

17. FULL APPLICATION – REINSTATEMENT OF LOWER HOLT FARM, BARBER BOOTH, EDALE FOR A NEW DWELLING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LOWER HOLT FARM, BARBER BOOTH ROAD, EDALE (WE, NP/HPK/0722/0910)

APPLICANT: MR AND MRS CHAPMAN

Summary

1. This application seeks consent for an agricultural workers dwelling in the open countryside approximately 450m south-east of Barber Booth. The application has provided an Agricultural Justification Statement which outlines the scale of the applicant's farming enterprise, in addition to the stocking numbers. The main building group of the farm is located at Whitmore Lea Farm in Barber Booth; however, the land in the applicant's control is de-centralised and dispersed across Edale.
2. The supporting information demonstrates an extensive workload for the applicant but crucially does not demonstrate a genuine and essential need for the worker(s) to be readily available at most times day and night. This issue is exacerbated by the siting of the proposed dwellinghouse, which would be approximately 600m directly away from the main building group of the farm, but approximately 1.2km when using tracks and roads.
3. It is therefore considered that the application has failed to meet the criteria outlined in policy DMH4A. As there are no extenuating circumstances which require an essential worker to be readily available at all times, the proposed development would constitute an isolated dwellinghouse in the open countryside. The proposed development would harm the valued characteristics of the landscape through the introduction of an isolated property in the centre of open grazing land approximately 350m away from Barber Booth Road. The property, in addition to its domestic paraphernalia, would contribute to an unacceptable urbanising influence on the Edale landscape, particularly when viewed from sensitive receptors such as Rushup Edge and Lords Seat.
4. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

5. The development site is Lower Holt Farm, an early 19th century outfarm. The buildings on site are in an extremely poor state of repair, and in some parts, almost completely collapsed. Notwithstanding its poor state of repair, the legibility of the former buildings is still visible. The building group is L-shaped, and its assumed uses include a small farmhouse set between an agricultural store/hayloft and a hay mew. Set slightly to the north, there is the remnants of a structure believed to be cattle stalls.
6. While the buildings are extremely dilapidated, some of their features are still visible. The buildings are constructed from local gritstone, with large gritstone surrounds and natural stone slates on the hayloft roof. There is a tree growing extremely close to the southern elevation of the structure, which is causing further structural issues.
7. Access to the site is achieved via a 380m field track which connects to Barber Booth Road.
8. The applicant's wider land holdings include a farm grouping in Barber Booth proper called Whitmore Lea Farm, located in the north-western section of the village between the River Noe and the railway line.

9. The land under the applicant's control is dispersed in nature. They control a large section of land to the north of the Whitmore Lea farm site and the railway line. They also control a large amount of the field parcels surrounding Lower Holt itself, including a strip of land stretching from near Rushup Edge to the River Noe. They also own a triangular section of land bound by the Chapel Gate footpath. In total, the applicant operates on 158ha of land across the Edale valley.

Proposal

10. This application seeks consent for the construction of an agricultural workers dwelling on the site currently occupied by Lower Holt Farm. It is noted that the application refers to the scheme as "reinstating" Lower Holt Farm; however, the application is not proposing to convert the existing structures, rather it proposes to demolish the existing structures and re-use some of the material on site in the construction of the new dwelling. Accordingly, the Authority dispute the suitability of the word "reinstatement" and consider that the application proposes a new dwellinghouse.
11. The application proposes the complete removal of all structures on site and the erection of a 3-bedroom dwelling, in an L-shaped form. The property would be constructed from partially reclaimed materials from the existing structure on site, and also feature gritstone detailing such as quoins and window surrounds. The roof would be clad with natural stone slate and all windows and doors would be hardwood timber painted in a recessive heritage colour.
12. The proposed dwelling would feature a gritstone chimney, and also a metal flue on the eastern roof slope for a log burning stove.
13. The dwelling would be set on a generous residential plot which would include an Indian sandstone terrace surrounding the whole property, in addition to a large terrace in the semi-enclosed courtyard. The driveway would be formed from self-compacted gravel and would have space for 3 cars. The access track would be surfaced in compacted gravel with grass centre.
14. To the south of the proposed residential curtilage, the application proposes a 14-panel solar array bound by a timber fence. There would also be a Ground Source Heat Pump providing heat to the property.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **The application has not demonstrated a genuine and essential functional need for an agricultural worker dwelling on site. The supporting information has not demonstrated why the applicant would need to be readily available at most times, day and night. As a result, the proposed development is contrary to policy DS1, HC1, HC2, DMH4 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**
2. **By virtue of its location and siting, the proposed development would represent an isolated dwellinghouse in the open countryside. The proposed dwelling would not be sited against the main building group of the farm, and would instead sit far removed from nearby built-form. The proposed dwelling, including its domestic curtilage, parking area, and proposed solar array would harm the special qualities of the National Park by introducing a large and isolated dwelling onto an otherwise open rural landscape. This would contribute to an unacceptable urbanising influence on the Edale valley landscape, which would also harm the setting of the Edale Conservation Area.**

