footway is provided on the western side of the access road on the opposite side, and the footway at the frontage of the new store will be proposed as shown on plan 210\_02/E. To enhance connectivity of the site, the continuous footway also needs to propose at the western side where possible and needs to be connected with the proposed footway at the frontage of the site.*

*Furthermore, the requirement of a pedestrian crossing point also needs to be assessed on the access road or at the appropriate location. A revised drawing be submitted to show the works advised above. It is noted that the closest bus stops to the site are located on Whitecross Road to the southwest of the site, within 150m walking distance; this is welcome.*

*The trip generation information suggests the trip generation of 91 two-way vehicle trips in the AM peak, 76 two-way trips in the PM peak hour and 60 two-way vehicle trips in the Saturday peak hour, however out of the total trips, it is stated that the TS that 85% trips are pass-by and only 15% trips are new trips on the highways network. It is considered that 15% of new trips are low and needs to be investigated.*

*It is noted that a total of 27 car parking spaces have been proposed including 2 disabled bays as per the requirement in the Peak District National Park in Development Management Policies – Appendix 10. The proposed car parking is acceptable; however, the dimension of the bays and aisle width needs to be shown. The Highway Authority is also satisfied that a servicing area has also been proposed. The cycle parking numbers also need to be identified.*

*The Highway Authority recommends that a Travel Plan Statement be submitted for this proposal."*

In response to this, the applicants have submitted additional information, which has been forwarded to the Highway Authority. The Highway Authority now has no objection to the application and recommends conditions relating to a construction management plan, proviso of the new access and car parking, pedestrian access, and visibility splays.

13. District Council: No response.

14. Tideswell Parish Council: *"The Parish Council have viewed the application and understand the reasons made for the relocation of the store. Whilst we are concerned about the loss of the amenity in the centre of the village, we would like to put on record that we believe it is very important that the existing building is put to good use and the possibility of retail opportunities are prioritised in the planning process for the ground floor.*

*In the proposed application we would want to see suitable pedestrian access in place involving a pedestrian crossing and with better lighting for those visiting the store in hours of darkness. Pavement access on the way from the village to the area should be improved from its current state.*

*Provision for electric vehicle charging is desirable.*

*We would request that the inclusion of a post office be included in this plan with the current post office facility due to close shortly due to retirement. When the post office closed before there was a very significant amount of support from residents for a post office to remain in the Parish and that is still the case”.*

15. Environment agency: EA has no formal comment to make. *“The development falls within flood zone 1 and therefore we have no fluvial flood risk concerns associated with the site. There are no other environmental constraints associated with the application site which fall within the remit of the Environment Agency”.*

16. PDNPA Policy Team:

The proposed store has a floorspace of 441sqm with a large area of hardstanding. There is a question whether the proposal should be considered as a Major application. In considering this, Licensing Laws can be referred to when assessing the size/scale of a shop: these regard ‘small scale’ as being under 280sqm. This size is also reflected in the Use Classes Order, with the local shop (F2) considered as being under 280sqm.

- The interpretation of small scale also raises issues with regards to policy DS1, which allows for ‘small-scale retail’.

- What are the exceptional circumstances to justify this development in accordance with GSP1 and GSP2? Significant net benefits are required to satisfy these policies.

- Policy GSP3 is also relevant when considering whether the scale of development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park The proposed development is on a greenfield site at the edge of the field will impact on the dark skies. We cannot see a lighting scheme for the proposal, nor does the LVIA consider lighting issues. The issue of lighting and landscape impact should be discussed with the Landscape Architect.

- Does the applicant expect shopping patterns to change? e.g. are they looking to serve the needs of the local community the settlement’s visitor capacity (as per Policy HC5a and para 7.6 pf the DMP) or to appeal to a wider catchment of trade? It is noted from the Derbyshire Dales Retail Study that the shop is currently used as a ‘top up’ shop and not for main food shops.

