

12. FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED RENOVATION AND CONVERSION OF VACANT BARN/STABLE TO ONE BEDROOM HOLIDAY LET AT BARN AT UPPER YELD ROAD, BAKEWELL. (NP/DDD/1022/1333 GB)

APPLICANT: MR R LAWSON

Summary

1. The proposals comprise the conversion of a small roadside barn on Upper Yeld Road in Bakewell to a one bedroom holiday let unit.
2. The barn is a non-designated heritage asset and its conversion to holiday accommodation is therefore acceptable in principle.
3. The proposals would, subject to conditions, conserve and enhance the buildings character and appearance.
4. Whist concerns have been raised in relation to the amenity impacts of the development, officers are satisfied that any such impacts would be low, and are outweighed by the benefits of conserving the building and providing holiday accommodation of this type, in accordance with the first and second statutory purposes of the National Park.
5. The application is therefore recommended for conditional approval.

Site and Surroundings

6. The barn stands to the south of Upper Yeld Road, 90m north-east from its junction with Shutts Lane, and around 130m from the nearest buildings of Lady Manners School, at the junction of Merrial Close with Upper Yeld Road. It stands hard against the inside edge of the pavement to Upper Yeld Road. The building stands as a remnant field barn surviving the residential expansion of this part of Bakewell during the mid 20th Century and stands in close proximity to inter-war housing to the south of the road. Historic Ordnance Survey mapping show the barn standing in isolation in 1920, but in proximity to modern development by the 1950s.
7. The barn is a small, simple and generally modified limestone field barn with gritstone detailing and stone slate roof. It measures 5.25m x 4.25m in footprint with eaves to 3.5m and ridge to 5.25m. Detailing is simple with stone quoins, heads and cills. Existing openings are limited to a timber stable door to the south elevation with evidence of ground floor and first floor openings and picking holes having been blocked up in brick and limestone rubble.
8. The building has a very limited curtilage with a narrow strip of land in ownership extending across less than half of the rear elevation and tapering from 2m in width to a point some 13m to the south east between twin drives/tracks, themselves separated by a stone wall of approximately 1.4m height. Otherwise the building stands to the limits of the application site, fronting the pavement and bounded to its gable elevations by twin tracks, including Merrial Close and a private track serving dwellings to the rear of properties fronting Upper Yeld Road.
9. The buildings stands in close proximity to two dwellings which front Upper Yeld Road, themselves separated by the twin tracks, with the application building standing between those tracks as they part and meet Upper Yeld Road. The rear elevation of the application building stands marginally forward of the front elevations of the detached dwelling Merrial House to the immediate south east and the semi-detached dwelling Rivendell to the immediate south. The nearest point of

separation between the barn and Merrial House is 4m, and 5.5m to the side extension of Rivendell.

10. Opposite the barn across the road to the north-west is Lady Manners School playing fields.

Proposal

11. The proposal comprises the conversion of the barn to form a one bedroom self-catered holiday let. The ground floor would be a compact open plan kitchen and living space with a single bedroom and en-suite at first floor level, partly within the roof void. Original openings would be unblocked for windows and the existing door opening forms the point of access to the barn. Two new small rooflights would be installed to the southern (rear) roofslope.
12. External dimensions of the building would not be altered. Overall internal living space would be less than 30m².
13. To a significant degree the proposals would not entail new external materials to the walls apart from window frames and door and new black cast iron rainwater goods. The application scheme proposes the replacement of the existing stone slate roof with blue slate.
14. External space is significantly limited, but sufficient for the rear door to open on to the narrow strip in ownership to the rear finger of land alongside the track where bin storage is proposed.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions -

- 1. Standard time limit**
- 2. Carry out in accordance with specified approved plans**
- 3. Agree details, recess and finish of timber windows and doors, including a scheme of obscuring and fixing for hayloft opening**
- 4. The roof shall be clad with stone slate to match the existing**
- 5. Cast metal RWGs painted black and installed on rise and fall brackets directly to the stonework without the use of fascia**
- 6. Use limited self-catered holiday occupation for up to two persons maximum at any one time**

Key Issues

15. The impact of the development on the appearance of the built environment and landscape of the National Park, effect on the on neighbours' residential amenity, including parking and access.