It is therefore considered contrary to policies L1, L3, GSP1, GSP2, DMC3, DMC4, DMC5, and DMC8 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Key Issues

- Principle of development;
- Agricultural Justification
- Design and Impact on Valued Characteristics of the Landscape
- Cultural Heritage
- Other matters

History

15. There is no planning history for the development site.

Consultations

16. Derbyshire County Council Highways Authority – Requested additional information prior to confirming final position.
17. Edale Parish Council – Unanimously in strong support of the application on social and environmental grounds. They considered the application fulfils a local need for housing, in particular agricultural workers. Edale Parish Council consider it important that agricultural workers are able to live within the community. The Council also consider that the reduced travel would have a positive environmental impact, and the application would meet a high standard of sustainability.
18. PDNPA Built Environment – Site is a non-designated heritage asset. Its significance lies in its evidential value. If granted consent, the remains of the building should be recorded prior to its development.
19. PDNPA Archaeologist – The building is recorded on the HER as early 19th century or earlier but the presence of a massive pitched lintel and the collapsed remains of window mullions and hooded lintel of 17th century style suggest the outfarm is much earlier possibly 17th century in date.
20. The significance of the site, if it does originate in the 17th century is higher than if it was 19th century. It would be of regional significance.
21. Development would have a significant impact on the building which would result in a loss to many of the features of the farm; however, without the rebuild (*Planning Officer Note; The proposal as set out above is not to rebuild the existing structure(s) and is a new build dwelling on the site*) the farm will deteriorate more and the features that currently survive will probably be lost. As a non-designated heritage asset, recommends a balanced planning judgement. If approved, recommends a Historic Building Record and an appropriate WSI condition.

Representations

22. The application received 4 representations, including a response from the National Farming Union.
23. The letters of support raised the following comments:
- The supporting Agricultural Justification outlines that there is a requirement for a dwelling on site;
 - Landscape enhancement to reinstate the property;

- The dwelling would be important addition to the social fabric of Edale due to accommodation lost to short stay holiday-lets;
- The property would meet a high standard of sustainability;
- Applicant is an important member of the Edale community;
- The development site is a former farmhouse, and the introduction of a new property would follow the building pattern of the Edale valley.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

24. 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.
25. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been revised (2021). This replaces the previous document (2019) 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. In particular Paragraph 174 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
26. 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.

Main Development Plan Policies

Core Strategy

27. GSP1, GSP2 - *Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development & Enhancing the National Park*. These policies jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.
28. GSP3 - *Development Management Principles*. Requires that particular attention is paid to the impact on the character and setting of buildings and that the design is in accord with the Authority's Design Guide and development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park.
29. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Sets out that most new development will be directed into named settlements, but outlines that some development in the open countryside may be acceptable.
30. L1 - *Landscape character and valued characteristics*. Seeks to ensure that all development conserves and enhances valued landscape character and sites, features and species of biodiversity importance.

31. L3 – Cultural heritage assets. Seeks to ensure all development conserves and where appropriate enhances the significance of any heritage assets. In this case the Bradwell Conservation area is the relevant heritage asset.
32. HC2 - Housing for key workers in agriculture, forestry or other rural enterprises. States amongst other things, that new housing for key workers in agriculture must be justified by functional and financial tests.
33. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.