- Although the NPPF says that the sequential approach (to edge of centre proposals) should not be applied to applications for small scale rural development (para 89) and that ‘sites to meet local business and 2 community needs . . . may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements’, Core Strategy HC5B establishes a clear policy principle intended to apply to village centres as well as Bakewell, that ‘significant out of centre retail development will not be permitted’. The DMP did not define the impacts to be tested as was stated in para 12.30, so it would be relevant to consider whether the proposal is ‘significant’, and what impacts it may have, in the context of the Guidance for setting a locally appropriate impact test. For Tideswell these are likely to be: scale relative to the village centre, existing viability and vitality of the village centre, cumulative effects of recent developments and the vulnerability of the village centre.

- Policy DMC4 also needs consideration – how does the development relate to the settlement’s historic pattern of development, including the village centre.

- NPPF para 92 is relevant, which amongst other things, promotes healthy and inclusive safe places, mixed-use developments and social interaction, as well as encouraging safe and accessible links for walking and cycling. NPPF para 84 is also relevant for rural local business and community development that is ‘adjacent to or beyond existing settlements’. Such development must be ‘sensitive to surroundings, not have unacceptable impact on local roads, exploit any opportunities to make the location more sustainable by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or public transport’.

- From a Thriving and Sustainable Communities perspective the proposals for the vacated building are important for maintaining the strength of the village centre. Has there been any discussion with regards to the vacated building?

- Due consideration is also required regarding the impact the development would have in terms of encouraging sustainable travel patterns.

- It is considered that the sustainability measures are insufficient to satisfy policy CC1.
- If the application is approved we should explore defining the relevant category within Use Class E (i.e. E(a)). This is because, unlike the current store which would be considered a village store under Use Class F2 (i.e. less than 280sqm), the proposed store would fall within Use Class E, which could be interchangeable with the other E class uses.

17. PDNPA Transport Officer: The Transport Officer highlights issues with the Transport assessment, notably the comparator sites that are referred to being in urban rather than rural locations. He also requests submission of a Travel Plan. For a development of this size, he believes that a travel plan would be appropriate. The primary scope would be for staff employed at the site, but there is also an opportunity to influence customer behaviour as well. (This has now been submitted). In terms of parking, he notes inconsistencies between the level of parking referred to in various application documents (either 27 or 28) The Peak District National Park Parking Standards has a minimum standard of 1 space per 30m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum standard of 1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup> for 'General Shops'. There is also an allowance for staff parking of 1 space per 100m<sup>2</sup>. In this case the floorspace of the proposed development is 441m<sup>2</sup>. Based on the Peak District National Park Authority Parking Standards, this would equate to an allocation of parking spaces for the development of a minimum of 19 and a maximum of 22. Given the nature of the location and the proximity of the store to the village, he believes that a maximum number of 22 spaces is appropriate.

The provision of secure cycle parking is welcomed, given the relative ease of cycle access from the settlement. The provision of cycle parking offers the opportunity to encourage sustainable transport access to the site. In most cases, the Authority would wish to see EV charging points included as part of the development. However, in this case, the anticipated throughput and short dwell time would reduce the usefulness of provision as part of this development.

He has now commented on the submitted Travel Plan, but he does not consider that this addresses the issue of how many car parking spaces are to be provided; the agent has been asked to respond to this.

## **Representations**

18. We have received eight representations, with four objecting to the application and four supporting it.

19. The objections raise the following points:

- The current store is well located in the centre of Tideswell. Relocating it will lead to people having to drive there. Should remain where it is. Oppose use of green land for a new development.
- Whilst we understand, from a business angle, the reason to wanting to increase the capacity of the existing Co-op by relocating to a new location within the village,
- Firstly, that it is wrong to build on a greenfield site.
- Secondly, access: whilst the new site would be most suitable for drivers, there are many elderly residents whose mobility is restricted. Some of them do not have easy access to a car. At present they are able to reach all of the village's facilities, including the Co-op. For such people, it would be a serious (and for some an impossible) to get to and from the new site.
- Thirdly, the likely effect of the relocation on other businesses and traders. These will probably be negatively impacted by this proposed development. The new Co-op would no doubt offer more product lines. so the likes of Tindalls and Poppies and possibly even the pharmacy will be detrimentally affected by this increased direct competition. Many of these businesses together with the various cafes and the bookshop, are reliant for part of their trade on footfall in the village centre. A relocated Co-op would cater largely for "one stop" shoppers who, having done their

shop, need not wander around the heart of the village itself. Our small businesses are valued not just for the things which they sell but also for their important social gathering function which serves to link people to place. They all help to bring the village to life. Sever this and Tideswell as an active and vibrant community could be changed irreparably.