History

16. No planning history pertaining to the barn.

Consultations

Derbyshire County Council Highways

17. No objections.

Bakewell Town Council

18. Objects in relation to:

- Window openings (safety and privacy issues).
- Parking Proposals - none provided
- Access to neighbouring properties (during and after build)
- Amenity space/bin storage.
- Roof replacement materials (stone to slate) are not in keeping with current design features

19. Derbyshire Dales District Council – No response to date.

Representations

20. Seven third party representations have been received, all objecting to the proposals.

21. Objections variously reference the following points of concern:

- Loss of privacy through overlooking windows between the barn and Rivendell and the attached St Johns, including views into ground floor bay window and first floor bedroom windows and front garden. Whilst maintaining these objections, some note that obscure glazing to the proposed first floor gable window would help address this.
- Loss of privacy and ability to enjoy the front garden of Merrial House arising from window openings created in the east elevation.
- Concern that the proposals indicate the unblocking of an opening to the east elevation which is not evident, and objection to that design element.
- Concerns about maintaining vehicle and emergency access, and visibility on emergence from Merrial Drive and the parallel track arising from occupants' and cleaners' parked cars during use, and builders' vehicles during construction period.
- Concern that opening windows would further limit access by large vehicles to the twin tracks.
- On-street parking would exacerbate existing parking congestion associated with Lady Manners School and use of the sports facilities.
- Domestication of a vernacular barn.
- Concerns about noise nuisance from use of the barn as a holiday rental resulting in loss of residential amenity.
- Insufficient space for external bin storage

Main Policies

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1, L3, RT2

Relevant Development Management policies: DM1, DMC1, DMC3, DMC4, DMC5, DMC7.

National Planning Policy Framework

22. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in July 2021. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and Government guidance in the NPPF.
23. Para 176 of the NPPF states that 'great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.'
24. Para 177 explains that when considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:
 - (a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
 - (b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; andany detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

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). GSP1 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 says that opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon, and opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings.
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 L1 requires that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape Character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan and other valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.
29. L3 deals with heritage assets including assets of local significance and requires that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of the heritage assets and their settings. Other than in exceptional circumstances development is not permitted that is likely harm the significance of a heritage asset.
30. RT2 deals with hotels, bed and breakfast and self-catering accommodation. It supports the change of use of a traditional building of historic or vernacular merit to serviced or self-catering holiday accommodation, except where it would create unacceptable landscape impact in open countryside.

Development Management Policies

31. The Development Management Policies DPD requires a high standard of design (DMC3), and require any heritage asset's significance to be identified and conserved or enhanced through development (DMC5). DMC3 also seeks to protect the amenity of the area and neighbouring properties.
32. DMR3 requires that within settlements listed in DS1, A holiday occupancy condition will be applied to self-catering accommodation if the property being converted has inadequate indoor or outdoor living space or is so closely related to adjoining properties that the introduction of residential use would cause unacceptable harm to their amenity.

Assessment

Principle

33. The proposal for conversion of a redundant traditional barn to self-catering holiday accommodation is acceptable under RT2 in principle, providing that the host building is a traditional building of historic or vernacular merit.
34. The building is a modest and simple former field barn dating from at least the 19th century, which has survived the expansion of Bakewell in the middle of the last century.
35. Originally positioned on a road/trackside field edge in the countryside, it is now enveloped by residential development to the south, on the site of the former fields. The supporting heritage statement to the application supports that position, setting out that the building long pre-dates the surrounding housing and school development and reflects former White Peak farming practice across the site prior to development. As such it represents a remnant of the historic landscape and activity in this location, deriving some heritage significance from this.
36. The building itself appears largely unaltered, is sound and is constructed in traditional limestone rubble with gritstone detailing with a stone slate roof.

37. Accordingly it is appropriate to consider the building as being both a non-designated heritage asset and as having vernacular merit. As such its change of use complies with RT2.