Development Management Policies

34. DMC3 - Siting, Design, layout and landscaping. Reiterates, that where developments are acceptable in principle, Policy requires that design is to high standards and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. The siting, mass, scale, height, design, building materials should all be appropriate to the context. Accessibility of the development should also be a key consideration.
35. DMC5 states that Planning applications for development affecting a heritage asset, including its setting must clearly demonstrate: (i) its significance including how any identified features of value will be conserved and where possible enhanced; and (ii) why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary. Policy DMC8 states that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into, out of, across or through the area, should assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of the Conservation Area will be preserved or enhanced.
36. DMC8 requires applications for development in a Conservation Area to assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of a Conservation Area will be preserved or enhanced.
37. DMH4 - Essential worker dwellings - The need for a worker dwelling to support agriculture, forestry or other rural enterprise businesses will be considered against the needs of the business concerned. Development will be permitted by conversion or new build provided that:
 - i) a detailed appraisal demonstrates that there is a genuine and essential functional need for the worker(s) concerned, with a requirement that they need to be readily available at most times, day and night, bearing in mind current and likely future requirements; and
 - ii) stated intentions to engage in or further develop the business are genuine, reasonably likely to happen and capable of being sustained for a reasonable period of time. The Authority will require financial evidence that:
 - the business has been operating for at least three years; and
 - the business is currently profitable; and
 - it has been profitable for at least one of the last three years; and
 - the profit from the business as opposed to turnover, is such that it can sustain the ongoing cost of the dwelling; and
 - the ongoing costs associated with the dwelling linked to the landholding reflect the actual and potential income that might be generated from the landholding; and

- iii) there is no accommodation available in the locality that could enable the worker(s) to be readily available at most times, day and night, bearing in mind current and likely future requirements; and
 - iv) where a new building is proposed, there is no traditional building that could be converted for use as a worker dwelling, within or close to the main group of buildings, in line with other policies and guidance on siting and design; and
 - v) where conversion of existing buildings is not an option, construction costs of new buildings reflect the likely sustainable income of the business; and
 - vi) the new building is within or immediately adjacent to the site of the existing building group and enhances the building group when considered in its landscape setting; and
 - vii) the new building is smaller than any house in the building group that is already under the control of the business and in accordance with policy DMH5, unless an acceptable landscape and building conservation outcome for the building group and the setting can only be achieved by a bigger building.
38. DMH11 - A legally enforceable agreement to mitigate impacts of a development proposal, where this cannot be achieved through the use of planning conditions alone. These will be applied to housing developments such as affordable housing, Essential worker dwellings and ancillary accommodation. Removal of a Section 106 Agreement to remove the ancillary status of accommodation will not normally be permitted.
39. DMT3 - Safe access should be provided in a way that does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality, and where possible, enhances it.
40. DMT8 - Off-street car parking for residential development should be provided.

Supplementary Planning Documents

- 41. Supplementary Planning Guidance on Design, 1987, 2007, 2014.
- 42. Climate Change and Sustainable Buildings SPD (2013)

Assessment

Principle of Development

- 43. The proposed development is located outside of the built form of Edale and Barber Booth, and is therefore considered to be in the open countryside. Policy DS1 states that the majority of new development will be directed into named settlements, but goes on to state that development at agricultural enterprises which require a rural location will be acceptable in principle. This is expanded upon in policy HC4 which states that new housing for key workers in agriculture, forestry or other rural enterprises may be acceptable subject to justifying a functional and financial test.
- 44. Policy DMH4 expands on this point by outlining 7 criteria that essential workers dwellings need to comply with. Part I of this policy outlines that a detailed appraisal is required which demonstrates that there is a genuine and essential functional need for the workers to be readily available at most times, day and night, bearing in mind the current and likely future requirements of the farming operation.

Agricultural Justification

- 45. The application is supported by an Agricultural Justification Statement. This document outlines the holding size, in addition to stocking numbers and other relevant information.