20. Those supporting the application raise the following points, which include some questions:
- This will help ease congestion around the current location, and benefit disabled shoppers. The increased range will also give locals more options.
  - A village the size of Tideswell needs a shop much larger than the present Co-Op. There appears to be very little scope for further development on the present site and, as far as I can see, there are no alternative suitable sites near the village centre.
  - A better Co-Op in the village would reduce the need to travel so frequently to Buxton or elsewhere. Many people who shop in the current Co-op get there by car so there would be no change for them. Many other people, often elderly, walk to the current Co-Op. They would undoubtedly be disadvantaged.
  - Moving the store will have a detrimental effect on Tideswell's centre, but it is important to most people that we have a store, especially a larger one with a wider choice of goods; people have tended to be critical about the limited range prompting them to shop elsewhere.
  - The application states that there's a footpath on the south side of Whitecross Road which would require pedestrians to cross what is, at times, a busy road. Therefore some kind of crossing should be installed for pedestrian safety.
  - The application states that the site is 'well served by public transport', but it is served by services 173 (Bakewell-Castleton) and 65 (Buxton-Sheffield) which both only run at two hourly intervals.
  - We would appreciate it if the Co-op to tell us what they intend to do with the existing building.

### **Main Policies**

21. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, DS1, L1, CC1, HC4, HC5.
22. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMS1, DME8, DMT3, DMT8.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

23. 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.
24. Paragraph 176 states that "*great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.*"

## Peak District National Park Core Strategy

25. 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.
26. 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. 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.
27. 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.
28. 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.
29. 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.
30. Policy L1 says that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.
31. Policy HC4 Provision and retention of community services and facilities states: *“Proposals to change the use of buildings or sites which provide community services and facilities including shops and financial and professional services to non-community uses must demonstrate that the service or facility is: I. no longer needed; or II. available elsewhere in the settlement; or III. can no longer be viable. Wherever possible, the new use must either meet another community need or offer alternative community benefit such as social housing. Evidence of reasonable attempts to secure such a use must be provided before any other use is permitted.”*

32. HC5: Shops, professional services and related activities says that in towns and villages:  
*“A. Shops, professional services and related activities must:*  
*I. be located within the Bakewell Central Shopping Area, or in or on the edge of named settlements listed in policy DS1; and*  
*II. be of appropriate scale to serve the needs of the local community and the settlement’s visitor capacity.*  
*B. Significant out of centre retail developments will not be permitted.*  
*C. Related activities such as professional services, and premises for the sale and consumption of food and drink, will be permitted provided that there is no harm to living conditions or to the role or character of the area, including its vitality and viability”.*
33. 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

34. The most relevant development management policies are DMC3, DMS1, DME8, DMT3 and DMT6.
35. Policy DMC3 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.
36. Policy DMS1 *Shops, professional services and related activities in Core Strategy policy DS1 settlements* says:  
*In furtherance of Core Strategy policy HC5, shops, professional services and premises for the sale and consumption of food and drink within settlements listed in Core Strategy policy DS1 will be encouraged provided that:*  
*i. there are adequate facilities and access for the storage and disposal of goods, waste and delivery of stock; and*  
*ii. in newly built shops (and in those conversions that involve substantial change to an existing building) where upper floors are proposed or already exist, provision is made for access allowing separate use of upper floors. This should be from an entrance onto the front of the building wherever possible”.*
37. Policy DME8 provides additional advice on new employment development, with reiteration of the need to minimise the impact of development on valued characteristics and amenities within a locality. Particular attention should be paid to the visibility of any new development from evident vantage points, reducing the visibility of vehicles and plant equipment, and regulating noise and other disturbances through establishing appropriate times of operation.
38. Policy DMT3 sets out that development will only be permitted where a safe access that is achievable for all people can be provided in a way that does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality.
39. DMT6 Business parking states:  
*“A. New or enlarged car parks will not be permitted unless a clear, demonstrable need can be shown.*  
*B. Where planning permission is required, additional parking provision should be of a limited nature, whilst being appropriate to the size of the development and taking account of its location and the visual impact of parking”.*