Design

38. The proposal comprises a change of use with limited external alterations to the building. The most significant external change to the building would be the re-opening and glazing of former windows, vents and picking holes which have been bricked up or otherwise filled in for security reasons over the years. The former openings to the windows and door that are proposed to be re-opened are visibly apparent and officers are confident these proposals would reinstate historic openings. Two small conservation rooflights are proposed to the north elevation.
39. In respect to external openings, a neighbour has objected (amongst other issues) in relation to the re-opening of a ground floor opening to the east gable of the barn which would be in close proximity to the front garden of Merrial House. The objection claims that there is no evidence a window opening existed at that point and to reopen it in the course of the works would be inappropriate and unneighbourly. Officers requested that further evidence be provided by the agent to clarify the former existence of the proposed opening. Photographs have been supplied from inside the building which clearly indicate an opening has existed at this point in the past. The scale and location of the proposed window and the thickness of walling, allied with recessed window frames would suggest the reopening would therefore have no materially harmful effects on the external appearance of the barn. Impacts on neighbourliness are considered in a later section of this report.
40. The application proposed the replacement of the stone slate roof with a blue tile roof. As existing, the stone slate roof is an important part of the building's appearance, character and vernacular heritage, but is showing signs of sag. The application proposes that the use of blue slate would reduce weight on the roof structure. Given that the existing roof timbers are likely to need replacement or reinforcement in the course of the conversion, and given that no evidence suggesting the change in roofing is necessary to retain the structural integrity of the building, should Members be minded to approve the application a condition to retain the stone slate roof is recommended.
41. Notwithstanding concerns arising from the reopening of windows on amenity grounds, the proposed design, subject to conditions securing appropriate opening detailing, is considered to be appropriate in that it conserves and enhances the building as a traditional building.
42. Whilst the external appearance of the barn would be slightly altered consequent to window openings, the effects on its vernacular character and its landscape prominence are not considered to be significant or harmful to the valued characteristics of the national park. Policies GSP3, L3, DMC3, and DMC10 would therefore be satisfied in relation to design and conservation matters as a consequence of the proposals.

Amenity

43. Objection from neighbours has arisen in relation to the potential for a loss of residential amenity consequent to the change of use as a self-catering holiday use. In relation to the character of use itself, the proposals for a single bedroom unit of less than 30m² useable floorspace would suggest that intensity of use, and potential for unneighbourly or anti-social patterns of use are considered to be unlikely to arise. The building could physically accommodate individuals and couples only, perhaps with an infant or child, but family or larger groups could not be. There is no external

- amenity space suitable for outdoor recreation or catering for guests. The fundamental character of the proposed use would therefore be low-key, cater for individuals and couples only and increase the simple and low-cost visitor accommodation offer to visitors to the National Park at a level not incompatible within a residential area.
44. Particular concern has been raised by the three closest neighbours to the barn on the grounds that there would be a loss to privacy of their homes through over-looking of front gardens and visibility into habitable rooms from within the converted barn.
 45. Given the close proximity of the barn to neighbouring dwellings these concerns are not unreasonable, but officers consider the relationship between the buildings would not lead to any unacceptable reduction in privacy to those dwellings over that currently possible from the public realm, as follows;
 46. Although in close proximity to the two nearest dwellings (Merrial House to the south east and Rivendell to the south), and to a lesser extent to the property referred to as St Johns, ground floor window openings from the rear of the barn would afford only acute viewing angles from within the barn towards windows to habitable rooms within the neighbouring dwellings.
 47. The main direction of view from those windows would be along the track and the parallel Merrial Close, affording views between the rear-facing barn windows and gable windows of the two nearest neighbours at only acute angles to their gables. These views would be further reduced by recessing the window frames within the wall openings of the barn (which would be required on design and heritage grounds). Furthermore, only Merrial House has habitable rooms with openings on this gable elevation, and these are at first floor level; hence loss of amenity from ground floor windows of the barn would be negligible.
 48. Views from other ground floor openings of the barn towards the front elevation of Merrial House would principally take in the integrated garage door to the dwelling and then, further along its frontage, the front door. No front elevation openings to Merrial House are therefore considered to be adversely affected in relation to privacy. Views across front garden, currently open to all users of the pavement and road, are not considered to constitute a significant additional loss of privacy.
 49. The proposals include the reopening of the first floor loading door which historically gave access to the hay loft. It is proposed to glaze the upper part of the opening with a vertically boarded panel below to reflect previous character. This window would afford views out to the west along Upper Yeld Road and across the front curtilages of the neighbouring dwellings, the angle of view to any front-facing windows of these properties becoming more acute with distance from the barn. Consideration is therefore necessary as to whether the resulting relationship between this first floor window of the barn and ground floor and first floor windows of Rivendell and St Johns would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy and amenity. The resultant angle of divergence from windows at distance of 7m at the nearest points between first floor windows would be approximately 50°. This angle of view would effectively be further narrowed when having regard to the requirement to recess the window to the barn within the opening. In this respect it is considered that a loss of privacy to this neighbour would be low, but would occur.
 50. Concern is also raised by the neighbouring property residents arising from loss of privacy consequent to views into ground floor bay windows of Rivendell and St Johns. Whilst the bay windows protrude forward of the front wall of the house, they are located further from the barn than the nearest bedroom window, meaning that viewing angles are consequently further reduced. It is acknowledged that views into the bay window side panes and spaces within themselves may be possible, but views in to

the rooms beyond the windows would be very restricted.