46. The document outlines that the applicant currently lives in Taddington, some 14 miles away from the farm at Barber Booth. This typically equates to a 30-minute drive to the farm each day; however, it is acknowledged that journey times may be longer as a result of traffic on local roads. It also outlines that the applicant has been farming at Barber Booth for over 30-years, and has been supplementing the farming business with a part-time fencing contractor role. Due to increased stocking numbers and workload, it is the applicant's intention to cease the fencing work, and instead work full time at the farm.
47. The appraisal outlines that the applicant currently operates on 158ha of land, the majority of which is hill and moorland. As a result, much of the land is only acceptable by foot or 4x4.
48. At present, the applicant has 280 ewes with 100 followers, and approximately 40 bucket calves and 55 store cattle. The document then goes on to outline that it is the applicant's intention to increase their stocking numbers to 160 bucket calves and 80 store cattle. The increase in calves and cattle would assist in making the farming enterprise financially viable moving forward.
49. The Statement calculates that at present, the holding currently has a labour demand equivalent to 1.54 full time workers, but this would increase to 2.34 full time workers once the anticipated future growth is factored in.
50. The Justification Statement outlines two main factors to consider when assessing whether the applicant has a genuine and essential functional need to be readily available at all times. It states that calves are required to be fed twice a day, and be supplied with fresh drinking water daily. It also states that legal guidelines state that someone should check the calves twice daily for disease or ailments, but notes that best practice is to do this more often. It then goes on to state that during lambing season, the applicant uses an outdoor lambing system with an existing building on site used as an emergency lambing area or casualty area. It states that the applicant checks pregnant ewes 4 times per day, with the majority of the land only accessible by foot or 4x4.
51. It is acknowledged that the applicant has an extensive and heavy workload associated with his farming business, and this would only grow as a result of any expansion. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the Agricultural Justification Statement has failed to demonstrate the *genuine and essential functional need* to be readily available at most times day and night. Indeed, it is noted that during particularly busy period, such as lambing, the applicant will have a requirement to be on site at many hours to ensure health of the flock. Notwithstanding this, the Statement outlines that the applicant has a caravan on site. It is considered that during particularly busy periods, this caravan should provide appropriate temporary accommodation.
52. The Statement provides an overview of seasonal duties. It outlines that in April, the applicant lives on site permanently to provide care for the lambs and ewes. It then goes on to state the typical working week in July, which requires stock checks, shearing of sheep, and feeding of calves.
53. The heavy workload is acknowledged; however, it is considered that the Statement has not justified the requirement for the applicant to be readily available at all times. Indeed, there are busy periods across the year; however, the Statement relies heavily on the overall workload, which is noted to be high but is not in of itself a sufficient requirement for a permanent dwelling.
54. The Authority considers that the Justification Statement relies heavily on preference for the applicant to live nearby, as opposed to a clearly defined justification. It notes that

during Winter months, it may be difficult for the applicant to get to the farm from Taddington. This is acknowledged but the frequency of such poor weather is questioned.

55. The Justification Statement outlines that the commute from Taddington to Lower Holt Farm twice a day takes up a lot of time daily, in addition to the financial costs of the commute. Whilst the time freed up by living on site is acknowledged, the Authority are mindful of paragraph 6.69 of the Development Management Policies Plan, which states that *the desire of someone to live at or near their place of work is not a justification for a worker dwelling in the National Park*.
56. As such, it is noted that the farming enterprise has a significant workload but it is considered that the Agricultural Justification Statement has failed to address why the applicant is required to be “readily available at most times, day and night”.
57. In assessing compliance with policy DMH4, it is important to assess the remaining criteria. The application has been supported by sufficient financial information which demonstrates that the farm holding has been trading for at least 3 years and is capable of funding the dwelling. It is therefore compliant with part II and V of the policy.
58. The Justification Statement has provided a 3-mile radius search of available properties to purchase in order to demonstrate that there is no nearby accommodation suitable for their needs. This however comprises a simple ‘Right Move’ search at a point in time and is considered insufficient to comply with part III of the policy. There is no search of property to rent nor evidence of a search over time. Given accommodation needs do not arise overnight and the difficulty of finding property in this area it is reasonable to consider a longer search period to satisfy this part of policy. In this regard officers are aware of property being for sale in the recent past in the parish including more affordable restricted dwellings to meet local and agricultural needs. Without more evidence of such a search including the private and local authority/Housing Association rented sector we cannot conclude that there is no accommodation available locally to meet the stated need.
59. The application also makes passing reference to outline why a traditional barn at the Whitmore Lea Farm site is not available for conversion. It states that vehicular access to this property is limited, and the conversion would have a negative impact on the overall operation of the farm. It also states that conversion of this barn would require agricultural operations to be relocated elsewhere. The Authority do not consider this a sufficient justification to demonstrate compliance with part IV of policy DMH4, particularly when the proposed alternative is a highly isolated new build property in the open countryside. The application has not provided information on why the reorganisation of the Whitmore Lea Farm site with new agricultural buildings which would allow the conversion of the traditional barn is not possible. Accordingly, it is considered contrary to part IV.
60. The proposed development does not comply with part VI of the policy. It is over 500m away from the main building group, and would be highly isolated on the landscape. This will be explored in a later section of this report.
61. The proposed development does not meet the criteria of policy HC2 and DMH4 to justify an essential worker dwelling. Whilst the workload on site is extensive, the application has not met the wording of the policy by not providing a well-reasoned justification for why there is an essential functional need to be readily available at most times day and night. Furthermore, it also fails to comply with parts IV and VI of policy DMH4.