## **Assessment**

### **Principle of proposed development**

40. Development management policy DMS1 (set out above) says that in furtherance of Core Strategy policy HC5, shops, professional services and premises for the sale and consumption of food and drink within settlements listed in Core Strategy policy DS1 will be encouraged provided that there are adequate facilities and access for the storage and disposal of goods, waste and delivery of stock. Core Strategy Policy HC5 seeks to locate shops, professional services, and related activities within or on the edge of named settlements listed in Policy DS1. Tideswell is a DS1 settlement. Policy DS1 also says that these developments must be of appropriate scale to serve the needs of the local community and the settlement's visitor capacity.
41. The Authority's Policy Team have asked whether the development would be a major development and refer to the Government's definition of a local shop, which is now included in the Use Classes order. The proposed building is well below the size that would fall within the "major development" category, but it would be larger than the Use Classes Order definition for a local shop. Use Class F2 is for local community uses, with F2 (a) defined as shops (mostly) selling essential goods, including food, where the shop's premises do not exceed 280 square metres and there is no other such facility within 1000 metres. Although the external footprint of the building is 480 square metres, the retail floor space is 279 square metres, which falls within the "local shop" definition in the Use Classes Order. However, the point made by the Policy team is an important one in that the proposal would only be acceptable if it provides a facility serving the local community, so it is appropriate that any approval restrict the retail use to a convenience store.
42. The supporting documents explain that the existing Co-op store lacks the capacity to serve the local community, particularly in a way that reduces the need to travel beyond the settlement for all convenience needs. In pre-application discussions Officers agreed that the replacement store would be beneficial in its ability to serve a greater proportion of local residents, as well as visitors to the area. Given its location beside the main road through Tideswell, it is evident that the proposals comply with the requirements and limitations of these respective policies.
43. As Tideswell is a DS1 listed settlement and the site is on the edge of the village, officers consider that the proposal is acceptable in principle. This advice was given in the pre-application advice given to the applicants. Officers also agree that whilst the existing store is well-located in the centre of the village, it is small and with a cramped layout, with very limited village centre parking. As such it does not sufficiently serve local residents and other visitors to Tideswell. In this respect, the proposals would deliver an enhanced convenience goods provision and will ensure maintenance of a convenience shop of this nature in Tideswell, which could otherwise be lost.
44. In pre-application advice officers also advised the applicants to set out the consideration of any alternative sites, through a Sequential Test, which seeks to establish the availability, suitability and viability of any sites within an agreed catchment that could accommodate the proposed development, and which are sequentially preferable to the proposal site. Having undertaken a search for available properties and land for commercial use, no suitable were identified. A single café premises in the centre of Tideswell was returned in searches, though this property did not meet any of the criteria to be considered as a sequentially preferable alternative to the proposal site. Officers are not aware of any sequentially preferable sites. Consequently, we conclude that the proposal is acceptable in principle on this site.

45. The Parish Council and some of the representations ask what the future of the existing Co-op building will be. This is also raised in the comments from the Authority's Policy Team. Although this is not a material consideration in the decision on this application, the applicant's agent has been asked if information can be provided on this. The continued use by the building of another retail operator would not require planning permission and would be the preferred option. Some changes of use would be "permitted development" not requiring planning permission, but any changes of use that do require permission would have to meet the requirements of the relevant policies, notably HS4 and DMS2, particularly Part A.