51. Whilst potential for overlooking from this first floor window is therefore concluded to be low when taken in the context of the current public views towards these neighbouring principal elevations, it is recognised that the nature of use proposed introduces potential for overlooking of a less fleeting nature than might occur from passing pedestrians or drivers, resulting in some loss of amenity when compared to existing public views towards these windows.
52. As a result of these potential impacts, it is recommended that a condition is imposed to require this first floor opening to be obscure glazed and non-opening, other than for purposes of fire escape.
53. Policy DMC3 allows for development otherwise acceptable in principle to be permitted subject to consideration of amenity, privacy and security of the development and other properties. Specific standards are not set out in terms of separation distances and viewing angles. The consideration on the effects of the proposals on amenity and loss of privacy between windows at obtuse angles but in relatively close proximity requires a balanced judgement to be reached. In this instance there is no debate about the relative proximity of proposed windows to existing habitable rooms of the neighbouring houses. However the direction of viewing angles resulting from the proposals to habitable room windows of the neighbouring dwellings is such that any loss of amenity would be very low and, on balance, acceptable subject to obscure glazing the first floor window of the barn which would remove any remaining concern about privacy loss.

Parking and Access

54. No off-street parking is proposed to serve the proposed holiday unit. Representations have noted that the road is subject to parking congestion at the end of the school day, but this is temporary and limited to term time. Concern has been raised also in respect to the sight line obstruction possible as a consequence of visitor parking outside the barn to users of Merrial Close and the parallel unnamed track which emerge to Yeld Road either side of the barn. Parking to Upper Yeld Road in the vicinity of the barn is however unrestricted. The scale of the proposed use, and its location within Bakewell would suggest users are likely to be reliant on a single vehicle or access the barn on foot or bike or by public transport. Given the likely scale of trip generation and parking requirements arising from use of the barn, it is considered unlikely that materially detrimental congestion or obstruction over and above that which currently is commonly experienced would occur, and on a section of road which no highway restrictions currently apply. Obstruction of the driveways and drop kerbs would not be an inevitable consequence of use of the barn for holiday accommodation and any such anti-social parking may be subject to highway enforcement procedures.
55. Derbyshire County Highways Authority has raised no objections subject to identification of off-street parking arrangements. No parking capacity is available on the application site, and the assessment of parking and highways considerations is based upon on-street parking for any visitor arriving by private vehicle as appraised above. Further clarification from DCC has been requested. The Highways Authority's further response has confirmed that given the unrestricted parking status of Upper Yeld Road, no objection is raised to on-street parking. Given the daily parking patterns associated with Lady Manners School in the vicinity of the barn, it is not considered that the potential on-street parking need generated by a two person holiday unit would have any detrimental material effect on highway safety.

Conclusion

56. In conclusion, with the above suggested planning conditions, the proposals would conserve the character and appearance of the building and is therefore in accordance with the policies of the development plan and the NPPF.
57. Through conversion of the barn a non-designated heritage asset would be provided with a viable future use that would safeguard the building with limited external alteration. In doing so the positive conservation of the historic built heritage of Bakewell would be furthered. Given the location, scale and relationship to neighbouring dwellings, it is unlikely that other uses which would conserve the building may be forthcoming with less potential impact on local amenity. In addition, the proposed use at a modest scale would add to the overnight accommodation offer of Bakewell and in doing so support the second statutory purpose.
58. Impacts on residential amenity and privacy to neighbours have been considered and are low, and do not outweigh the benefits of the scheme in the planning balance.
59. There are no further material considerations that would indicate that planning permission should be refused.

Human Rights

60. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
61. List of Background Papers (not previously published) Nil
62. Planning Officer – Graham Bradford