Design and Impact on Valued Characteristics of the Landscape

62. The design of the proposed dwellinghouse seeks to take its inspiration from the former buildings on site. It would be constructed from natural gritstone which has been reclaimed

from the former buildings on site, and feature formal gritstone detailing such as quoins, lintels and sills. The roof would be natural slate.

63. The proposed dwelling would be L-shaped to match the historic form of the buildings on site. The design of the proposed dwellinghouse has tried to conserve its historic characteristics. The property would have a very solid and utilitarian character and appearance, featuring minimal openings and large sections of uninterrupted masonry.
64. It is considered that the design of the property itself is acceptable. It would feature traditional material, detailing, and conserve an agricultural character. Whilst it is large in scale, it is considered that the design itself is acceptable in isolation. The submitted plans make speculative statements on how the detailed design of the former structure on site would have looked. As a result of the current state of the property, the detailed design of the existing structures on site are largely unknown. Notwithstanding this, the design of the house itself is broadly acceptable. It is therefore compliance with adopted design guidance.
65. Whilst in isolation, the design of the property is broadly acceptable, when it is viewed in its context, it is considered that it would contribute to an unacceptable urbanising influence on the landscape.
66. The development site is located in the Upper Valley Pastures landscape type of the Dark Peak. This area is characterised by:
- A low lying gently undulating topography, rising towards adjacent higher ground;
 - Network of streams and localised damp hollows;
 - Pastoral farmland enclosed by hedgerows;
 - Dense streamline and scattered hedgerow trees;
 - Dispersed settlement with isolated farmsteads and small clusters of farms and dwellings.
67. The application states that the construction of the dwellinghouse would “reinstate” an important outfarm which would positively contribute to the historic landscape of Edale. As noted earlier in this report, the Authority consider this application for a new-build residential property in the open countryside. The site is not previously developed land as suggested in the Planning Statement and there is no residential planning use currently on site as the property is ruinous and has been uninhabited for several decades. Accordingly, there are no material considerations which would render this development site any more preferable than a completely undeveloped field pasture in the open countryside.
68. At present, the ruins at Lower Holt Farm provide a low-intensity, understated landscape feature. It does not feature a domestic curtilage, and it did not have an intrusive access track until one was installed between 2020 and 2022 without consent.
69. The proposed dwellinghouse would have a large footprint on site at approximately 150sqm (for context, our maximum size guidelines for a 5-person affordable house is 97m²). Including the proposed terrace, carparking area, and domestic curtilage, it is considered that the structure would appear highly intrusive on the landscape, particularly when viewed from the south along footpaths at Rushup Edge and Lords Seat. Due to the form of the proposed building, it features two large pieces of uninterrupted roofing. It is considered that the relatively low in height but large footprint design of the structure has the potential to make it more visible on the landscape by occupying a larger area. Due to the sites’ location deep in the grazing lands of the valley, it is considered it would be at odds with the largely agricultural pastures of the landscape. The compacted gritstone carparking area and the Indian sandstone terrace would severely contrast the grazing land of the surrounding landscape, and appear highly domestic in a rural setting.

70. The proposed solar array would sit outside of the proposed domestic curtilage to the property and be bound by an inappropriate timber fence. This would further exacerbate the urbanisation and domestic creep of the property on the rural landscape. The Climate Change and Sustainable Buildings SPD states that solar arrays should be located inside the domestic curtilage of properties and be sited in the least obtrusive places. The proposed location of the arrays is clearly contrary to this guidance.
71. Whilst some measures may help mitigate the impact of the development on the landscape, such as siting all infrastructure underground and restricting outside lighting, it is considered that simply by virtue of the proposed location of the property, in addition to its scale, curtilage detailing and associated infrastructure, the development would contribute to an urbanising influence on the landscape. This would cause significant harm to the valued character and appearance of the open rural pastoral landscape of Edale which contributes significantly to this special landscape of the National Park. It is therefore contrary to policies L1 and part VI of policy DMH4.