### Design and Landscape Impacts

46. The proposed building would sit parallel to Whitecross Road, with gable facing north and south, towards to A623 and the village respectively. It would be a single storey rectangular building, apart from a gabled entrance projection on the west-facing elevation, into the car park. It would have a floor area of approximately 440 square metres. The building would be faced with natural stone, with grey cladding above and in the apex of the gables; the plans state natural gritstone, with gritstone detailing. The agent has been advised that this should be natural limestone, given the location of the site on the edge of a traditional White Peak Village. The roof would be dark grey standing seam cladding, the windows and doors would be anthracite coloured. Signage would be dealt with under the appropriate regulations, which have a specified amount of "permitted development" without the need for express consent.
47. The siting and orientation of the building follows the pre-application advice and the design is considered to be a simple but sympathetic modern interpretation of the local building tradition. Although it is a relatively wide building, it is close to the Whitecross Road industrial estate and to a relatively modern agricultural building. In this context the form and design of the building is considered to be acceptable.
48. The building would be the first building on the roadside when entering the village from the north. However, when seen in the context of the adjacent sites, it would not be unduly intrusive. It would be a relatively low building with a dark roof. A Landscape and Visual Appraisal has been submitted with application. This assesses the landscape character of the site and its surroundings and considers the landscape and visual qualities of the site, its function in the landscape and its contribution to the wider landscape. The work undertaken included an assessment of the existing landscape features, together with a visual appraisal of the site and its context. The site is an open field surrounded by low stone walling. A new drystone wall would be provided to enclose the site, together with a landscaping scheme.
49. The Appraisal provides a very thorough assessment of the proposal and its likely impact on the landscape character of the area, taking into account the proposed design and layout and the proposed landscaping scheme. It also notes that the proposed building would be seen in context with the neighbouring business park development. It concludes that the proposed development would not adversely affect key characteristics of the Limestone Village Farmlands LCT with long-term neutral effect. Regarding visual effects, this would be limited to immediately adjacent to the site and few viewpoints around the eastern edge of Tideswell. This includes some very localised short-term moderate adverse visual effects from Whitecross Road and the Business Park immediately adjacent to the site; localised minor adverse effects from Tideswell settlement edge and the final approach into Tideswell on Whitecross Road (B6049); and some negligible adverse effects from the near section of Chesterfield Road (A623), the short sections of nearby rural lanes south-east and north-east of Tideswell. By year 15 all visual effects would reduce to minor adverse, negligible adverse or neutral.

50. In summary, officers agree that the development would not harm the landscape character of this part of the Peak District National Park and to the setting of the Tideswell Conservation Area. It would therefore in accordance with Core Strategy Policies L1 and DMP policy DMC3 and the relevant policy guidance in the NPPF relating to the protection of the National Park's landscape and heritage.

#### Economic Benefits:

51. The proposal involves the erection of a new convenience store on the edge of one of the largest villages in the National Park and one which serves as a service centre for surrounding communities. The store would replace the existing Co-op which is in the centre of the village. Whilst the concerns of some residents about the relocation to a less central site are understood and acknowledged, the likelihood is that if a new store is not built, the existing store would close, with no replacement, because of its small and cramped nature. The new store would provide a more spacious modern layout, with a wider range of goods, attracting people from the surrounding area who might otherwise travel further to Buxton, Bakewell or Chapel-en-le-Frith. As many of these would drive in any case, the on-site car park would make this journey more convenient. Although the new store is not within the village centre, it is close to a bus stop, albeit with a limited service, as noted in one of the representations.