Cultural Heritage

72. The development site is recorded on the Derbyshire HER as an early 19th century outfarm. There is some evidence, such as a large pitched lintel and hooded lintel, which suggest it could be as old as 17th century. It is therefore a non-designated heritage asset, possibly of regional importance found to be of 17th century. The development site is also located in the Edale Conservation Area. Accordingly, policies DMC5 and DMC8 are engaged which required development to conserve or enhance the significance and setting of heritage assets.
73. Due to the current state of the buildings on site, much of the significance of the property has been lost through decay and age and its current significance is largely evidential. It is noted that if a viable use is not found for the structure, it would likely continue to dilapidate which is not uncommon in the National Park and a scenario which is not in itself unacceptable – in this regard it is noted that the Planning Inspector supported the Authority in refusing the conversion of isolated listed former farmsteads in a relict agricultural landscape in the Holme Valley mainly on grounds of landscape harm.
74. In this case it is noted that the proposed development would lead to the complete loss of a non-designated heritage asset; however, it is considered that if a viable use was acceptable on site, this loss would be acceptable subject to appropriate recording. The current state of the structures would mean that the overall harm or loss resulting from the removal of the non-designated heritage asset would be less pronounced. Accordingly, its removal could be made acceptable subject to historic building recording and an appropriate WSI.
75. In addition to the harm on the asset itself, it is important to consider the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the Edale Conservation Area. Edale's Conservation Area is considered unusual in that it covers large areas of rural landscape. This is due to the historic form and growth of the 6 rural communities which make up the wider Edale valley.
76. It is considered that the provision of the new dwelling at Lower Holt Farm would erode the setting of the Edale Conservation Area. Where there are isolated properties across Edale and in particular Barber Booth, they are largely historic buildings which relate to the historic agriculture practiced in the area. This application, in the absence of a proven agricultural need essentially seeks consent for a large, private dwellinghouse. Whilst the design of the property is meant to look agricultural in character, and it could be tied to an agricultural holding, the submitted plans show that there wouldn't actually be any

agriculture practiced on site (apart from providing vehicular access to field parcels). Instead it would be a completely domestic and residential structure. This is at odds with the character of the area, and would erode the historic characteristics of the area by allowing a private and domestic property in the centre of agricultural pastures.

77. As discussed in the landscape section above, it is considered that the provision of the large dwellinghouse in the open countryside, with a large domestic curtilage and intrusive paving and driveway, would erode the historic and agricultural characteristics of the area. In addition to harming the valued characteristics of the landscape, it is also considered to have a negative impact on the wider setting of Edale Conservation Area for similar reasons. It would result in a large new-build, domestic property to be located in an extremely isolated position on an otherwise undeveloped, historic and rural landscape.
78. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF requires any less than significant harm to a designated heritage asset to be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposed development. The benefits in this case are largely private to the applicant. The less than substantial harm associated with an isolated dwelling in the historic landscape would therefore not be outweighed by any public benefits. Whilst there may be some benefits associated with a farmer who takes part in the Countryside Stewardship Programme living on site, it is considered that this would not outweigh the harm associated with the isolated dwellinghouse.
79. Accordingly, the proposed development is contrary to policy L3 and DMC5 due to the negative impact it would have on the setting of the Edale conservation area. There are no public benefits which outweigh the less than substantial harm to the setting of the conservation area. It is therefore also contrary to paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

80. The proposed development would feature high standards of sustainability and climate change mitigation, including solar arrays and a ground source heat pump. It would also be constructed from reclaimed materials from the existing structures on site. As such, it is considered to comply with policy CC1.
81. The Highways Authority requested additional information before providing final comments. Additional information was provided to support this application, including visibility splays based on the 85th percentile approaching vehicle speed, hardstanding for the first 10m of the track and the widening of the first 5m of the access track to 5.5m. The additional information was sent to the Highway Authority for comment; however, no response was received. It is considered that the submitted information appropriately address the preliminary concerns raised by the Highway Authority. As such, there are no anticipated highway or access constraints associated with this development.

Conclusion

82. This application seeks consent for a 3-bedroom agricultural workers dwelling in Barber Booth. The application is supported by an Agricultural Justification Statement which outlines that the applicant has an extensive workload; however, it is considered that the Statement does not provide a reasoned justification for why there is an essential and functional need for workers to be readily available at most times on site. Accordingly, it is considered to not comply with policy DMH4, in particular part A (I) of the policy.
83. By virtue of its location, the proposed development would harm the special qualities of the National Park, including the landscape and Edale Conservation Area. The proposed development would be isolated in the landscape, and result in an unacceptable

urbanising and domesticating influence on the otherwise pastoral and rural landscape. It is therefore contrary to policy L1, DMC5, and DMC8.

Human Rights

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

85. List of Background Papers (not previously published)

86. Nil

Report author: Will Eyre, North Area Planner