#### Highway issues:

52. Access to the proposed development would be taken from the access road that serves the new Markovitz development. This comes off the B6049, Whitecross Road. The access road has recently been upgraded to a two-way carriageway to adoptable standard, as part of the recent development. It provides a suitable access point for the expected level of car movements in and out of the site. The Planning Statement says that treatments will be implemented in line with the requisite road standards, including sufficient road and footpath widths, to ensure the safety of customers visiting the premises by car, bicycle and on foot.
53. The layout of the car park provides 24 standard bays and two accessible bays. Cycle parking is also included to encourage sustainable transport where possible. Turning space is also accommodated within the site for delivery vehicles, to enable them to enter and exit the site in forward gear. The Planning Statement also says that the proposed development represents a significant improvement when compared to the existing convenience store on Commercial Road, which lacks any dedicated parking provision and thus limits both the practicality of the store and its turnover. It therefore concludes that the proposals are in accordance with relevant local policies, including DMT3 and DMT6 concerning access and design criteria and business parking, respectively.
54. The Highway Authority response makes a number of points about the proposal and requests additional information before making a final recommendation. This additional information has now been submitted and the Highway Authority has no objections subject to conditions.
55. The Authority's Transport Officer initially raised a number of matters in his response. A Travel Plan has now been submitted, which has addressed the Highway Authority's concerns, but he still remains concerned that the amount of parking is in excess of the level set out in the Authority's adopted standards (25 plus two disabled spaces, as opposed to 22 in the Authority's adopted standards). This has been pointed out to the agent, but given the edge of village location and the wider service function that Tideswell performs, this slight over-provision is considered to be acceptable.

### Impact on residential amenity

56. The nearest neighbouring properties are some distance away to the south-west, on the opposite side of Whitecross Road. At this distance, in terms of the development itself, there would be no direct impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. It is considered that the operation of the business, including vehicle movements and deliveries, would not cause such a level of noise and disturbance that the application would be refused on this basis. Planning conditions should be imposed to control hours of opening and delivery times. The application form says 7am to 10pm, but in this location 8am to 8pm is recommended. On this basis, the proposal accords with policies GSP3 and DMC3 in these respects.

### 57. Archaeology:

A desk-based archaeological assessment has been submitted with the application. This indicated that site is a field that has had largely the same layout since at least the early 19th century. It is likely to have been enclosed from the medieval open field in the post-medieval period. It has been in agricultural use, likely largely as pasture or meadow, from the early 19th century onwards. No recorded archaeological investigations have been undertaken within the vicinity of the site, therefore the general understanding of the buried archaeological resource within 1km of the site is limited. The available evidence suggests that conditions for the preservation of archaeological remains within the site are moderate to high. The potential for significant medieval to modern archaeological remains is considered to be low. The potential for prehistoric to Roman remains is currently uncertain, but on the basis of available evidence the overall archaeological potential is considered to be low.

58. The appraisal concludes that the proposed retail development will not impact on the setting or significance of any designated heritage assets or Tideswell Conservation Area, and would have a minor impact on the historic character of the rural outskirts of Tideswell. Impacts on potential buried remains would arise through the stripping of topsoil in advance of development, and from the excavation of trenches for drainage, services, foundations, or sub-surface tanks. Having taken this appraisal into account, a condition requiring archaeological monitoring is recommended.

### 59. Climate Change and Carbon Reduction Measures:

The Planning Statement refers to the requirements of policy CC1 Climate Change mitigation and says that any energy efficiency measures will be subject to an assessment of the greatest benefit to the environment and future occupants, as well as ongoing running costs and physical feasibility. It adds that once the detailed design proposals are completed and detailed energy assessments for the development are possible this exercise will be undertaken. It does not include any specific proposals at this stage, which is disappointing. For example, solar panels could be incorporated into the roof, as they have been at Aldi in Bakewell. The car parking could also include dedicated EV charging points, although the Authority's Transport Officer rightly makes the point that the short "dwell time" on site would limit the usefulness of these. The applicant's agent has been asked to address this, but a condition requiring the submission of a detailed scheme of environmental measures is recommended in any approval.

### Conclusion

60. The proposed site is considered to be acceptable in terms of its relationship to other development on the edge of the village. Although the location is less central than the existing shop, it will provide the village with a larger shop with a greater range of goods and with on-site parking. The siting, layout and design of the proposed building are

considered to be acceptable. The application is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

### **Human Rights**

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

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

62. Nil

63. Report Author: John Scott